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Councillor Dan Gordon
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WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

A meeting of the WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL will be held in the COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA on TUESDAY 7 AUGUST 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. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

4. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

4.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 29 – 31 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 29 – 31 May 2018.

4.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 3 July 2018

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Council:
(b) Confirms as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 3 July 2018.
4.3 Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 3 July 2018
(refer to Blue agenda papers)

MATTERS ARISING

5. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

6. ADJOURNED BUSINESS

Nil.

7. REGENERATION REPORTS

7.1 Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme – August 2018 Update – Gary Boot (Senior Engineering Advisor)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180723081893

(b) Notes the recovery works construction programme as presented in Attachment 1 of this report.

(c) Notes that 48 of the 52 projects on the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme have been completed, one will be completed in August 2018 and another in September 2018. The remainder are integral with the Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area.

(d) Notes that the current estimate for the capital component of the recovery works is $38,219,000, which is approximately $400K less than is budgeted.

(e) Notes that a proposal is being considered to convert the redundant Charles St wastewater pump station into a public viewing platform adjacent to the Kaiapoi River, rather than demolish the structure.

(f) Authorises staff to utilise the remaining budget of $100K allocated for demolishing the Charles St wastewater pump station for investigating and establishing the public viewing platform, if it is found to be feasible and safe to do so.

(g) Forwards this report to the Utilities and Roading Committee and Regeneration Steering Group for their information.
7.2. **Building (Earthquake Prone Buildings) Amendment Act 2016** –
Greig Wilson (Building Inspector) and Lynley Beckingsale (Policy Analyst)

167 - 175

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(h) Receives report No: 180710076763


(j) Notes that the period of public consultation will be from 20 August to 20 September 2018, following which a hearing is proposed for later in October.

(k) Notes consultation with affected property owners is being undertaken.

(l) Appoints Councillor….. and Councillor….. and Councillor….. to the Hearing Panel.

8. **REPORTS**

8.1. **Rangiora-Woodend Road, Gressons Road, Boys Road and Northbrook Road Speed Limit Review**– Bill Rice (Senior Transport Engineer)

176 - 215

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180706075194.

(b) Approves consultation being carried out on the proposed speed limit changes summarised below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Woodend Road from end of existing 80km/h east of Smarts Road to proposed Ravenswood roundabout</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Woodend Road from proposed Ravenswood roundabout to start of 50km/h north of School Road</td>
<td>70km/h</td>
<td>60km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gressons Road</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys Road from Rangiora Woodend Road to existing 50km/h at railway line</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbrook Road from Boys Road to existing 50km/h east of Goodwin Street</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Notes the consultation on this proposal will be carried out between 13 August and 9 September 2018.

(d) Notes the Community Boards will be updated at the end of the consultation process.
(e) **Notes** that any submissions on the proposal will be taken into account before the speed limit change is presented to the Council on 2 October 2018 for approval.

(f) **Circulates** this report to the Community Boards.

8.2. **Request for Budget for Completion of Oxford Rural No. 1 Source Upgrade Project – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180724082339.

(b) **Notes** that the consent to take water from the new well has been granted by Environment Canterbury and that there were no appeals against this decision.

(c) **Approves** an additional capital budget of $200,000 for the Oxford Rural No.1 Source Upgrade budget for the 2018/19 financial year ($130,000 level of service budget, $70,000 renewal budget) to make a total combined capital budget of $2.6M.

(d) **Notes** that this budget will compensate for additional expenditure required to gain the resource consent to take water from the new well, as well as to allow sufficient contingency for the completion of the project.

(e) **Notes** that this additional budget will increase the Oxford Rural No.1 water rate by approximately $11 per unit per year, which is a 2% increase over next year’s projected water rate for the scheme.

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

8.3. **Southwest Rangiora Supply Main – Request for Additional Budget – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180726083675.

(b) **Approves** an additional capital budget of $40,000 to the Southwest Rangiora Supply Main – Stage 1 project for the 2018/19 financial year to give a total budget figure of $314,000.

(c) **Approves** staff to engage the Council’s Water Unit to complete these works for the quoted price of 147,776.36 without seeking alternative prices.

(d) **Notes** that the reason for not publicly tendering the work is because the Water Unit have the capability and capacity to complete the work at a competitive price.

(e) **Notes** that the costs associated with this project will be recovered through the West Rangiora Water development contribution, and that the increase in budget will increase this development contribution by $49 per new connection from the 2019/20 financial year onwards.
8.4. **Rangiora Airfield Plan Change and Designation – Craig Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No.180730084697

(b) **Approves** staff lodging the Proposed plan change and notice of requirement for Rangiora Airfield (Trim 180730084763 and 180730084766)

(c) **Circulates** this report to the Boards.

8.5 **Councillor Appointments to Rangiora Airfield Advisory Group – Sarah Nichols (Governance Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180725083462.

(b) **Retrospectively ratifies** Councillor Gordon to replace Councillor Atkinson as the Council representative on the Rangiora Airfield Advisory Group.

(c) **Notes** that Councillor Williams will continue to also be the Council representative on the Rangiora Airfield Advisory Group.

9. **HEALTH AND SAFETY**

9.1 **Health and Safety Report for July 2018 – Jim Palmer (Chief Executive)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180723081898.
10. MATTERS REFERRED FROM COMMITTEES AND COMMUNITY BOARDS

10.1 Parking Restrictions at Oxford Road Charles Upham Drive Acacia Avenue intersection and on Charles Upham Drive – Bill Rice (Senior Transport Engineer)
(refer attached report no. 180628071686 to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting of 11 July 2018)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180628071686.
(b) Adopts the attached Amended Second Schedule – Parking Restrictions to the Parking Bylaw 2007 (TRIM No 180629072243).
(c) Notes that other safety concerns at the Oxford Road, Acacia Avenue, Charles Upham Drive intersection are to be addressed in the Oxford Road urbanisation project.
(d) Notes that further parking restrictions may be required on Oxford Road to accommodate right turn bays at the intersection.
(e) Notes that further parking restrictions may be required on the roading network north of the Charles Upham village vehicle entrance. These will be added to the parking bylaw second schedule when this section of road is vested in Council.

10.2 Final Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 – Kitty Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager)
(refer attached report no. 180710076344 to the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party meeting of 19 July 2018)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180710076344.
(b) Adopts the final Waste Management & Minimisation Plan 2018 (180710076343).
(c) Circulates a copy of this report to all Community Boards for their information.

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

11.1 Minutes of a meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee held on 19 June 2018

11.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on 19 June 2018
11.3 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri Youth Council held on 26 June 2018
464 - 466

11.4 Minutes of a meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group held on 2 July 2018
467 - 469

11.5 Minutes of a meeting of the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party held on 19 July 2018
470 - 473

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the information in items 11.1-11.5 be received.

12. COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

12.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board held on 5 July 2018
474 - 486

12.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board held on 9 July 2018
487 - 496

12.3 Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board held on 11 July 2018
497 - 509

12.4 Minutes of a meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board held on 16 July 2018
510 - 518

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

13. CORRESPONDENCE

14. MAYOR’S DIARY

14.1 Mayor’s Diary 25 June to 30 July 2018
519 - 521

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report no. 180720081108.

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 3 July 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 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting of 11 July 2018</td>
<td>Minutes to be received for information.</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MATTER REFERRED FROM THE RANGIORA-ASHLEY COMMUNITY BOARD 11 JULY 2018

18.3 Report of Raymond Qu (Property Assets Advisor) and Rob Hawthorne (Property Manager)
Proposed Sale process for 70 and 74 High Street, Rangiora
Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7
Section 48(1)(a)

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 – 18.3</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CLOSED MEETING
See Public Excluded Agenda (blue papers)

OPEN MEETING

19. NEXT MEETING
The next scheduled meeting of the Council is on Tuesday 4 September 2018 commencing at 1pm.
MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD IN THE
COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA, ON TUESDAY 29 MAY TO
THURSDAY 31 MAY 2018, COMMENCING AT 9AM EACH DAY.

PRESENT:
Mayor D Ayers (Chair), Deputy Mayor K Felstead, Councillors N Atkinson, K Barnett, R Brine
(departed 10.43am after item 5.2), A Blackie, W Doody, D Gordon, J Meyer, S Stewart and
P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE:
J Palmer (Chief Executive), J Millward (Manager, Finance & Business Support), C Sargison
(Manager, Community & Recreation), G Cleary (Manager, Roading and Utilities), S Markham
(Manager Strategy & Engagement), C Brown (Community & Green Space Manager), K Simpson
(3Waters Manager), J McBride (Roading & Transport Manager), Y Warnaar (Asset Planning
Engineer Roading), O Davies (Drainage Asset Manager), K Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset
Manager), C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager), C Parton (Wastewater Asset Manager), M Harris
(Customer Services Manager), S Hart (Business and Centres Manager), M Edgar (Corporate
Planner) and S Nichols (Governance Manager).

Tuesday 29 May 2018 (Day One)
The meeting adjourned for refreshments at 10.43am and reconvened at 11.01am.
The meeting adjourned at 12.02pm to enable Councillors to familiarise themselves with the
Community Facilities Provision report and reconvened at 12.09pm.
The meeting adjourned at 12.48pm for refreshments and reconvened at 1.23pm.
The meeting adjourned for refreshments at 3.14pm and reconvened at 3.25pm.
The meeting adjourned at 5.24pm to reconvene on Wednesday 30 May 2018 at 9.05am.

Wednesday 30 May 2018 (Day Two)
The meeting adjourned for refreshments at 10.17am and reconvened at 10.35am.
The meeting adjourned at 11.53am for a public excluded briefing on roading and utilities
related matters and reconvened at 12.06pm.
The meeting adjourned for refreshments at 12.34pm and reconvened at 1.04pm.
The meeting adjourned for refreshments at 3.19pm and reconvened at 3.35pm.
The meeting adjourned at 5.38pm and reconvened on Thursday 31 May 2018 at 9am.

Thursday 31 May (Day Three)
The meeting reconvened at 9am and concluded at 10.45am.

The Mayor welcomed everyone to the meeting, acknowledging the full public gallery.

1. APOLOGIES

Moved: Councillor Atkinson  Seconded: Councillor Blackie
An apology for early departure was received and sustained from Councillor R Brine on
29 May 2018 from 11am.
An apology for early departure was received and sustained from Councillor Meyer on
29 May 2018 from 3.05pm.
An apology for absence was received and sustained from Councillor R Brine for 30 and
31 May 2018.

CARRIED

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Mayor Ayers declared a conflict of interest with submission 296 (Compass FM), being a
Trustee.
Councillor Doody declared a conflict of interest with submission 272 (North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support), being the current Chairperson (noting it was a Council appointment to the Group).

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 8 May and Wednesday 9 May 2018 to hear submissions to the Draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028

Moved: Councillor Barnett Seconded: Councillor Gordon

THAT the Council:

(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 8 May and Wednesday 9 May 2018, subject to minor amendments supplied by Councillor Barnett.

CARRIED

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Nil.

OVERVIEW

Day One
J Palmer outlined the meeting process and provided background to this point regarding the Long Term Plan.

J Palmer spoke of the work that had been undertaken to contribute towards the Long Term Plan, which included the District Development Strategy, a review of the Asset Management Plans, assessments of community needs, concept designs for the indoor court facility, consultation on kerbside collection, the work undertaken by the regeneration steering group and many discussions with councillors on a number of policies and Council direction.

J Palmer reflected on these deliberation meetings being an accumulation of 18 months of work by staff and Councillors, working through the budget meetings in January and then consultation with the community on the draft LTP which sets out the budgets for the next ten years. Over 800 submissions from the community were received with more than 50 people and groups speaking during the two day hearing process. It is now the responsibility of the Council to consider that consultation feedback, in conjunction with staff information to determine the Council budget and set the rates for the upcoming financial year. It has been a very thorough process.

J Palmer commented briefly on the government indications related to public water supplies and additional UV treatment, to which this Council had taken the precautionary action of including provisional budgets. J Palmer also commented on the unexpected crash in the international recycling market, with consequences that may require greater spending than forecast. This had been signalled to the Council last week and further discussions would be held tomorrow.

Day Two
J Palmer provided an update from the previous day and spoke of the recycling cost increases and potential options for the Council to consider.

ACCEPTANCE OF A LATE REPORT

Moved: Councillor Gordon Seconded: Councillor Felstead
That the Council accept a late report titled Community Facilities Provision – Craig Sargison (Manager Community & Recreation), Trim reference 180514052564 to be considered during the meeting as item 5.4.

CARRIED

5. REPORTS

5.1 Draft Long Term Plan 2018-28 Special Consultative Procedure – M Edgar (Corporate Planner)

M Edgar spoke briefly to the report.

Moved: Mayor Ayers    Seconded: Councillor Doody

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report LTC-03-13-04/TRIM Number 180517054560.
(b) Receives all 850 submissions and associated submission points raised by submitters, which are included in the ‘Deliberations Pack’ previously distributed to Councillors.
(c) Adopts all submission recommendations proforma.

CARRIED

5.2 Multi-Use Sports Facility – C Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)

Mayor Ayers indicated his intention to move the staff recommendation.

C Sargison spoke briefly to the report, highlighting the alternative proposal received from DM and AD Smith Investments Ltd, the purchase of the Coldstream Road land and the consultation with the community which had included both the concept layout of the facility at the Coldstream Road site, and the layout of the proposed building. From the submissions received, there was general support for the design of the facility with staff acknowledging that some feedback mentioned concern at the affordability of the project. Staff mentioned the costings included in the previous Long Term Plan (2015-2025 LTP) being $108 per household, based on a $23 million facility, and the current draft 2018-2028 LTP costing of $27.85 million with a per household cost of $91. The decrease per household was based on the increase of population of the district.

There were no questions from Councillors.

Moved: Mayor Ayers    Seconded: Councillor Gordon

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180430046651
(b) Notes the submissions to the Draft LTP on the multi-use indoor court facility
(c) Notes the letter of offer from DM and AD Smith Investments Ltd for an alternative proposal at Flaxton Road.
(d) Declines the proposal from DM and AD Smith Investments Ltd because the long-term cost of leasing will be greater than through Council ownership by around $12.575 million.
(e) Approves the Master Plan for the layout of the Council owned land at Coldstream Road (Trim 170816088145).
(f) **Agrees** to proceed with the development of the Multi Use Sports Facility at Coldstream Road for a total project cost of $27.85 million with the construction of the facility being completed around September 2020.

(g) **Requests** staff to submit a report on procurement of professional services for the detailed design of the facility to the July Council meeting.

(h) **Notes** that the rate effect of the facility is an increase of $91.00 per property per annum.

(i) **Circulates** the resolution and the report to the Community Boards.

Mayor Ayers stated that this is a very important decision to make for both the Council and for the whole of the Waimakariri District. Mayor Ayers reflected back to 2011 when he was first approached and now seven years later, the Council have received many submissions over various forums and it has been clearly established there is a need for this facility in our district. It is within the context of Greater Christchurch. Mayor Ayers reflected on the Metro Sports facility in Christchurch two years ago, and the City being aware of the Waimakariri proposal. Mayor Ayers acknowledged concern from the community in relation to cost as this will be one of the biggest projects since 1989 when the Waimakariri Council was formed.

Mayor Ayers reflected on concerns raised regarding debt versus recreation and fitness, the community consultation and the strong response in favour of the project. Mayor Ayers stated that he had lived in Rangiora since 1983 and had never encountered a councillor who was not concerned with rate burdens. Mayor Ayers stated that the 2018/19 financial year was the biggest projected rate rise and yet there is minimal funding relating to the stadium for this year. The Council has debt levels but it also prepared for earthquake funding with a cushion for insurance if there is no government support or insurance should the situation arise. This Council has been responsible in dealing with debt and debt projections he stated. Mayor Ayers spoke of the valid Council discussions and debate that related to the ‘nice to have’ or ‘need’ which included other assets such as libraries. Mayor Ayers remarked that one of the options is to delay the sports facility project, but it costs more and construction costs rise quicker than inflation, so if the Council wait it will be worse for the community. Mayor Ayers spoke of who will benefit; the community, and the Council must think community wide. He acknowledged that not everyone uses all the facilities in the district, reflecting on his personal fight for the Dudley Pool, which he has only used once with his grandchildren.

Mayor Ayers commented on low income households, not just being the elderly, and he believed low income families would use this facility, along with the many others in our community who will benefit.

Mayor Ayers remarked on the Local Government Act and the four well beings included in the legislation that states the purpose of local government is to enable democratic local decision-making and action by, and on behalf of, communities and to promote the social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being of communities, in the present and for the future. Therefore we as a Council have to provide for our diverse community he stated.

Since 2011 this Council has been bold, purchasing land, building town halls and libraries bigger and better, and rising to the challenges of a growing community. Mayor Ayers urged the Council to be bold and support the recommendation.

Councillor Gordon agreed with the comments made by the Mayor, commenting that the debate is more about affordability rather than needing a facility, as the location has already been agreed some time ago. Councillor Gordon spoke of a recent visit to the Marlborough stadium and reflected on being part of several LTP cycles where such a facility as this had been mooted. Councillor Gordon believed
this was the right time, based on his feedback from the community with 87% of submitters supporting the sports facility. Councillor Gordon spoke of the affordability argument that comes with such large asset investments such as Dudley Pool and the Regeneration area yet the cost is spread over 20 years. Councillor Gordon stated he was always prepared to consider a private/public collaboration and reflected on the alternative option and the implications of a lease arrangement. Councillor Gordon spoke of the location and linkages with other sporting codes, a design by a reputable firm which enables expansion over time, the multi-use features and the proposed partnership with the North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust. Councillor Gordon stated that given the public feedback and expectations of many in the community he urged colleagues to vote to proceed with the sports facility project.

Councillor Williams stated he was in favour of the indoor court facility being built as an asset but held concerns in relation to the timing of construction, believing 2022 would be better for spreading the cost. Councillor Williams asked colleagues what was more important; flood mitigation, sewage and drinking water standards or the stadium. Councillor Williams commented on the existing Trust facilities and Rangiora High School, noting that the Council had committed $1m earlier in the year towards the new Kaiapoi High School gymnasium facility. Councillor Williams queried the 87% support as organisations represented many people yet the submission was counted as one vote. He commented on the Standard and Poors credit rating and issues that they have raised in relation to Council borrowing. Councillor Williams reflected on his reasoning for standing for Council and the promise made of rates being affordable for everybody, and his belief that core work should be undertaken first. Councillor Williams believed it was prudent to budget and put some funding aside for the stadium in two to three years’ time, and he concurred with Councillor Gordon’s comments related to other asset sales potentially assisting with funding of the stadium.

Councillor Doody stated she was in favour of the stadium proposal, reflecting on being part of the concept working party and involved from the ground up ensuring a suitable outcome for the community. Councillor Doody acknowledged the work of the Sports Trust and how they give back to the community.

AMENDMENT

To staff recommendation (f)

Moved: Councillor Atkinson   Seconded: Councillor Meyer

That the Council

(f) Agrees to proceed with the development of the Multi Use Sports Facility at Coldstream Road for a total project cost of $27.85 million (inflation adjusted) with the construction of the facility to start in 2021/22.

LOST

Division called by Councillor Atkinson

For: Councillors Atkinson, Blackie, Meyer, Stewart and Williams.

Against: Mayor Ayers, Councillors Felstead, Barnett, Brine, Doody and Gordon.

Amendment Lost 6:5.

Councillor Atkinson spoke of affordability and timing, acknowledging the facility is necessary for the growing district. He agreed with the Mayor’s statement of the Council needing to be bold and taking that important step however given the capital works programme it could be argued that being bold is to pause the stadium project. The Council are uncertain what the recycling programme will cost going
forward and we have programmed major upgrades for our waste water and drinking water which we have to do as a responsible Council. Councillor Atkinson spoke of unknown factors that could have an impact on the future budgets, including transport related changes, sea level rise, housing subsidies, future rates rises and the need to be prudent and fiscally responsible as the budgets were already committing $141m on capital improvements over the next 10 years. Councillor Atkinson reflected on submissions and staff advice remarking that the Council needs to live within its means, just like the community.

Councillor Meyer spoke to the amendment, reflecting on the democratic process, work undertaken to date and the pride he held for this Council. He stated he was not against the stadium project, reflecting on the earthquake and what the Council team had achieved since Canterbury changed in 2011, noting that the rebuilds have come at a great cost; both socially and economically. Councillor Meyer accepted the stadium project would go ahead but remarked that the timing is important in relation to the balance sheets and noting that whilst the current financial ratings are positive he cautioned potential impacts that could come in the next one to two years and how he would be more confident to start the stadium in three years’ time when the Council would be in a better financial position. He mentioned implications to rating, budget and impacts on infrastructure. Councillor Meyer accepted people would be disappointed if the project was delayed by several years, however that is a short time in local government, yet it would enable the Council to get its financial ducks in a row.

Councillor Gordon sought clarification from the Chief Executive in relation to the risk of Standard and Poors (S&P) downgrading the Council rating, with drainage projects not being delayed and the capital spend over the next 10 years, based on matters raised in debate by Councillor Meyer.

J Palmer advised that the S&P rating had changed to a negative outlook (not a downgrade), which they would review again in 12 months’ time. The reasons for the change were related to the change of capital profile and if the Council delivers on the LTP it is likely that the Council rating will return to a stable outcome. The financial effect to the Council, if it was to be downgraded to an AA- grade, would mean that borrowing would change across a $200m loan programme of (.05 to .1%) which equates to approximately $20,000 per year. Management believe the funding effect is manageable within the overall budget as the operating budget is $90m. J Palmer advised that the drainage and water programmes needed to be considered separately and he outlined the upgrades that have occurred over the last three years, and information resulting from the Havelock North Inquiry. The prospect of chlorination in the future has seen an inclusion of an additional $3m in the budget, which was consulted on however this now needs to be increased to $6m for UV treatment which has been factored into the LTP currently before the Council. It was further advised that no renewal plans are affected. It was acknowledged sewerage was a significant investment involving $20m in Woodend and Rangiora. Capital programmes had been reviewed, factoring staff resources which has resulted in a realignment of some budgets. It was advised that one of the larger projects for Council’s consideration involving $4m would occur tomorrow relating to the Kaiapoi drainage solution and associated development occurring in Silverstream. J Palmer advised that the total capital spend over the next 10 years is approximately $440m, with $120m of that figure proposed in the first two years, including $30m carry-overs. That would result in $90m remaining to be spent over the next two years and is relative to what the Council has been spending over the last few years.

Councillor Barnett expressed her delight that everyone who had spoken so far agreed to build the sports facility, reflecting on the many issues the Council has tackled since 2010 when she came onto the Council and commenting that prudent spending is generational. Councillor Barnett remarked that she did not believe pushing out the stadium project by three years will help with generational years, and the Council was aware of the self-imposed debt levels. Councillor Barnett
commented on the S&P ratings, and being the only Council with such a high financial rating, reminding members it was a higher rating than the banks. Councillor Barnett commented on the excellent financial condition that the Council was in, with staff informing members well and through prudent management ensuring the Council and community could financially cope with an alpine fault event. Councillor Barnett reflected that in the 2015-2025 LTP the Council agreed to put $23m in the budget, and now it is putting an additional $4.7m in the budget. She commented on the earthquake and the resulting fast growth that followed including demands for recreation and sport space by the local schools and reflected on the submission feedback and needing a facility for the young members of the community. Councillor Barnett believed Ashburton, Selwyn and Christchurch have better facilities than currently provided for in Waimakariri, and the community cannot wait another three years. Councillor Barnett noted that there were very few submissions speaking against the $18m for regeneration related projects, believing that the community were signalling for the Council to recover and rebuild. Councillor Barnett spoke of the importance of the sports facility, being a place of community connection as well as for community health. Councillor Barnett stated this proposed facility is needed now, although she believed it may not be big enough.

Mayor Ayers spoke to the amendment, commenting that it fails to show a difference, commenting on the financial stability of the Council, the Excellence Programme in which Waimakariri and Wellington City are the only two councils to achieve an AA rating by independent assessors. He commented on flooding mitigation projects and the $20m remediation project which is on-going. Mayor Ayers acknowledged sea level rise and climate change is happening but it is a 50 to 100 year programme, not the next three years. We know the population is increasing, across all age groups, and acknowledged the higher elderly population. He commented on the spike in growth after the 2011 earthquake however the district continues to grow. Mayor Ayers stated that we have certainties and uncertainties in the planning and knowledge, however that happens every year into the future and the Council needed to deal with it based on the best information and judgement at the time. Drinking water issues are across New Zealand and the Government is working and listening to Local Government issues. Whilst the Government is making changes that may cause some uncertainty but it is also working with us not against us.

Councillor Stewart acknowledged the sports stadium as an exciting facility but expressed concern on costs, reflecting on expenses over the next decade, district growth, projects in the LTP and the impacts on ratepayers. She remarked on the rates rebate that not all eligible persons apply for, the costs associated with clean water, recycling issues, and nitrate contamination. Councillor Stewart expressed concern that the costs of treating nitrate issues were not factored into the current budget, although more information would be furnished from ECan later in June. Councillor Stewart remarked that by delaying the stadium facility three years whilst the construction costs may increase, the costs on the community are likely to decrease as the population continues to grow. The time delay would also enable the Council to better understand the recycling cost issues, government related implications regarding water and to complete the most ambitious works programme that has been proposed. Councillor Stewart stated she did not want to see the failure of the capital works programme, and was mindful of the S&P rating which the Council had achieved to this point by prudent financial management and the potential downgrade. Councillor Stewart stated she supported the amendment.

Councillor Blackie commented on ‘do we want to afford it?’ and referred to budget buffers for future disasters. He commented on the four community boards, which represent a portion of the community and their thoughts on the stadium proposal proceeding. Councillor Blackie remarked on the Ashburton sports facility considered by some as being too small, associated costs and the fact that Ashburton did not have the same earthquake associated costs. Councillor Blackie commented on the $40m that the Council had borrowed to undertake earthquake
related works, the recovery plan, and rate increases in relation to the CPI. Councillor Blackie was concerned about the working poor, and balancing the desirability of such a community asset. Councillor Blackie was supportive of delaying the sports facility for three years.

Councillors Felstead remarked that if the facility is delayed, there will always be other community challenges, which should be dealt with as they occur. He commented on affordability and the rates projections, stating he would vote against the amendment.

Councillor Gordon stated he was against the amendment for reasons already stated. The modelling had been done on the North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust being involved in the project, which is operated by respected community members from professional backgrounds such as an accountant, lawyer, pharmacist and other business people and the proposal had Councillor Gordon’s confidence of success.

Returning to the substantive motion.

Councillor Barnett clarified three out of the four community boards support the sports facility (with some conditions), and that only the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board was opposing the facility at this time.

Councillor Atkinson commented on some of the unknowns, such as regional facilities and the burden on ratepayers, believing that a three year delay would be better for the community, reminding members that it was only recently that the facility had moved forward in the budget timeframes, as it had been in the outer years. Councillor Atkinson stated that if the stadium is not going to be delayed then the full Council need to support the facility, therefore he stated he would support the substantive motion as he wanted to see a facility for the community, however he was disappointed in his view that the Council was not being as prudent as he believed it should be.

Councillor Stewart stated she would not support the motion as previously outlined, acknowledging that all Councillors were supportive of the stadium and it was the timing and impact on the ratepayers that was in debate. Councillor Stewart commented that her emphasis was on the natural environment including the waterways which are under threat and polluted, with associated financial costs to come, and reflected on the environmental issues the district was facing in the next five to 10 years.

Councillor Felstead stated that he would support the motion believing it is a function of the Council to provide the facility. Councillor Felstead stated this Council was progressive, and could afford to be and needed to cater for the district growth, and would deal with issues as they arose.

In his right of reply, Mayor Ayers reflected on Councillor Williams’ comment on the submission of groups being counted as one submission, and their voice should be considered, remarking that he did not personally count such submissions as one vote.

Moved: Mayor Ayers   Seconded: Councillor Gordon

THAT the Council:
(a)  Receives report No. 180430046651
(b)  Notes the submissions to the Draft LTP on the multi-use indoor court facility
(c)  Notes the letter of offer from DM and AD Smith Investments Ltd for an alternative proposal at Flaxton Road.
(d) **Declines** the proposal from DM and AD Smith Investments Ltd because the long-term cost of leasing will be greater than through Council ownership by around $12.575 million.

(e) **Approves** the Master Plan for the layout of the Council owned land at Coldstream Road.

(f) **Agrees** to proceed with the development of the Multi Use Sports Facility at Coldstream Road for a total project cost of $27.85 million with the construction of the facility being completed around September 2020.

(g) **Requests** staff to submit a report on procurement of professional services for the detailed design of the facility to the July Council meeting.

(h) **Notes** that the rate effect of the facility is an increase of $91.00 per property per annum.

(i) **Circulates** the resolution and the report to the Community Boards.

**CARRIED**

Division called by Councillor Gordon


Against: Councillors Blackie and Stewart.

Substantive Motion Carried 9:2

Mayor Ayers thanked the Councillors for the spirit in which the debate occurred and the full public gallery for their interest.

The meeting adjourned at 10.43am and reconvened at 11.01am.

Councillor Brine departed at 10.43am.

Following a question from Councillor Barnett in relation to submission responses staff explained that not all submissions would receive a standard response and responses would be tailored to submission points raised. Some groups will have ongoing discussions with staff to explore further options.

5.3 **Multi-Use Sports Facility Operating Agreement – C Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)**

C Sargison spoke to the report briefly outlining the proposed stages of the process. He confirmed key aspects of the agreement with the Trust operation including naming rights and rental fee.

J Palmer acknowledged that the maximum revenue was anticipated to build over 18 months as the Trust builds the activity programme, commenting on the initial anticipated operating shortfall.

Councillor Stewart sought assurance that the Trust has capacity to run the stadium plus its undertaking of the Flaxton Gym, whilst doing justice to both operations. J Palmer reflected on the two Councillors that are appointed to the Trust Board, and matters would be traversed over the next six months to help confirm that aspect. J Palmer spoke of the quality of the relationship with the Trust.

Councillor Barnett queried Rata Foundation funding, asking if it was envisaged that the Trust could apply for more funding, including from other organisations. C Sargison commented on previous discussions with the Rata Foundation relating
to all council facilities. Lotteries funding would be to the Council and staff will investigate that now the Council has approved the sports facility proceeding.

Councillor Blackie queried the $200,000 of annual contributions and impacts if the Trust were not meeting the operating costs. J Palmer commented that to ensure transparency of the commercial operation of the Trust, and being conscious of other private gym facilities in the district, the Council should always expect the rental from the Trust. Through the programme the Trust should be able to cover operational matters and the Council would pay rates and insurance. If the Trust makes a profit, then those profits are returned through programmes to the community. J Palmer spoke of fees and charges which would be a joint discussion and the close monitoring of the operations, particularly in the first 18 months.

Councillor Williams enquired if the Trust would keep accounts separate to other operations to assist with the financial and operational monitoring. J Palmer advised that the Trust would run separate accounts for the sports facility to show appropriate accountability and transparency. The details of the fit-out details will become clearer over the next six months, pending funding from the Rata Foundation and other aspects. Briefings will occur with the Council prior to the finalisation of tender for works etc.

Councillor Atkinson queried fundraising by the community and where that contribution may go (ie running costs or to the capital cost to the Council. C Sargison advised that it was likely Rata Foundation or Lotteries funding would go to capital costs. For funding from various community groups it may be more appropriate to be a contribution for equipment for various sports. J Palmer spoke of corporate sponsors that then contributes to operating costs.

In a supplementary question Councillor Atkinson sought clarification on sports organisations/clubs contributing to the facility that may have otherwise been utilised for independent sports club facilities. J Palmer commented on the potential appetite by those individual groups to fund raise, and community passion to contribute towards costs. C Sargison referred to the report, commenting that some clubs/groups intend to contribute however that would be part of the contribution towards the $1m that the Trust are raising for fit-out related matters.

Councillor Stewart was interested in the mechanics of reporting from the Sports Trust back to the full Council to show transparency. J Palmer advised that as part of the agreement there will be the appropriate accountability provisions and spoke of a need to create a forum to exchange views and discuss further accountability and the co-ordination of the mechanisms. Over the next few months staff will bring back that information to the Council for consideration and comment.

Councillor Barnett sought clarification of the review terms and an exit agreement. J Palmer confirmed there would be appropriate clauses in the agreement relating to ceasing of the agreement and review provisions will also be included. He also confirmed that information will be discussed with the Council prior to formal adoption. Staff commented that it is a collaboration and negotiation with the Trust.

Moved: Councillor Atkinson Seconded: Councillor Blackie

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180516053790
(b) Approves that the Multi Use Sports Facility will be operated by the North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust.
(c) Notes the key terms of the proposed agreement with the Trust.
(d) Approves staff negotiating a formal agreement for the operation of the Multi Use Sports Facility at Coldstream Road with the Trust for the consideration of Council.
(e) Notes that the agreement will be prepared for Council’s consideration prior to the Council awarding a contract for the construction of the Multi Use Sports Facility.

CARRIED
Councillor Stewart Abstained

It was noted that members of the Trust are Council appointees (Councillors Doody and Gordon) and therefore there was no conflict of interest in matters being discussed.

Councillor Atkinson remarked on questions from the community related to where raised funds go towards the stadium and he hoped community groups would undertake some fundraising as he believed it is a community responsibility for that operation. For the groups with capital funds Councillor Atkinson felt it was important they contribute towards the facility as they will directly benefit. Councillor Atkinson was supportive of sponsorship going towards operational matters and agreed that reporting back should be included in any agreement, be regular and to the full Council. Councillor Atkinson remarketed that the Trust have done a good job in what they have run to date.

Councillor Gordon reflected on his colleagues’ good comments, questions and matters raised for consideration. He commented that the Trust does have assets and as a Trustee he believes the project is manageable and that it is in everyone’s interests that the project succeed. Councillor Gordon reflected on the Coldstream Road hockey facility fun by the Trust, on behalf of the Council with an appropriate agreement in place. The Trust is run on a business model, with surplus funding returned to the community through various programmes. Councillor Gordon provided various examples. He reflected on the Rangiora Town Hall operation run by a commercial operator and how that agreement is working well for the Council and the community.

Councillor Stewart stated she would abstain from the vote, whilst accepting comments made and the Trust history. Councillor Stewart reflected on Enterprise North Canterbury (ENC) and Te Kohaka o Tuhaitara Trust relationships not being of the same magnitude as the stadium project. Councillor Stewart stated that she would appreciate regular financial reporting with quarterly timeframes as a minimum. Councillor Stewart also wished to see the ratepayers respected and the facility to achieve what everyone hopes it will achieve.

Councillor Barnett supported the recommendation and explained her line of questioning. The Trust members are well known members of the community and very experienced she remarked. Councillor Barnett spoke of the Council’s capital contribution and her concern with the ongoing operational costs, however she believed this was a great model on behalf of the community.

Councillor Doody, as a Trustee, stated that she was impressed with the Trust’s current operation and has confidence they will run the stadium operation well.

Mayor Ayers reflected on what the motion means for the parties involved, with the details to follow. He acknowledged the Trust is not in the same space as ENC and Te Kohaka as those are both joint agreements with Hurunui District Council and Ngai Tahu respectively. Mayor Ayers spoke of other Trusts where the Council has appointments on the Board and the points made by Councillors, reflecting on the complexities of district requirements over time, noting that fundraising methods have changed over the years too.

Councillor Williams was supportive of the Trust running the stadium and believes they will do a good job, noting the Trustees are well qualified to run such an operation. Councillor Williams remarked that he held some concern on the details however, he looked forward to seeing more information in the coming months.

Mayor Ayers confirmed that the Trust Deed will state that, should for any reason the Sports Trust dissolve, then the assets would go to the Council.
In his right of reply Councillor Atkinson was unsure of some Councillors’ understanding of the motion, and emphasised that the final agreement will come back to the Council for approval before the contract to build the facility is let. Councillor Atkinson stated that he has faith in the Trust and wishes them well in the future endeavours and is confident in the relationship with the Council.

The meeting adjourned at 12:02pm to enable Councillors to familiarise themselves with the Community Facilities Provision report, then the meeting reconvened at 12:09pm.

5.4 **Community Facilities Provision – C Sargison (Manager Community & Recreation) Trim 180514052564 (Late Report)**

C Sargison spoke to the report highlighting aspects in the issues and options section of the report and explaining the table which was in the draft LTP. C Sargison commented on facilities at Pegasus and the need to undertake a feasibility study, which would include assessing impacts from Ravenswood. The ideal situation was likely to be a library and community centre co-joined. He commented on other facilities available in the community currently such as the rugby club rooms at Gladstone Park and explained the current lease arrangement for the temporary Pegasus Community Centre. It was explained that the Rangiora Library funding was spread over several years as there is a need for planning and design, taking into consideration population growth and another LTP. It was advised that book storage needs have been temporarily accommodated.

Councillor Barnett queried the similarities in recommendations (c) and (d). C Sargison spoke of an identified need in the north eastern area of the district for meeting spaces and the merits of a library to service Woodend and Pegasus communities.

Mayor Ayers commented on terminology of North Woodend rather than Ravenswood.

Mayor Ayers queried the extension proposal to the Rangiora Library and whether it is intended to join with the Service Centre building. C Sargison spoke of potential options such as the library downstairs and staffing upstairs, however further investigations would be required before refining the options.

Councillor Meyer enquired if staff were aware that the offices adjacent to the current Pegasus Community Centre are empty. C Sargison confirmed his awareness and explained further the relevant community needs and long term requirements for the community whilst providing best value for money.

Councillor Felstead queried that if the feasibility investigation identified that a more substantial investment in Pegasus was appropriate and are funds available for such a facility? C Sargison advised funds were not presently available and it would be an Annual Plan decision in future years.

Mayor Ayers understood property was selling quickly in Ravenswood, and enquired if staff had considered the need to move quickly to secure appropriate land. C Sargison acknowledged the information and potential of the business zone area being extended, commenting on potential options for a community facility, however the feasibility study was required to determine the next stage.

Councillor Williams stated he saw a need now for a larger community facility at Pegasus, and queried the investigation and land options. C Sargison acknowledged validity advising the feasibility study would show the best options for further Council consideration.

At the request of Councillor Williams each staff recommendation was taken individually.
Moved: Councillor Barnett    Seconded: Councillor Doody

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180514052564

(b) Notes the feedback received from submissions

CARRIED

(c) Confirms the following financial provision and timing in the LTP as follows (noting these are unchanged from the provisions in the Draft LTP):

Moved: Councillor Gordon    Seconded: Councillor Meyer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTP YEAR</th>
<th>$40,000</th>
<th>INVESTIGATION INTO LOCATION OF A COMMUNITY FACILITY/LIBRARY IN WOODEND/PEGASUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AMENDMENT

Moved: Councillor Barnett    Seconded: Councillor Doody

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTP YEAR</th>
<th>$40,000</th>
<th>INVESTIGATION INTO LOCATION OF A COMMUNITY SPACE IN WOODEND/PEGASUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

J Millward commented on the LTP Consultation and the risks of making substantive changes that had not necessarily been consulted on affecting where rates come from. Following a query from Councillor Gordon the Chief Executive advised that he did not see this particular motion as raising any procedural concern.

Division called by Councillor Barnett

For: Councillors Barnett, Blackie, Doody, Gordon, Meyer and Williams.
Against: Mayor Ayers, Councillors Felstead, Atkinson, and Stewart.
Carried 6:4

Councillor Barnett stated she was not convinced a library was needed in every area of the District, commenting on the good Kaiapoi and Rangiora Library resources. Dilution of the facilities with staffing, resources and books would have an impact on budgeting. Councillor Barnett remarked she would rather see facilities for the future with technology scope, however she was comfortable with a kiosk to return library books. Councillor Barnett believed the focus of any new facility should be community space but accepted Oxford is a different matter and the current Service Centre and library makes sense for that particular community. Councillor Barnett remarked that community space does not necessarily require staffing and can be rented.

Councillor Doody understood the Woodend-Sefton Community Board would like a wider scope of the area to be considered.

Mayor Ayers stated he would oppose the motion and believes consideration should be given to a library provision. He remarked there was need to acknowledge that this area of the district is scheduled to grow through to Waikuku. Mayor Ayers commented that the Council could consider further information, and may take an option of a community facility with enough land that could enable a library to be built in the future.
Councillor Williams was supportive of Councillor Barnett’s comments, believing a community building was needed in Pegasus now as there is an established community, whereas Ravenswood is yet to establish. Councillor Williams remarked that he did not see the need to stretch the library facility at this point in time.

Councillor Atkinson was supportive of an investigation, agreeing with the option of a community facility, but cautioned it was important to thoroughly investigate. Councillor Gordon stated he was supportive of the amendment and was comfortable with exploring additional community spaces whilst remaining flexible to options.

Moved: Councillor Gordon  Seconded: Councillor Meyer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTP</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
<th>FURTHER PLANNING FOR LIBRARY EXTENSION AT RANGIORA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

Moved: Councillor Gordon  Seconded: Councillor Meyer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTP</th>
<th>YEAR 5</th>
<th>DETAILED DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION COMMENCEMENT OF RANGIORA LIBRARY EXTENSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3MILLION</td>
<td>Car-parking development for land approved for community groups buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

Councillor Wendy queried the Rangiora Library extension and whether it was likely the building would expand vertically or horizontally. Mayor Ayers responded that any library development links with the future of the Service Centre and confirmed that $50,000 is included in the budget to assess the alignment between the two buildings.

Councillor Atkinson queried construction in years five and/or six with investigation in year four yet to be decided. J Palmer advised there was another LTP cycle to refine the timing.

**AMENDMENT**

Moved: Councillor Atkinson  Seconded: Councillor Gordon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTP</th>
<th>YEAR 5 AND 6</th>
<th>DETAILED DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION COMMENCEMENT OF RANGIORA LIBRARY EXTENSION DEPENDING ON OUTCOME OF YEAR 4.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3MILLION</td>
<td>Car-parking development for land approved for community group buildings in the regeneration areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

Moved: Councillor Barnett  Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTP</th>
<th>YEAR 10</th>
<th>LANDSCAPING/CAR-PARKING ON LAND APPROVED FOR COMMUNITY GROUP BUILDINGS IN THE REGENERATION AREAS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3.9million</td>
<td>New community space at Ravenswood/Pegasus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

Councillor Barnett commented on the wording for the submitter responses. Councillor Barnett spoke of the need to have a placeholder in the budget with further debate during the review once the investigation has concluded.
Mayor Ayers acknowledged that a placeholder in year 10, may be too far out for the community however there were several Long Term Plans to be considered and altered if that was the desire of the Council. Mayor Ayers acknowledged capital spending, a needs analysis and investigation. Any variation could occur during the Annual Plan process.

Moved: Councillor Barnett    Seconded: Councillor Doody
(d) **Notes** that a separate report on the provision of land for community owned buildings in the Regeneration Areas will be progressed once the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan is finalised.

CARRIED

*The meeting adjourned at 12.48pm and reconvened at 1.23pm (Day One).*

5.5 **Community Facilities Fees and Charges – C Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)**

C Sargison spoke briefly to the report, drawing attention to a small change in the recommendation for combined room use at the Woodend Community Centre to $30/hr. He advised that user groups were written to prior to the LTP ensuring they were aware of the LTP proposals and ability to submit. C Sargison reflected on discussions during the draft LTP meeting with regard to the Rangiora Airfield operation. He commented on the proposed fee structure for the Rangiora Town Hall, particularly in relation to power being included in the hire fee. The draft proposal asked if fee changes should occur at one time, with C Sargison advising which facilities have charges proposed to be staggered over two financial years.

Mayor Ayers spoke of the free access to the Woodend Community Group and whether the same terms could be extended to the Ohoka Community Association. Staff confirmed that would occur. Staff explained about community associations using Council facilities. It was proposed that if community groups discuss their circumstance with staff then a report can be submitted to the Community and Recreation Committee for alternative arrangements.

Councillor Atkinson queried recommendation (e) and whether it raises a precedent. C Sargison provided an example of the Friendship Club which varies on meeting attendance as to whether one or two rooms required at the Woodend Community Centre. In a supplementary question, Councillor Atkinson sought further clarification. Staff responded.

Councillor Gordon referred to the Cust Community Centre and West Eyreton. Staff advised they were listed under the all other facilities heading.

Councillor Gordon queried the process on amending phasing of charges over three years. Staff advised they would come back to the table with an alternative recommendation later in the meeting. Staff recommended leaving the Oxford and Rangiora Town Halls unchanged from the recommendation.

Councillor Williams queried $4m² at the airfield and whether the long term leases can be increased prior to lease expiry dates. C Sargison commented that the airfield leases were on an annual rent review cycle that was staggered. Current timeframes were explained, however any change is at the Council’s discretion. Staff advised that airfield lease holders were written to in February 2018 indicating a fee change.

Councillor Stewart queried if a future report would address non-airfield users taking advantage of cheap rental/storage areas. Staff confirmed that a report would come to the Council in time.
Councillor Stewart queried room hire for Environment Canterbury related meetings such as the Water Zone Committee. Staff confirmed there was a mutual arrangement between Councils utilising meeting room facilities and advised that only staff supported advisory groups use the Chambers and Committee Room facilities.

Councillor Blackie queried recommendation (f) querying risks with different conditions for different groups. C Sargison spoke of examples of other non-profit organisations in the performance arts area and how groups seeking a change in conditions would be considered by the Community and Recreation Committee via a staff report.

Councillor Barnett queried the danger in removing recommendation (f). Staff advised the group had submitted to the LTP and the Council needed to respond appropriately to their submission. Once the decision is made staff would write to the groups and advise accordingly.

Mayor Ayers commented on two potential amendments and advised of process.

Moved: Councillor Atkinson    Seconded: Councillor Blackie

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180514052641

(b) Notes the submissions received on community facilities fees and charges.

(c) Confirms that the applicable charge for ground rental at the Rangiora Airfield is $4.00m² applicable to lease renewals occurring from 1 July 2018.

(d) Notes that staff are reviewing the basis of charging at the airfield with the intent of reducing the operating subsidy to the airfield and will present a report to Council prior to the adoption of the 2019/20 Annual Plan.

(e) Approves the Woodend Combined Friendship Club continuing to utilise the Woodend Community Centre for its monthly afternoon meetings on the basis of having the two meeting rooms available but only being invoiced for one room.

(f) Approves Staff concluding an agreement with Agape Dance Academy for the use of Pearson Park Pavilion and Oxford Town Hall as detailed in 4.3 of the report.

(g) Approves the Pegasus Residents Group and the Woodend Community Association having use of Council community facilities for their meeting at no charge.

(h) Approves the following definition of user types for charging:

1. Where the event or meeting is run by an association managed by a committee and all profits after reasonable operating expenses are returned to the community in some verifiable manner. Profits may also be held by the group and applied to the upgrading of equipment for use in future events or improving services to the members of the group and/or the community at large.

2. This category would also include an event or meeting where there is a passive or active recreational value to the community and activities where meetings or events are organised on a regular, scheduled basis but attended by members of the public on a casual basis and where a nominal fee is charged to cover the cost of the venue and reasonable operating costs. This would include
events such as fitness or aerobic type classes, music and dance groups, gardening groups and other activities designed to provide recreation on a not for profit basis. Organisers of subscription based, or classes with a rate per term or per month will be charged the applicable tutor rate unless the use is covered by a separate Council approved agreement.

(i) Approves the following table of fees and charges for community facilities with effect from 1 July 2018 applying to all users unless otherwise agreed by the Community and Recreation Committee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pavilion</th>
<th>Commercial per hour (incl gst)</th>
<th>Tutor Rate per hour (incl gst)</th>
<th>All other users per hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Community Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Hall</td>
<td>$28.75</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Room A or B</td>
<td>$28.75</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Meeting Rooms A &amp; B</td>
<td>$57.50</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire Complex</td>
<td>$414 per day</td>
<td>$200 per day</td>
<td>$180 Per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruataniwha Civic Centre</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ Room One</td>
<td>$28.75</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ Room Two</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other venues: (excl those above, Rangiora Town Hall, Oxford Town Hall)</td>
<td>$28.75</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Town Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; P Room</td>
<td>Commercial (incl gst)</td>
<td>Other users (incl gst)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$57.50/hour</td>
<td>$15/hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Hall</td>
<td>$57.50/hour</td>
<td>$25.00/hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire venue – per hour</td>
<td>$86.25/hour</td>
<td>$40/hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire venue – day rate (six hour or more)</td>
<td>$517.50</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wedding rate (incl 3 hrs set up, full day hire and 2 hrs cleaning) | n/a | $200
---|---|---
Auditorium projection equipment (incl technician) | $57.50/hour | $50.00/hour
OB&I League for movies (x3 hrs, incl WDC owned projection equipment, wi-fi and electricity) | n/a | $45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rangiora Town Hall</th>
<th>Commercial users (incl gst)</th>
<th>Other users (incl gst)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Auditorium – Performance Day</td>
<td>$1,035.00</td>
<td>$373.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Auditorium – Pack In/Out, Rehearsal (maximum 14 days)</td>
<td>$230.00</td>
<td>$143.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Auditorium – Pack In/Out, Rehearsal (additional days)</td>
<td>$287.50</td>
<td>$172.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Theatre – per hour (minimum 2hrs)</td>
<td>$115.00/hour</td>
<td>$57.50/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Theatre – day rate</td>
<td>$690</td>
<td>$345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Theatre – Projection Equipment (incl Tech)</td>
<td>$57.50/hour</td>
<td>$57.50/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function Room</td>
<td>$57.50/hour</td>
<td>$57.50/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio Room</td>
<td>$345.00/day</td>
<td>$345.00/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Room</td>
<td>$23.00/hour</td>
<td>$23.00/hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(i) Circulates this report to the Boards.

CARRIED

Councillor Atkinson commented that he did not like singling out groups, and wondered if the Council would receive complaints from commercial operators. Councillor Atkinson believed the facility charging was not keeping pace and Councillors owed it to the ratepayers to be fair to all users.

Councillor Blackie endorsed Councillor Atkinson comments, acknowledging being behind with charges which now results in a jump to get back to parody. Councillor Blackie was supportive to spread the increases over two years.

AMENDMENT

Staff recommendation (i) being changed to read:

Moved: Councillor Gordon Seconded Councillor Barnett

(i) Approves the table of fees and charges for community facilities with effect from 1 July 2018 applying to all users to be phased in over three years except the Rangiora and Oxford Town Hall, unless otherwise agreed by the Community and Recreation Committee:

LOST

Division called by Councillor Atkinson
For: Councillors Barnett, Felstead, Gordon and Mayor Ayers.
Against: Councillors Atkinson, Blackie, Doody, Meyer, Stewart and Williams.
Lost: 6:4

Councillor Gordon, commented on the increased fee impact has on small groups, providing an example of a bowling club who was a hall user over many decades. He accepted points made by colleagues as it seems a small amount. Councillor Gordon stated he was comfortable with the wording in recommendation (f) as it enables groups to present a case to the Community & Recreation Committee for consideration. Once the charges are implemented Councillor Gordon believed further feedback may be received which could be referred to the Committee on a case by case basis.

Councillor Barnett remarked that while it seemed that the increases were like pocket change, small community groups which are the heart of the community, especially in the rural areas do feel the impact. Councillor Barnett acknowledged that fees should have gone up a $1 a year since 2012, however she did not wish to see groups disband because facility fees had increased 50% ie $10 to $15.

Councillor Atkinson disagreed with Councillor Barnett, commenting that groups come and go by the drivers which they formed a group in the first place, and he could not support spreading the increase over three years. Councillor Atkinson agreed all groups have community benefits. From Councillor Atkinson's observations, every year after fee increases, groups complain, however he personally is unaware of groups disbanding due to the increased facility fees; only their lifecycle.

Councillor Barnett spoke to the motion, acknowledging the discussion time, for what appears to be a small aspect in the overall the budget. Councillor Barnett stated she would support the motion but felt uncomfortable with the outcome. Councillor Barnett reflected on the various groups that appeared at the LTP hearing and submitter comments, commenting on one group being treated separately to other groups and the importance of the Community and Recreation Committee considering information on its merits. Councillor Barnett agreed fees and charges needed to increase and the motion does provide some time for groups to adjust.

Councillor Doody commented on meeting with groups as current Chair of the Community and Recreation Committee, budgets and differing circumstances. Councillor Doody was supportive of the motion.

Councillor Atkinson stated he held some sympathy for Councillor Barnett's argument, however there is an option available to groups can seek alternative arrangements through the Community and Recreation Committee. Councillor Atkinson posed a rhetorical question in light of the new sports facility, wondering how community groups will cope with increased facility use and how many will fold.

### 5.6 Regeneration Work Programme – C Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)

C Sargison spoke briefly to the report, highlighting key aspects of the proposal.

Councillor Barnett sought clarification that the outer year programme is likely to be achieved for the overall project. C Sargison spoke of work with the Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group and community engagement. Staff believe the programme is achievable subject to resource consenting processes. C Sargison
commented on the close working relationship with external funding sources and support for ecological linkages. 

Staff advised that the resource consent for the piling at the Kaiapoi riverbed had been signed off this morning, and that signalled another step forward in the programme.

Moved: Councillor Atkinson Seconded: Councillor Blackie

**THAT** the Council

(a) **Receives** report No. 180518054707.

(b) **Notes** the submissions that have been received.

(c) **Approves** the deferral of the provision of $1.4 million for the development of the Memorial Garden to an outer year of the LTP (beyond Year 10).

(d) **Approves** the balance of the Regeneration Budget as per the Draft LTP and the re-spread of the funding for the implementation of Recreation and Ecological linkages to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$520,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e) **Notes** that this re-spreading does not affect the overall budget provision for Regeneration.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Atkinson stated this is a great step forward for the District, commenting that it was important to continue pushing forward as the recovery of the District develops.

Councillor Blackie remarked on the inability to push aspects of the programme back because so much of it was integrated with another stage in the overall project. Also community groups and sports clubs were awaiting progress that impacts on their planning and timetables. Councillor Blackie stated he was comfortable with the direction of the programme.

5.7 **Oxford Surveillance Cameras – C Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)**

C Sargison spoke briefly to the report, advising one local supermarket has contributed to the project, which would potentially enable the video footage to be viewed at the Oxford Police Station, and in time, potentially the Christchurch Central Police Station. The new cameras will be of significant quality to enable vehicle number plate recognition.

Councillor Barnett queried the option for cameras at Woodend and Pegasus. Staff advised that nothing had been included in the budgets for any other towns, and this project had come about as a specific request from the Council. Staff explained that the Woodend Community Centre has a different level of security cameras installed. The upgrade of security cameras was approximately half way through completion as staff and police continue to work with businesses. The Rangiora camera network, would eventually include coverage of the Southbrook area.

Moved: Councillor Felstead Seconded: Councillor Doody
THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 180517054436.

(b) Notes the report from Visual Networks on Oxford Street Surveillance Cameras.

(c) Approves an additional $31,000 in the Greenspace Budget for the installation of additional surveillance cameras and infrastructure in Oxford during 2018/19.

(d) Circulates this report to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board.

CARRIED

Councillor Felstead stated this project is well overdue and it was important that a Council system is installed. This is common sense and he was very pleased to support the project.

Councillor Doody concurred with her colleague’s comments, remarking that it will be of great assistance to the Police.

Councillor Atkinson was absent from the Chambers from 11.12am to 11.34am on Day 2.

5.8 Kaiapoi Town Centre Activation – S Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement) and S Hart (Business and Centres Manager)

S Hart spoke to the report and reflected on a recent Council briefing, outlining the cost allocations. Staff advised that the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan was underway and due to be presented to the Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group on 11 June, before being presented to the July Council meeting. It was advised public consultation will follow from mid-July to mid-August and an outline of what is proposed was very briefly presented.

S Markham commented on the challenges on activating the Plan and that the land available for development had increased by 60%. However it would take many years to get it to a sustainable, functioning business state. Staff advised they were not currently confident the right structures and processes are in place to provide the focus and agility required to succeed, hence the need for a focused investigation. It is a great opportunity but time and planning is needed to get the best outcome. Staff commented on a recent visit to Hastings District Council who are facing rapid change in their business area and staff found the visit enlightening how the project was being handled, with their agility to respond and the focus of generating jobs in the town centre. Hastings District Council is of similar size to Waimakariri, and was very focused on generating employment and vitality of the town centre. There are learnings from the project relating to revenues in the future against land sales and the knowledge gained would also be useful for consideration of future Rangiora Town Centre Strategies.

Councillor Williams sought clarification of the increased budget for additional staff, in conjunction with ENC directions. S Markham advised the budget in the LTP was staffing in the Business Centres Manager’s area for the Business Friendliness Programme which is how businesses liaise and engage with our regulatory process, which is complimentary to what is being proposed with this report which is about generating real estate development and business attraction to the Kaiapoi Town Centre.

In a supplementary question Councillor Williams enquired how that will occur for the $150,000 investment. S Markham commented that $150,000 would be used for the investigative work and then scope the requirements required (including
resourcing), signalling another $100,000 would then be required for the next stage. Staff commented on investment, and did not rule out further investment to be funded by returns from land sales in the future.

Councillor Barnett remarked that there is a lot programmed with other work streams such as District Development and District Plan, and queried delaying this proposal one year until the river site and wharf work was completed. S Markham spoke of timeframes and being ready for implementation in 2019-2020 and the planning required to enable those arrangements to be in place occurring during the 2018-2019 year. S Markham remarked that without doing any marketing there are a number of perspective investors and business relocation opportunities, and we do not currently have the resources to work with them, in the way we believe we need to. This report is about investing in preparation of future business opportunities.

Councillor Barnett enquired how long it would be before the Council could expect a return on the investment. S Markham advised it would be over many years as eight hectares of business land takes time to fill and requires dedicated on-going attention.

Councillor Barnett queried the Kaiapoi Town Centre Strategy that is due to be rolled out, and referred to a submission querying what budget we have to implement that and sought clarification on budgetary measures to implement the Kaiapoi Town Centre Strategy and would this money be better generally allocated to the Kaiapoi Town Centre Development Strategy, rather than being specific. S Markham advised there is not currently a specific implementation budget for the plan that as it is yet to be consulted on and is not mandated at this time. It is proposed to occur during 2019-2020. It was advised the funding for this project is legitimate charging against future revenues out of the mixed use business, as that is the funding source. To merge it with a general Town Centre Strategy budget is to then put it back onto the Council’s budget directly which is controlled through rating. S Markham commented on the Crown agreement, including return of profits in a 50/50 profit share arrangement.

J Palmer commented on risk factors with the eight hectares and outlined reasoning, including reflecting on Christchurch City options available to business operators. He commented on the marketing, development and strategy approach going forward. The Council needs good advice before launching into the next phase of decision making, and the advice being sought through this stage will help shape a good strategy going forward.

Councillor Blackie, reflected on the Hastings example and enquired who was driving the project and their qualifications or experience. S Markham advised it was a balance of internal and external resourcing and commented on the strategy focus and success. This has taken time to build and sustain business relationships over a long period of time.

Councillor Blackie asked why not consider a large developer/real estate agency and enable them to market the land area. S Markham commented that was an option available to the Council, however it comes with its own risks, reflecting on who is in control of the transaction, associated costs and the need for the Council to lead and generate the transaction for maximum benefit to the overall strategy.

Councillor Gordon queried the return on investment. S Markham advised it would depend on what is offered to the market. Staff commented generally on potential options for future considerations by the Council.

Councillor Stewart referred to the Hastings model, which could be an option, asking about resources invested both financially and staff to enable such a project to succeed. S Markham spoke of the Hastings strategy project group having four staff that are allocated projects and then brings engineering, planning, property specialists together. The focus is the project management discipline and the outcome. S Markham remarked on a recent discussion with Lawrence Yule MP, (and former Mayor of Hastings) and his direction to enable 1,000 jobs. The degree of organisation focus on the delivery of that Mayoral direction.
Councillor Stewart enquired if the current Town Centres' Manager role is a rung on the ladder towards this strategic property group that Hastings have developed. S Hart responded by providing positive examples of business friendliness through the liaison of the regulatory units of the Council and the review and implementation of the Town Centre Plans that are being proposed, explaining his role and future timing.

Councillor Stewart queried Hastings District Council’s desire to create 1,000 jobs in five years, and where they were in that plan. S Markham advised more information could be shared in a future workshop, however he could advise that the success of Hastings has been built on by itself.

Moved: Councillor Blackie Seconded: Councillor Gordon

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180516053730.

(b) **Allocates** $150,000 over 2018/19 and 2019/20 to fund investigations into a sustainable mechanism for managing the divestment and development of the Kaiapoi Town Centre (KTC) mixed use business areas (MUBA) into the long term.

(c) **Notes** that cost incurred in such investigations leading to an ongoing mechanism to manage the Council’s interest in the MUBA land would be a cost against which future revenues from divestment could be applied.

(d) **Notes** that the extent and future timing of take-up of this funding beyond the initial report costed at up to $50,000 would be determined by Council decision-making on that report.

(e) **Notes** the potential for the Government’s Provincial Growth Fund among other funding sources to contribute to the costs of these investigations and any follow-on actions will be considered as part of the initial investigation.

(f) **Notes** the potential for the learning arising out of this investigation to be applied to the challenges faced in ensuring long term activation of the Rangiora Town Centre, as key sites there undergo comprehensive redevelopment.

CARRIED

Councillor Blackie stated matters had been well covered during the discussion and he was comfortable with the motion.

Councillor Stewart stated she welcomed this step forward as the strategic plan pulls together diverse threads and considers it an appropriate approach to take. Councillor Stewart will look forward to seeing how this proposal links with the work of Enterprise North Canterbury.

5.9 **Community Board Submission for a Waimakariri Youth Development Grant – The Community Board Chairs – presented by E Cordwell (Governance Advisor)**

E Cordwell spoke to the report briefly.

Mayor Ayers queried the proposed decision group of Community Board chairs and a representative from the Youth Council, enquiring if the grants will be awarded on a community board ward basis. E Cordwell advised grants would be on a district wide basis determined by the presentation and best project proposed by the applicant, which benefits both the young applicant and the community. Potentially there could be up to two grants in any one year.
Moved: Councillor Gordon          Seconded: Councillor Doody

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180423043863.

(b) **Approves** the introduction of an annual Waimakariri Youth Development Grant Fund of $4,000 to operate as described in attachment i: Draft Youth Development Grant Criteria and Allocation Process (Trim 180410038656).

(c) **Confirms** the establishment of a Youth Development Grant Committee comprising the Community Board Chairs and a representative of the Youth Council to administer the Grant Fund and that the Youth Council now be invited to make such an appointment.

(d) **Requests** the Governance Manager to make all necessary arrangements to introduce the Waimakariri Youth Development Grant for the 2018/2019 financial year.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Gordon believed the proposal fits well with youth development, with clear processes and looked forward to the active WaiYouth group assisting in its promotion.

Councillor Doody was supportive of the proposal, remarking it was important youth have an opportunity. It was also good to be including the Youth Council by having one member on the decision panel.

Mayor Ayers commended Oxford-Ohoka Board Member Thomas Robson for bringing this matter up and progressing it to this stage with staff assistance.

5.10 **Public Submissions to Long Term Plan: General – K Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager)**

K Waghorn spoke to the report and commented on submission requests, remarking on illegal dumping and a programme to increase public awareness.

Councillor Gordon reflected on past discussions regarding charity organisations and illegal dumping.

A public excluded briefing occurred from 11.50am to discuss illegal dumping matters. The public were welcomed back to the meeting at 12.08pm.

Moved: Councillor Gordon          Seconded: Councillor Doody

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180515053040.

(b) **Notes** that there was no significant demand during LTP consultation from rural residents wanting the Council to extend kerbside collection services into rural areas.

(c) **Endorses** staff continuing to work with rural residents and communities as requests arise to determine if the Council could provide appropriate and cost effective kerbside collection services to, or recycling facilities closer to, those communities.

(d) **Notes** that the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan includes an Action to continue funding for Enviro-schools.

(e) **Notes** that the Solid Waste Budget allocates $25,000 per annum to fund Enviro-schools over the next ten years.

(f) **Notes** that any expansion of the Enviro-schools Programme would require an increase in funding above current levels.
(g) **Notes** that the Southbrook resource recovery park is an unsuitable location for composting operations for a number of reasons, including:

i. Proximity to several composting operations results in competition for the feedstock and end markets;

ii. The limited space available for compost maturation;

iii. The sensitivity of the receiving environment to leachate and odour in particular;

iv. Proximity to businesses that sell compost both in bulk and in bags.

(h) **Notes** that once the reuse and recycling areas have been expanded there may be an opportunity to sell compost produced from our residents’ green waste, but that the implications of this with regard to the Council competing with local businesses would first have to be considered by the Council.

(i) **Requests** that staff develop a campaign around correct disposal of recyclable and reusable materials and the responsible disposal of rubbish, which can be run in local media and social media.

Councillor Gordon remarked he was satisfied with the report content.

5.11 **Public Submissions to Long Term Plan: Kerbside Collection Services – K Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager)**

K Waghorn spoke to the report, reflecting on submitter views. Councillor Doody queried public communication and education going forward. Staff commented on a proposed communications plan, which would include several drop-in sessions.

Moved: Councillor Barnett  Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180515053012.

(b) **Approves** inclusion of the "your choice" kerbside collection service in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

(c) **Notes** that 284 (76.5%) of the 371 submissions received are in favour of the "your choice" kerbside collection service.

(d) **Notes** that the Solid Waste Activity Management Plan and the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan will be amended to include the "your choice" collection service: fortnightly rubbish bag or bin collection and/or weekly organics bin collection.

(e) **Notes** that the final version of the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan will be presented to the Council for adoption in July 2018.

(f) **Approves** increasing the level of education and community engagement around waste minimisation.

(g) **Endorses** the provision of support to, and promotion of local waste minimisation initiatives that are led by, businesses and community groups.

(h) **Notes** that there is sufficient budget in the Waste Minimisation account to fund an increase in community engagement and provide support to and promotion of local waste minimisation initiatives that are led by businesses and community groups.

(i) **Requests** staff to investigate requiring better waste and litter management by developers and building companies through consenting processes in
order to reduce the impact of earthworks and windblown construction materials on the surrounding environment.

(j) **Notes** that there was no significant demand from rural residents wanting Council to extend kerbside collection services into rural areas during the LTP consultation.

(k) **Endorses** staff continuing to work with rural residents and communities as requests arise to determine if the Council could provide appropriate and cost effective kerbside collection services to, or recycling facilities closer to, those communities.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Barnett voiced some concerns related to administration, reflecting on many submissions received were from outside the collection area, and their general comments on awareness of waste minimisation.

Councillor Atkinson also held concerns on associated administration costs and the practicality of the operation, however he expressed excitement about it being ‘your choice’ for the most appropriate collection options for an individual.

Mayor Ayers remarked that it had been a long road to get to this point, with several community consultation processes and this is a big thing for the community.

**5.12 Solid Waste - Utilities and Roading Staff Submission to the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan– K Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager)**

K Waghorn explained two key aspects of report – carry-overs and budget impacts relating to the Chinese National Policy on recycling. The Council was informed this week that the new recycling rate was $95 per tonne this week, whereas the staff budgets were based on $65 per tonne. J Palmer reflected on discussions earlier in the Council meeting whereby it was agreed by the Council to move $800,000 of funds from the plant account to absorb the increase for the next three years.

Councillor Doody queried if softening the blow was camouflaging the serious nature of the matter going forward, and the need for honesty with the community. G Cleary commented that the figure was unlikely to reduce and spoke of the shock on the worldwide market. Potentially in time, there may be other markets and countries that come into the market. Longer term the Council has the option to address matters through future Annual or Long Term Plans.

Councillor Williams commented that if the Council charge commercial operators $65 per tonne there is potential to attract businesses from outside of the district. J Palmer commented that there were good reasons to set the recycle fee at $95 per tonne for commercial operators.

Councillor Doody enquired if staff believe that with a price increase there may be an increase in illegal waste dumping, particularly builders waste. Staff clarified this type of waste is commercial waste and not recycling waste.

Councillor Gordon enquired if there were any other potential savings on the capital programme. Staff advised they were comfortable that the schedule could be managed as programmed, as some projects had already been moved out several years.

Mayor Ayers enquired what was happening with cardboard, as it is currently free to dispose of. K Waghorn advised cardboard was funded through the general rates. The question has been asked of Waste Management, who have yet to signal a change. It is the mixed paper and mixed plastics that the price has been affected.

Councillor Barnett queried incineration models. Staff were aware of a unit on the West Coast but not nationally.
It was advised of a proposal to consider matters reflected on during Audit and Risk Committee discussions regarding the $800,000 surplus from the plant account being transferred to the general account, however the Committee recommended it remain flexible, so in light of unexpected costs, it is recommended to apply that funding across three years and then adjust rates from year four. The impacts were explained and a document tabled.

Councillor Gordon enquired about growth projections and impacts. J Palmer explained the growth rates, households and rating units over ten years and how the calculations work in relation to rates. On average 495 properties are added to the rating base each year across the district.

Councillor Gordon enquired what the risks were by taking the $800,000 from the plant account. J Palmer advised the plant account was deemed adequate for the time, subject to any major worldwide impacts.

Councillor Gordon sought an update to the rates breakdown of the areas that had been supplied the previous week. Staff explained that there was very little difference and would bring an updated sheet back at the end of the day.

Councillor Gordon queried the capital works programme and sought assurance that staff could deliver on the timetable, reflecting on the forward borrowing policy. J Palmer explained that each department manager had been asked questions relating to programmed delivery expectations. Larger projects may have planning costs in the first year and construction/delivery in the second year. The reality was that it is unlikely that the full budget would be spent as some projects are developer led; the recreation area has land purchases funded by development contributions, which again impacts on section releases, so some factors are out of Council control in regard to timing issues from developers. J Palmer commented on consultation, consenting timing and explained the carry-over factors and impacts on the budgets.

Councillor Gordon queried land sales. J Palmer responded that in year five there was potential for $3m to $4m additional budget, subject to zone planning following the District Plan change.

Councillor Gordon mentioned Lehmans Road in relation to conditions of the Public Works Act, and also the BNZ and Kingsbury Avenue properties. J Palmer explained the complexities involving the Public Works Act and Council responsibilities. The income would assist the loan (debt or capital) and should not be used against operations. The BNZ corner property would be released in the future, and J Palmer provided an update on discussions. A briefing would occur in the near future to both the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board and the Council explaining delays. The Kingsbury Avenue property would be retained for further water head works.

Councillor Williams commented on the Fishers Road property. J Palmer provided history of 4hectare land holdings, a past working party and circumstances in which land was released. Gravel reserves and reserve status was explained, along with long term lease arrangements, often with neighbouring property owners. A general discussion occurred.

Councillor Williams referred to the community space in Pegasus and potential funding options. J Palmer advised that once the feasibility investigation that the Council authorised the previous day is completed, then the Council will be in a better position to review the timetable and options. Community expectations will grow and J Palmer advised of various options that may become available after the investigation. General discussion occurred.

Mayor Ayers queried population projections of 2.5 people per household; pre-quake it was 2.3 people per household. J Millward explained the calculations and adjustments, which are updated every three years, with some level of conservativeness. J Palmer commented on outside factors such as the Greater
Christchurch Partnership, transport and government factors, however the information is based on the best understanding today.

Councillor Barnett sought clarification on what the plant account is about. J Palmer explained how it works.

Councillor Barnett asked for a report to the Audit and Risk Committee on carry-overs for the next three years, by department. J Palmer advised a report related to carry-over matters was on the current agenda with reports provided each year, explaining the delivery mechanisms.

Councillor Stewart sought an update on property holdings of the Council. J Palmer advised the Council held approximately 800 properties with approximately 600 properties leased out. General discussion occurred. J Millward advised on work being undertaken over the coming next year, which also involved reviewing the camping grounds and pensioner housing.

Councillor Doody referred to the plant account and queried if funds should be held back. J Palmer explained the sustainability report policy, commenting on issues and impacts.

Councillor Doody queried Ravenswood as a potential ‘I-Zone’ and how much land is allocated for industrial use. J Palmer explained that a total area of approximately 15 hectares is zoned commercial. It was unlikely the Council would have an ‘I-Zone’ type development like Rolleston. General discussion occurred including supporting a high value area that generates employment rather than a truck stop.

Councillor Atkinson was interested to see where the Council was going in terms of electric, hydrogen and other alternative fuels, and where the Council should be strategically placed. J Palmer advised there would be further discussions over the coming year through the sustainability work that the Council have already requested.

Mayor Ayers commented about processes, timeframes and community pressures. He would appreciate a future briefing on Ravenswood and refresh Councillor’s understanding of where connections are to Woodend, with business and residential interface. Mayor Ayers commented on ‘I-Zone’, noting that there was as much employment in Kaiapoi as in Rolleston, with Rangiora being twice that again.

J Palmer referred to the whiteboard matters.

Moved: Councillor Atkinson Seconded: Councillor Felstead

That the Council

(a) Approves applying $800,000 from the Plant Renewal Account, previously advised to the Audit and Risk Committee, to offset rates as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>$277,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019/20</td>
<td>$238,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020/21</td>
<td>$238,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021/22</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

Councillor Atkinson remarked that it is sensible and practical to undertake this action of offsetting the rates at this time.

Councillor Felstead reflected on the Audit and Risk Committee discussions and was satisfied with the action being taken.

Councillor Barnett commented on being cautious of taking late information and people lobbying at this late stage in the process.
Moved: Councillor Atkinson  Seconded: Councillor Gordon

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180509051042.

(b) **Approves** that the kerbside collection targeted rates be increased as follows in the 18/19 year:
   i) Recycling and Refuse Area: $103.00 including GST
   ii) Recycling-only Area: $93.00 including GST

(c) **Notes** that this is a $17.00 increase on the targeted kerbside collection rate

(d) **Approves** reducing the transfer from the Collection Account to the Disposal Account by $40,000: from $380,000 to $340,000

(e) **Approves** increasing the general rate funding to the Disposal Account by $151,498 in the 19/20 year which will increase the General Rate from $732,000 to $883,498

(f) **Notes** that the increase in the General Rate will fund the cost of processing recycled materials delivered directly to the transfer stations by members of the public

(g) **Approves** charging commercial collection companies the $95.00/tonne excluding GST ($109.24/tonne including GST) processing charge for their recyclable materials

(h) **Notes** that staff will bring a report to the Council to request approval to adjust the recyclables charge in the event that EcoCentral Ltd advises a change in the processing charge

(i) **Approves** the following capital works carry-over:
   i) Southbrook Recycling Compactor Shed: Carry over $226,300 to 18/19.

(j) **Approves** removing the following capital works from the 17/18 budget and including these capital works in the 19/20 budget:
   i) RPZ installation (backflow protection) Oxford: $43,900
   ii) RPZ installation (backflow protection) Southbrook: $50,000

(k) **Approves** removing the $1,488,000 budget for Land Purchase for Future Upgrades from the 17/18 budget and including the following capital works in the LTP budget:
   i) In 19/20: $400,000 Land Purchase for Screening
   ii) In 22/23: $1,385,000 Land Purchase for Future Upgrades

CARRIED

Councillor Atkinson acknowledged these are difficult and changing times. He stated it was important to be up front and transparent with the community, clearly explaining the reasons for this decision and the relationship with the world market.

Councillor Gordon believed it was false economy if the Council did not undertake the change now and commended staff for their work on the project.

Mayor Ayers endorsed comments of colleagues, remarking on prices of recyclables and understanding changing markets. He acknowledged China has their own issues of getting on top of the waste issue, as will other countries, including New Zealand which will have to deal with its own waste.

Councillor Doody displayed supermarket carry bags from recycled t-shirts.
In his right of rely Councillor Atkinson commented on China’s actions and how, as a Council, there were opportunities to be leaders in recycling such as incineration linking with power alternatives, which he believed was worthy of investigation and he looked forward to further discussions on how the world was dealing with recycling issues.

The meeting adjourned at 12.34pm and reconvened at 1.05pm (Day 2).

5.13 Earthquake Recovery - Utilities and Roading Staff Submission to the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan – G Boot (Senior Engineering Advisor), K Simpson (3 Waters Manager) and J McBride (Roading Manager)

K Simpson spoke to the report, outlining key aspects and explaining the reasoning for the staff recommendations.

There were no questions to staff.

Moved: Councillor Blackie Seconded: Councillor Meyer

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 180518054681.

(b) Approves bringing the Earthquake Recovery budget for Jones Street road and drainage works forward from 2019/20 to 2018/19, as outlined in tables 1, 1A, 2, and 2A of this report.

(c) Approves an increase to the Drainage component of the Earthquake Recovery budget of $181,000, as outlined in tables 2, and 2A of this report, to cover addition risks associated with potentially contaminated land and high groundwater table in the area of the SMAs.

(d) Notes that the Wastewater component of the Earthquake Recovery budget is on track to be underspent by in excess of $400,000 at the end of the 2017/18 year, with all projects being complete, which will more than offset the $181,000 increase in the Drainage budget.

CARRIED

Councillor Blackie commented on discussion the previous day, options for Jones Street, and the importance of undertaking the work properly. This resolution makes sense, mindful of how we want traffic to use that area he stated.

Councillor Meyer appreciated the report and the proposal.

Mayor Ayers stated the resolution was practical and common sense.

5.14 Funding and Budget Options Kaiapoi River Dredging Proposals – J Fraser (Utilities Planner) and D Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager – District Regeneration)

G Cleary spoke to the report, reflecting on the key two aspects. One being the pontoon area and the second being the navigation channel. G Cleary provided an update that the resource consent had been received for the piling, however it was explained the navigation channel work has a narrow window of opportunity to occur in the winter and the resource consent may be required later. If the spring opportunity is missed or the consent is delayed dredging would be programmed to occur in June/July 2019. Staff commented on discussions held with both Ecan and the Kaiapoi River Working Party. It was not looking favourable that Ecan would fund their share ($125,000) of the dredge and staff were awaiting the outcome of the Ecan LTP process. There was a risk to this Council to bear to whole cost,
however there were more discussions to be held. There is a strong case to Ecan that dredging the River will encourage river use and recreation along the riverbanks.

Councillor Atkinson enquired about the funding timing and impact on the project, with funding being a genuine carry-over. G Cleary commented on the budgets and being realistic in trying not to over promise and under deliver.

Councillor Barnett reflected on the regeneration projects, enquiring if it impacts on any other projects in the area by delaying the dredging to the following year. G Cleary commented on the impact on river users, including the coastguard and the pontoon area not being able to realise its full potential initially. The work cannot commence before the resource consent is granted and cannot occur during whitebait season.

Mayor Ayers enquired if any delay has an impact on other regeneration projects. Staff commented on the project involving the spoil. It was advised of impacts on Ecan and options available for the Council consideration. There was a need for further conversations at different levels with Ecan on how they support the regeneration project going forward. There was a small window of opportunity for dredging in late November, early December which would enable both projects to be undertaken together but it was subject to the resource consent timing.

Councillor Barnett enquired if there was any commercial risk to the area. G Cleary advised that it will not stop the pontoon progress. He acknowledged risks, establishment costs of the dredge and further potential discussions with the Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group. The preference was to install the pontoons as soon as the dredging was completed.

Councillor Gordon queried recommendation (e). G Cleary commented on expectations of the working party and funding expectations for the coming two financial years. Staff had recently received a more accurate cost of the dredge, with establishment and dumping of dredged material being a high portion of the overall cost.

Moved: Councillor Atkinson  Seconded: Councillor Blackie

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180514052211.

(b) Notes an existing budget of $250,000 is available for the marina basin dredging to enable berthing at the proposed new floating pontoons.

(c) Notes a budget of $50,000 has been allocated by the Waimakariri District Council in 2018/19 as part of the river rehabilitation programme, intended to be used to contribute to the costs of dredging of the navigation channel.

(d) Notes a total estimated budget of $500,000 is likely to be required to undertake the combined marina basin and navigation channel dredging projects, based on a 50% cost share from each project.

(e) Approves staff approaching Environment Canterbury to request a 50% share ($125,000) of the navigation channel dredging project costs ($250,000).

(f) Approves an additional budget of $200,000 to fund the navigation channel budget shortfall of $200,000 from a district wide rate, which covers the immediate need and includes underwriting the suggested Environment Canterbury cost share until repaid by ECan.

(g) Notes details of the current and proposed funding are included in tables in Section 6.

(h) Notes the proposed $500,000 combined budget may need to be revised following completion of the procurement process with the selected contractor.
(i) Circulates this report to all the Community Boards, and the Regeneration Steering Group.

CARRIED

Councillor Atkinson spoke of the carryover funds and the importance of continuing the momentum of this project. Councillor Atkinson spoke of the importance of dredging the waterway and Port area and Ecan’s responsibility for maintenance. Councillor Atkinson spoke of the Coastguard operation on the Kaiapoi River, the new riverside business due to open in October 2018 and the importance of this project succeeding. Councillor Atkinson expressed his views strongly on the disappointment of the slow progress and lack of action from Environment Canterbury and their need to come to the party to make it work for Kaiapoi.

Councillor Blackie concurred with Councillor Atkinson’s comments.

Councillor Gordon stated he appreciated the passion and concern expressed by his fellow colleague. He was supportive of the Chief Executive exploring the relationship channels with Ecan to work through the issues.

Councillor Williams believed that if the river was the responsibility of the Regional Council, then they should pay the full cost associated with the dredging operation.

Councillor Stewart endorsed Councillor Atkinson’s comments, and the importance of having a safe and navigable channel for the Coastguard. Councillor Stewart remarked that her focus was on the recreation and amenity of the river and linkages to the Water Management Plans.

In this right of reply Councillor Atkinson commented on the reasoning behind the 50/50 cost share of the dredging project, otherwise the fear was that the project would not happen at all, although he strongly believes the responsibility lies with Ecan. Councillor Atkinson reflected on his experiences escorting international vessels across the bar and into the Kaiapoi River, five vessels that had been launched in Kaiapoi and sold internationally over recent years and the importance for a safe navigation channel. Councillor Atkinson mentioned a resource consent for a Ngai Tahu mussel farm situated just off the coastline that could utilise the Kaiapoi River and Port in the future.

5.15 Staff Submission re Possible Government Policy Statement and other Funding Changes – B Rice (Senior Transport Engineer)

J McBride spoke to the report, with an emphasis on safety and access, noting there was an opportunity to claim funding for footpaths. Staff expected the second phase of the Government Policy Statement to be released in 2019. This was likely to have a focus on linkages between Christchurch, Rangiora and Rolleston, as well as improvement projects rather than maintenance projects.

Mayor Ayers enquired if there was any indication on a greater commitment to local roading from the Government. Staff advised there were no decisions yet.

Councillor Williams enquired if the replacement of street lighting to LED’s had commenced. Staff advised the programme had begun, explaining sodium or pole replacement. A subsidy would come in to effect this coming financial year, going forward with LED and it will change over the next three years as the full subsidy from NZTA is increased. Over the next three years all lights that are replaced will be LED. Staff continue to liaise with MainPower and are discussing a more efficient maintenance programme.

Councillor Gordon raised an issue with Coldstream Road footpaths, enquiring if the programme could be brought forward to meet existing conditions, now that the stadium was approved. A footpath would also improve safety for users of the hockey turf. Staff commented that the $500,000 budget was programmed to
coincide with the sports centre development looking at roading, the carpark and the footpath all in conjunction with the development as it was important that it occurs in a co-ordinated way. Staff advised there will be opportunity to stage the work. Now the decision on the sports facility is made the concept plan and work involving consultation with users and stakeholders would require staff to bring a report to the Council to bring funds forward into 2018/19 year. The reasoning was explained.

Councillor Gordon asked if any interim steps could be done to assist safety such as signage in the sports area. Staff would look into the matter now the sports facility decision had been made.

Councillor Barnett queried information on page 285, and enquired of the process going forward in relation to the GPS and how it is funded. Staff advised work included indicative figures and would not have an impact on services, with staff maximising funding wherever practical. G Cleary outlined how matters will work for 2018/19 acknowledging that NZTA funding does not align with LTP processes.

Councillor Doody referred to footpaths and the area by MainPower Oval (Rangiora) along the hedged area. Staff advised it was being discussed at an operational level. General discussion occurred regarding the increasing sporting activity in the Coldstream Road area.

J Palmer advised a briefing related to the Woodend Bypass would occur with the Council in mid-June.

Moved: Councillor Gordon Seconded: Councillor Meyer

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report No. 180426044997.
(b) Makes no changes to the draft LTP as a result of the GPS.
(c) Notes that a second GPS is expected to be released in 2019.
(d) Notes that the uncertainty regarding government funding of transport projects may require variations to the LTP in future years.

CARRIED

Councillor Gordon welcomed further discussion on both the Woodend Bypass and staff information on safety deficiencies on Coldstream Road and proposed improvements.

Councillor Meyer was appreciative of the discussions and the way forward.

Mayor Ayers remarked that much is happening in the transport space, acknowledging a level of uncertainty.

5.16 New Arterial Road – Noise Concerns – G Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading) and J McBride (Roading Manager)

J McBride spoke to the report outlining the proposal and the next LTP bid to stage the work. G Cleary commented on the section of land on the Ohoka Road side that sits higher than the road. Staff propose to undertaken improvement works on the other section of the road first.

Councillor Atkinson enquired what the distance was, past the last residence, as noise changes between the two surfaces. J McBride advised it was just slightly north of the last house at the speed change sign. Councillor Atkinson suggested staff consider stretching that distance between the two surfaces a little further past the last residence.
Moved: Councillor Atkinson  Seconded: Councillor Meyer

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180511051676;

(b) Approves resurfacing of the northern half of the New Arterial Road from the Kaiapoi River bridge north along Butchers Road to the 60/80km speed limit change at the northern end of the development with an asphalt surface at a cost for $250,000, and;

(c) Approves the reallocation of $250,000 from the Waikuku to Pegasus Connection budget of $605,000 to allow for the funding of the asphalt surfacing.

(d) Approves the resurfacing of the southern half of the New Arterial Road (from west of Island Rd to the Kaiapoi River bridge) with an asphalt surface in the next 3 to 5 years, with staff to submit a request for funding in the 2021-24 NZTA funding bid and 2021-31 LTP.

(e) Notes that if Council does reallocate budget from the Waikuku to Pegasus Connection budget that it is not subsidised by NZTA.

(f) Notes that this is unlikely to qualify for NZTA subsidy because it does not yet meet NZTA Guidelines or Council Policy requirements, and the final NZTA 'bid' for the 2018-21 period has already been submitted and assessed.

(g) Notes that if Council decides to resurface Butchers Road adjacent the existing houses it will come under pressure to seal the remainder of the New Arterial Road in the 60km/h area when the new houses are built and occupied.

CARRIED

Councillor Atkinson explained his reasoning behind the questioning, commenting from personal experience.

Councillor Meyer believed many residents will be pleased with the outcome and was personally surprised the proposed surface was not undertaken at the time of road construction, however he saw today as a positive outcome for the affected residents.

Councillor Blackie, stated he would support the motion, reluctantly, as it did not mitigate engine noise and believes it may create a precedent across the district.

Councillor Atkinson, in his right of reply, commented that resurfacing had already occurred in other places in the district.

5.17 Request to Increase Vehicle Entrance Application Fees – M Harris (Customer Services Manager)

M Harris spoke to the report briefly and explained the process of application handling.

Councillor Barnett enquired if there were any applications mid-way through the process. Staff will consider this aspect through the implementation and keep applicants informed.

Moved: Councillor Gordon  Seconded: Councillor Doody

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180518054893.

(b) Approves an increase to the fees for vehicle crossing applications to take effect from 1 July 2018 as follows:

Vehicle Crossing electronic application $150.00
Vehicle Crossing paper application form $160.00
Vehicle Crossing re-inspection fee $80.00
Fees include GST

CARRIED

5.18 Staff Submission to recommend changes to the Roading Capital Works Budget in the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan – Y Warnaar (Asset Planning Engineer Roading) and J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager)

J McBride spoke to the report briefly and advising that some projects had been moved to the outer years to enable the work programme to be prioritised.

Councillor Gordon queried the quality of road maintenance, and asked how that is being addressed with the contractors. Staff advised of the occurrence of regular meetings where matters are discussed, along with internal processes to track issues as they arise. G Cleary commented on the in-house capacity to manage service requests and responses to the public, with additional resources currently being sought. Y Warnaar commented on temporary road patches that may look undesirable until appropriate weather conditions enable suitable repairs to occur longer term.

Councillor Williams referred to a submitter’s comment and staff response. G Cleary responded, acknowledging some contractors could do better to minimise issues and improve communication with the community. Staff understood perceptions and concerns raised, noting that when benchmarked against other councils, WDC do rate well overall.

Councillor Doody suggested using the communications team more to convey messages to the community, particularly regarding temporary roading work.

Councillor Atkinson suggested further workshops and a report on levels of service would be beneficial. J Palmer reflected on a previous briefing and how 50km of road was always undergoing seal and maintenance in the district. He commented on the balance of funding and investment with NZTA funding up to 51% of associated costs. J Palmer spoke of conversations nationally regarding Councils balancing higher levels of service against cost implications and it would also be a matter for this Council to discuss at a further meeting.

Councillor Atkinson commented generally on funding issues and lobbying the government, noting that electric vehicles pay no road tax, which will reduce the funding pot over time.

Councillor Barnett welcomed such future discussion, commenting on the importance of the Skewbridge Road upgrade. Councillor Barnett enquired if any delay to that particular project was anticipated. Staff advised that no delays were anticipated at this point in time, outlining processing was in place for the start of the project. G Cleary commented on risks such as resource consent, scope accuracy, budget and land ownership, advising that if any risks become significant then staff could ask to push the project timeline out, however staff would have a better indication at the next Annual Plan.

Councillor Stewart commented on potential designs of the Skewbridge Road area with artwork as an entrance way and how she looked forward to any potential design concepts.

Mayor Ayers commented that NZTA have prioritised road maintenance at the top of their list.

Moved: Councillor Meyer Seconded: Councillor Barnett

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180510051603.
(b) **Approves** the budget changes as shown in the Table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>LTP changes</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22</th>
<th>22/23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Kaiapoi Mill Rd / Skewbridge Rd</td>
<td>Draft LTP</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,044,000</td>
<td>2,611,250</td>
<td>533,750</td>
<td>546,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>2,299,500</td>
<td>2,611,250</td>
<td>533,750</td>
<td>546,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook Outline Development Plan (Flaxton Rd Improvements)</td>
<td>Draft LTP</td>
<td>830,417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td>415,209</td>
<td>424,343</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main North Road improvements including Belfast to Kaiapoi cycleway</td>
<td>Draft LTP</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>766,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>919,800</td>
<td>52,225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Improvements in conjunction with NZTA PBC and Woodend Bypass</td>
<td>Draft LTP</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>255,500</td>
<td>130,563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>255,500</td>
<td>208,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Woodend Road Improvements including Boys Road</td>
<td>Draft LTP</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>306,600</td>
<td>156,675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>153,300</td>
<td>261,125</td>
<td>160,125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Draft LTP</th>
<th>$456,592</th>
<th>$228,296</th>
<th>$228,296</th>
<th>$228,296</th>
<th>$228,296</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>233,319</td>
<td>238,455</td>
<td>243,706</td>
<td>442,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverstream Collector Rd (Adderley-Island)</td>
<td>Draft LTP</td>
<td>1,901,868</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>921,709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook Road Improvements</td>
<td>Draft LTP</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>255,500</td>
<td>130,563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>51,100</td>
<td>78,338</td>
<td>266,875</td>
<td>109,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Purchase - Designations for growth</td>
<td>Draft LTP</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>106,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td>104,450</td>
<td></td>
<td>109,210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Purchase - Improved LoS</td>
<td>Draft LTP</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>106,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td>104,450</td>
<td></td>
<td>109,210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) **Notes** that budget may need to be brought forward if work progresses according to the original program.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Meyer commented on the roading budgets being one of the bigger budgets across the Council. He reflected on roadworks in his neighbourhood, large truck movements and traffic calming measures. Councillor Meyer also commented on the increased volume of large vehicles travelling on roads that were not originally designed for the volume and weight, which was an ongoing issue with an increasing population.
Councillor Barnett remarked that the report highlights the workload of staff and acknowledged balancing maintenance of the roading network, community expectations and the associated complexities of government funding.

Councillor Gordon spoke of the important commitment of the Council to maintain and improve roads, providing examples around the district of continuous maintenance matters. Councillor Gordon suggested a meeting between the contractors and the Council to increase the understanding of such matters. Councillor Gordon also remarked on the design of bridges, which must be practical and cost-effective.

Councillor Atkinson agreed with many comments made, reflecting on heavy vehicles and ongoing maintenance matters with particular roads. Councillor Atkinson was supportive of a workshop to understand matters further.

Councillor Stewart addressed the subject of design, and a desire for making the built environment attractive, as well as fit for purpose, without extending budget. Reflecting on a submitters comments regarding design, Councillor Stewart encouraged staff to look at the wider environment and to be innovative with design.

Mayor Ayers commented on heavy vehicle weight ratings, and suggested that for any new bridges and significant road works that the Greenspace staff be involved in the project from a design perspective, acknowledging that ascetics is in the eye of the beholder.

Councillor Meyer acknowledged the challenges over the next three years.

5.19 Drainage - Utilities and Roading Staff Submission to the 2018-28 Long Term Plan – O Davies (Drainage Asset Manager)

O Davies spoke to the report and advised of changes relating to recommendations (s) and (t) that were tabled.

Councillor Gordon asked if this was a manageable capital works programme, and queried if that was what the adjustments are about. O Davies confirmed the adjustments were to aid a realistic completion of the project. K Simpson advised the amendment would push out $1m by another year and explained the work programme. Staff advised the majority of the remaining $3m work is already well underway and staff were confident to deliver the programme on time and budget. Prior to the tabled change staff had already pushed a further $1.8m of work into the outer years.

Councillor Barnett suggested ways in which the information could be presented next year to enable an easier read.

Moved: Councillor Doody     Seconded: Councillor Barnett

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180514052798.

(b) Approves a new capital works budget of $80,000 in 2018/19 for drainage improvements at West Station Road (Main Street), Oxford under the Oxford urban drainage account.

(c) Notes that this has an increase on the Oxford Urban Drainage rate of $6.5% or $7.63 per property.

(d) Notes that the following works, referred to in the draft LTP Drainage Commentary (Trim No 171124127869) are programmed to be undertaken in Oxford in 2017/18 and 2018/19 using existing approved drainage budgets.

\[ \text{∑ Matai Place Soakpit - 2017/18 minor improvement works.} \]
∑ Kowhai Ave Overland Flow - 2018/19 minor improvement works.

(e) **Notes** that flooding in Burnett Street will be investigated to determine the cause and extent of the problem. Drainage staff will request further budget from the Council if required.

(f) **Notes** that improvements at Siena Place and Sillano Place, Mandeville, will be carried out in 2018/19 under the existing Flood Response drainage account.

(g) **Notes** that improvements at Siena Place and Sillano Place, Mandeville will have no financial impact on the Ohoka Rural Drainage budgets.

(h) **Notes** that the remaining portion of the improvements at Siena Place and Sillano Place, will be funded from existing approved Roading budgets.

(i) **Approves** an additional annual budget of $96,000 from 2018/19 to cover Project Management fees in the Drainage Maintenance Contract.

(j) **Notes** that the additional annual budget of $96,000 from 2018/19 to cover Project Management fees in the Drainage Maintenance Contract will increase drainage rates within the rural drainage schemes, by $5.00 per property.

(k) **Approves** new budgets on the Ohoka Rural Drainage Scheme of $15,500 p.a., Central Rural Drainage Scheme of $7,500 p.a., Coastal Rural Drainage Scheme of $8,500 p.a. and Clarkville Rural Drainage Scheme of $3,500 p.a. to build up a Maintenance Works Reserve Fund over 10 years.

(l) **Notes** that this has an increase per property on the Ohoka, Central, Coastal, and Clarkville Rural drainage schemes rates as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarkville</td>
<td>19.06</td>
<td>18.38</td>
<td>17.31</td>
<td>16.22</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>14.19</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>12.49</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>10.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Rural</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(m) **Approves** a new budget of $100,000 in 2019/20 and $100,000 in 2020/21 of the LTP under the District Drainage account (previously referred to as the Flood Response account) for Zone Implementation Plan Addendum minor capital works.

(n) **Notes** that this has no overall impact on rates as existing Flood Response projects have been deferred as per recommendation (t).

(o) **Approves** a new capital works renewal budget of $100,000 in 2018/19, for drainage upgrades as part of the Flaxton Road Urbanisation.

(p) **Notes** that this has an increase on the Rangiora Urban Drainage rate of $0.5% or $1.27 per property per annum.

(q) **Approves** an additional drainage maintenance budget of $190,000 in 2019/20 for Pond C remedial works.

(r) **Notes** that this has an increase on the Rangiora Urban Drainage rate of $0.9% or $2.37 per property per annum.

(s) **Notes** this budget estimate is based on the sediment being uncontaminated and able to be taken to a local landfill site. If tests show that the sediment is contaminated the budget may need to be increased to allow for disposal at Kate Valley. This will cost considerably more
money. Staff may need to request more budget from the Council if the sediment is found to be contaminated.

(t) **Approves** deferring the following drainage capital works budgets.

(u) **Notes** that a number of capital works and developer lead projects are being moved out to allow full project plans and investigations to be completed. Staff can manage this by reprioritising existing projects to better align with resource availability and Council long term infrastructure requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>New Budget Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URD0012</td>
<td>Rangiora Urban</td>
<td>North Drain Ashgrove Park</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 3 years to 2021/22</td>
<td>$300,000 each year in 2026/27 and 2027/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD0014</td>
<td>Rangiora Urban</td>
<td>Middlebrook Enhancement / Pond</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 3 years to 2021/22</td>
<td>$180,000 in 2021/22 and $200,000 in 2026/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD0017</td>
<td>Rangiora Urban</td>
<td>Blackett St piping</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 4 years to 2022/23</td>
<td>$50,000 in 2022/23 and $323,500 in 2023/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD0023</td>
<td>Rangiora Urban</td>
<td>Palmer / Church Pipework Upgrade</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 3 years to 2020/21</td>
<td>$70,000 in 2020/21, $379,000 in 2022/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD0031</td>
<td>Rangiora Urban</td>
<td>North Brook - Enhancement Work</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 3 year to 2021/22</td>
<td>$50,000 in 2021/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD0037</td>
<td>Rangiora Urban</td>
<td>Todds Road SW Pond</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 2 years to 2023/24</td>
<td>$935,000 in 2023/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD0043</td>
<td>Coastal Urban</td>
<td>Pines Kairaki Upgrade</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 2 years to 2021/22</td>
<td>$35,300 in 2021/22, $125,000 in 2022/23, $125,000 in 2023/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD0044</td>
<td>Coastal Urban</td>
<td>East Woodend Detention Pond 2.5Ha</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 2 years to 2021/22</td>
<td>$150,000 in 2021/22,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD0068</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Urban</td>
<td>Pond areas 1&amp;2; Land purchase</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 1 year to 2019/20</td>
<td>$1.856m in 2020/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD0071</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Urban</td>
<td>Parnhams Drain Catchment Improvements</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 4 year to 2022/23</td>
<td>$600,000 in 2022/23, $3m in 2023/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD001</td>
<td>Flood Response</td>
<td>Flood Response Rangiora - Lehmans Road Stage 2</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 3 years to 2027/28</td>
<td>$375,000 in 2027/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD002</td>
<td>Ohoka Rural</td>
<td>Wetherfield Lane Improvements,</td>
<td>Budget partially deferred for 2 years to 2020/21</td>
<td>$100,000 in 2021/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD003</td>
<td>Flood Response</td>
<td>Flood Response Rural Areas - Cones Road</td>
<td>Budget deferred for 2 years to 2021/22</td>
<td>$100,000 in 2020/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD0033</td>
<td>Rangiora Urban</td>
<td>Pentecost Road Stormwater Main</td>
<td>Defer construction (90% of budget) by 1 year to 2019/20</td>
<td>$72,000 in 2018/19 (LOS) $18,000 in 2018/19 (G) $648,000 in 2019/20 (LOS) $162,000 in 2019/20 (G)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
URD0034  Rangiora Urban  Pentecost Road SMA  Defer construction (90% of budget) by 1 year to 19/20  $20,000 in 2018/19 (LOS)  $5,000 in 2018/19 (G)  $180,000 in 2019/20 (LOS)  $45,000 in 2019/20 (G)

CARRIED

Councillor Doody congratulated staff on the work to date.

Councillor Barnett stated she appreciated staff looking at the programme and encouraged more of the same.

5.20 Water Supply – Utilities and Roading Staff Submission to the 2018-28 Long Term Plan – C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager) and K Simpson (3 Waters Manager)

C Roxburgh spoke to the report briefly, highlighting key changes, specifically related to UV treatment budgets and an upgrade of the underground asset maintenance/renewal. To mitigate the rate effect staff have pushed projects out to enable the budget and work programme to be more consistent and achievable.

Two additional recommendations were tabled (ww) and (xx) and these were explained.

Mayor Ayers enquired if the Health Board were aware the District had well heads underground and whether the Council would be chlorinating. C Roxburgh confirmed the Health Board is aware of the locations and conditions of all Council wells, outlining the work programme and the conditions of the District wells.

Councillor Barnett enquired if the Waikuku Beach work is completed and whether it has UV treatment. Staff confirmed the water supply has UV treatment and all the well work has been completed.

Councillor Gordon queried the timing of the Oxford well work, acknowledging it was in the budget but querying if the work would commence before government announcements. C Roxburgh referred to the Council decision of January 2018, that the physical works will not start until directed by the Government and resolutions today do not override the decision of the Council in January.

Councillor Doody enquired about Oxford Rural No. 2 with UV installation and what was the reason for waiting. C Roxburgh explained the installation of the UV equipment at the Domain Road source and the significant extension to the site was an independent project which the Council resolved would not occur, whereas the UV work that has recently been undertaken for Oxford Rural No 2 is not at Domain Road.

Councillor Atkinson enquired as to the condition of the four underground wells at Kaiapoi. Staff advised all the wells were in good condition, having been recently checked and are better than Christchurch conditions. Staff are confident in their condition but cautious of the interpretation of standards and if conditions change. Further improvements will be addressed over the next few months.

Councillor Blackie enquired if a well head is underground, and visibility does not have corrosion and the sealing pressures are correct, how can it get contaminated. Staff advised that if the pipes are in good order and correctly sealed there is no contamination. It was noted that following the Havelock North investigations, the findings report recommended that no new wells be built below ground.

Councillor Barnett queried chlorination provisions. C Roxburgh explained chlorination provisions were not included in this report, which was about UV filtration treatments, however the budgets have made provision for chlorination if needed.
Staff emphasised that there is no requirement for chlorination at this stage. Earlier budgets did have provision for alteration to pumping stations should chlorination be required at a later date. General discussion and clarification on the water supply budgets occurred. Following discussion on clarity of UV treatment and the provision for chlorination with alteration to well heads, two additional clauses were added to the resolution.

Councillor Atkinson queried the locations of the Kaiapoi wells. Staff explained the four sites.

Moved: Councillor Barnett Seconded: Councillor Gordon

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180509050672.

UV Treatment Budgets

(b) Approves an increase to the Rangiora UV Installation capital works budget from $600,000 to $1,400,000, and increasing the timeframe by which the project will be completed by one year, such that the budget will be $100,000 in 2018/19, $500,000 in 2019/20 and $800,000 in 2020/21, noting that this will increase the Rangiora water rate by $8.20 per connection per year from 2022/22 onwards and the Rangiora water development contribution by $86 per new connection.

(c) Approves an increase to the Kaiapoi UV Installation capital works budget from $800,000 to $1,800,000, and increasing the timeframe by which the project will be completed by one year, such that the budget will be $100,000 in 2018/19, $700,000 in 2019/20 and $1,000,000 in 2020/21, noting that this will increase the Kaiapoi water rate by $14.80 per connection per year from 2021/22 onwards and the Kaiapoi water development contribution by $164 per new connection.

(d) Approves an increase to the Cust UV Installation capital works budget from $270,000 to $600,000, and increasing the timeframe by which the project will be completed by one year, such that the budget will be $50,000 in 2018/19, $100,000 in 2019/20 and $450,000 in 2020/21, noting that this will increase the Cust water rate by $173.70 per connection per year from 2020/21 onwards and the Cust water development contribution by $2,063 per new connection.

(e) Approves the deletion of the $120,000 Cust Water Supply headworks renewal budget in 2022/23 and approves a new headworks renewal budget of $400,000 split $100,000 in 2019/20 and $300,000 in 2020/21 noting that the renewal of the headworks is triggered by the need to upgrade the treatment plant to accommodate UV treatment which cannot be accommodated within the existing site.

(f) Approves an increase to the Pegasus UV and Transfer Pumps Upgrades budgets from $420,000 to $750,000 for the level of service portion and from $78,110 to $150,000 for the growth portion, and also allowing for the timing of the project to be split with $100,000 Level of Service budget and $50,000 Growth budget in 2018/19, $100,000 Level of Service budget and $100,000 Growth budget in 2019/20, and $550,000 Level of Service budget in 2020/21, noting that this will increase Woodend-Pegasus water supply rates by $8.90 per connection per year from the 2021/22 year onwards.

(g) Approves an increase to the Ohoka UV Installation capital works budget from $270,000 to $500,000 and increasing the timeframe over which the
project will be completed by one year, such that the budget will be $10,000 in 2020/21, $90,000 in 2021/22 and $400,000 in 2022/23, noting that this will increase the Ohoka water rate by $193.50 per connection per year from 2023/24 onwards and the Ohoka water development contribution by $288 per unit.

(h) Approves an increase to the Oxford Urban UV Installation capital works budget from $400,000 to $560,000 and increasing the timeframe over which the project will be completed by one year, such that the budget will be $100,000 in 2018/19, $200,000 in 2019/20 and $260,000 in 2020/21, noting that this will increase the Oxford water rate by $138.30 per connection per year from 2021/22 onwards and the Oxford water development contribution by $138 per unit.

(i) Approves an increase to the Oxford Rural No.2 UV Installation capital works budget from $100,000 to $140,000 and deferring the completion date by one year, such that the budget will be $70,000 in 2019/20 and $70,000 in 2020/21, noting that this will increase the Oxford Rural No.2 water rate by $35.40 per unit per year from 2021/22 onwards and the Oxford Rural No.2 water development contribution by $35 per unit.

(j) Approves an increase to the West Eyreton UV Installation capital works budget from $100,000 to $170,000 and increasing the timeframe over which the project will be completed by one year, such that the budget will be $25,000 in 2020/21, $25,000 in 2021/22 and $120,000 in 2022/23, noting that this will increase the West Eyreton water rate by $22.70 per unit per year from 2022/23 onwards and the West Eyreton water development contribution by $601 per unit.

(k) Approves an increase to the Summerhill UV Installation capital works budget from $100,000 to $170,000 and increasing the timeframe over which the project will be completed by one year, such that the budget will be $25,000 in 2020/21, $25,000 in 2021/22 and $120,000 in 2022/23, noting that this will increase the Summerhill water rate by $11.20 per unit per year from 2022/23 onwards and the Summerhill water development contribution by $325 per unit.

(l) Approves an increase to the Poyntzs Road UV Installation capital works budget from $100,000 to $170,000 and increasing the timeframe over which the project will be completed by one year, such that the budget will be $25,000 in 2020/21, $25,000 in 2021/22 and $120,000 in 2022/23, noting that this will increase the Poyntzs Road water rate by $12.20 per unit per year from 2022/23 onwards and the Poyntzs Road water development contribution by $364 per unit.

(m) Notes that Poyntzs Road will only contribute to the UV treatment system if they join to the West Eyreton scheme prior to the project commencing. This strategy is proposed as a means of upgrading the Poyntzs Road scheme to achieve compliance with the Drinking-water Standards, but is subject to community consultation (as noted elsewhere in this report).

(n) Notes that allowance has not yet been made to operational budgets for the proposed UV treatment systems due to advice still being sought on this. These rating implications are expected to be modest relative to the implications of the capital cost, and will not come into effect until after the projects have been completed (2021/22 at the earliest). This will be addressed as part of a future Annual Plan.

(o) Notes that the requirement for UV treatment on supplies that are currently compliant with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand is in response to recommendations made in the Havelock North Drinking-water
Inquiry Stage 2 Report, and is based on the best understanding that staff have of what future requirements will be. Until Central Government provides clear direction there will be a degree of uncertainty regarding the requirements for these treatment systems.

(p) Approves changing the Ohoka, West Eyreton, Summerhill and Poyntzs Road UV treatment budgets from level of service budgets to a partially growth funded budgets, to reflect that the projects will be sized for future growth as well as existing demand on the scheme, and for consistency with the other UV treatment budgets where this is already the case.

(q) Notes that the reason for the recommended increases to the UV Installation budgets is due to detailed assessments being carried out at all sites, while original budgets included in the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan were based on high level engineering judgement until more detailed assessments could be completed.

Well Head Upgrade Budgets

(r) Approves a new capital works budget for the Kaiapoi water supply scheme of $100,000 in 2018/19 to allow the existing 4 underground well heads to be better sealed to reduce the risk of contamination, noting that this will increase the Kaiapoi water rate by $1.50 per connection per year.

(s) Approves a new capital works budget for the Woodend-Pegasus water supply scheme of $25,000 in 2018/19 to allow one existing underground well head to be better sealed to reduce the risk of contamination, noting that this will increase the Woodend-Pegasus water rate by $0.70 per connection per year.

(t) Notes that the reason for better sealing the well heads is in order to maintain the secure status of the schemes, and to address the public health risk associated with the existing underground well heads, also noting that this is in particular in response to stricter application of requirements of below ground well heads by drinking water assessors which puts the Council at risk of losing its secure status.

Kaiapoi Source Capacity Upgrade

(u) Approves a new capital works budget for the Kaiapoi water supply scheme of $800,000 over the 2025/26 ($50,000), 2026/27 ($150,000) and 2027/28 ($600,000) financial years to fund a new well, noting that this is forecast to increase the Kaiapoi water development contribution by $1,345 per new connection.

(v) Notes that the reason for this new budget being identified is due to high demand over the 2017/18 summer causing the water modelling to be refined for the Kaiapoi scheme, which has resulted in the realisation that a new well will be required to accommodate future growth on the scheme.

Mandeville Storage Upgrade

(w) Approves an additional capital works budget for the Mandeville water supply scheme of $250,000 for the 2021/22 financial year, noting that this will increase the Mandeville water rate by $10.4 per unit per year from the 2022/23 year onwards, and the development contribution by $107 per new unit from 2018/19 onwards.

(x) Notes that the reason for requiring the additional storage for the scheme is in order to provide emergency storage to reduce the risk or duration of an outage on the scheme.
**Garrymere Source Upgrade**

(y) **Approves** the deferral of $140,000 capital works budget that is forecast for the 2018/19 financial year for the Garrymere water supply scheme to the 2019/20 financial year.

(z) **Approves** the deferral to the increases to the operational budgets for the Garrymere water supply scheme as noted within the contents of this report, to reflect the proposed treatment system being constructed 12 months later than originally planned.

(aa) **Notes** that deferring this budget will allow staff to establish a Water Supply Advisory Group for the scheme in order to work through issues and options with the source upgrade project prior to committing to a solution, which is in response to feedback received when the community was consulted on this project.

**Poyntzs Road Source Upgrade Project**

(bb) **Approves** deferring $693,000 of the $793,000 capital works budget for the Poyntzs Road source upgrade budget from the 2018/19 financial year to the 2019/20 financial year.

(cc) **Notes** that deferring this budget will allow staff to continue to work with the West Eyreton and Summerhill water supply advisory groups regarding the sharing of their source water prior to consulting with the Poyntzs Road community regarding the source upgrade budget.

**Kaiapoi Water Headworks Renewals**

(dd) **Approves** increasing the Kaiapoi water supply headworks renewals capital works budget for the 2018/19 financial year from $40,000 to $250,000 to allow for renewal of pumps and a generator that has failed subsequent to the draft Long Term Plan going out for consultation.

(ee) **Notes** that staff have obtained 3 quotes for the pump replacements at the Peraki Street headworks, and the new pumps (which take 12 weeks to deliver) will be ordered upon the approval of this report, to reduce the risk of a lack of pumping capacity for the scheme during the upcoming summer months.

(ff) **Approves** the deletion of the $180,000 Kaiapoi water supply headworks renewals capital works budget for the 2020/21 financial year as this was intended for the renewal of the Darnley Square generator, which is now proposed to be renewed in the 2018/19 financial year.

**Other Rescheduling and Minor Adjustments**

(gg) **Approves** deferring 50% of the $731,000 capital works budget allocated to the Gladstone and Pegasus Well Raw water main project (split $511,700 for level of service and $219,300 for growth) from the 2018/19 financial year to the 2019/20 financial year for the Woodend-Pegasus water supply scheme.

(hh) **Notes** that this budget was recently increased by $231,000 for the reasons noted in report 180322031093[v2].

(ii) **Approves** deferring 50% of the $700,000 capital works budget allocated to the Rangiora Water Supply Smith Street 5th Bore capital works project from the 2018/19 financial year to the 2019/20 financial year.
(jj) **Notes** that deferring the above budgets will allow staff to provide a greater level of certainty that the project will be completed in accordance with the timing of the budgets, and reduce the risk of carry overs.

(kk) **Approves** removing the $15,000 capital works budget allocated to the Woodend-Pegasus water supply scheme for the Ravenswood Trunk Main North Upgrade 1 project for the 2018/19 financial year as this main has already been installed as part of the Ravenswood development.

(ll) **Approves** reducing the capital works budget for the 2018/19 financial year for the Rockford Road Trunk Main Stage 1B project on the Oxford Rural No.1 scheme budget from $150,000 to $50,000 given that the majority of the work will be able to be completed under the budget allocated to the 2017/18 financial year, noting that this will decrease the Oxford Rural No.1 development contribution by $135.10 per unit.

(mm) **Approves** the following changes to the Woodend water supply renewals budget, noting that overall this will reduce the Woodend-Pegasus water rate by $1.6 per connection per year:

- i) In 2018/19 removing the $40,000 level of service budget and $70,000 renewal budget.
- ii) In 2019/20 increasing the renewal portion of the budget from $70,000 to $80,000.
- iii) In 2020/21 reducing the level of service portion from $40,000 to $20,000, and the renewal portion from $70,000 to $40,000.

(nn) **Approves** deferring the $110,000 Gladstone Road Wells Electrical Kiosk Control Renewal budget for the Woodend-Pegasus water supply scheme from the 2020/21 financial year to the 2021/22 financial year in order to better spread expenditure over the Long Term Plan period.

(oo) **Approves** deferring the $75,000 level of service and $175,000 renewal portion of the Waikuku Beach water pipeline renewals budget from the 2020/21 financial year to the 2021/22 financial year, in order to better spread expenditure over the Long Term Plan period.

(pp) **Approves** deferring $300,000 of the $350,000 capital works budget for the Darnley Square and Peraki Street Reservoir Strengthening and Sealing budgets from the 2018/19 financial year to the 2019/20 financial year in order to reduce the risk of a carry over on this project.

(qq) **Approves** deferring the $20,000 renewal and $180,000 level of service budgets for the Gammans Creek backup source project for the Oxford Urban water supply scheme from the 2020/21 financial year to the 2021/22 financial year, in order to better spread expenditure over the Long Term Plan period.

(rr) **Approves** reducing the Kaiapoi water renewals capital works budget for the 2018/19, 2019/20 and 2020/21 financial years from $380,000 per year to $300,000 per year in order to minimise expenditure over the first 3 years of the Long Term Plan period where possible.

(ss) **Approves** reducing the Oxford Urban water renewals capital works budget for the 2018/19, 2019/20 and 2020/21 financial years from $100,000 per year to $50,000 per year in order to minimise expenditure over the first 3 years of the Long Term Plan period where possible.

(tt) **Approves** reducing the Rangiora water supply renewals capital works budget from $380,000 to $330,000 in 2018/19 and from $430,000 to
$330,000 in 2019/20 and 2020/21 in order to minimise expenditure over the first 3 years of the Long Term Plan period where possible.

(uu) Approves deferring $80,000 of the $100,000 budget for the Coldstream Road water main extension project for the Rangiora water supply scheme from the 2018/19 financial year to the 2019/20 financial year in order to reduce the risk of carry overs.

(vv) Notes that for all budgets proposed, and proposed changes to budget beyond 2018/19 the community will have the opportunity to provide feedback on as part of future Annual Plans or Long Term Plans.

ww) Notes that staff will engage with the relevant communities and water supply advisory groups before construction of the UV treatment projects, and that staff will report back to the Utilities and Roading Committee with a more detailed scheme specific consultation plan for approval prior to commencing.

(xx) Notes that a budget shortfall has recently been identified for the North-East Kaiapoi Boost Main Project which is to be carried over from the 2017/18 financial year. Staff will report back to the Council with options involving increasing the budget, reducing the scope to meet the budget, or deferring the second stage to a future financial year.

(yy) Notes the 30 January 2018 Council resolution regarding chlorination.

(zz) Notes that both Waikuku and Mandeville water UV installation has been completed.

CARRIED

Councillor Barnett commented on the huge amount of work undertaken in a short time and how it gave her confidence going forward, particularly in light of possible government changes, thereby she considers this responsible action.

Councillor Gordon concurred with comments made by Councillor Barnett.

A brief general discussion occurred relating to the water supply submissions, particularly regarding individual responses which were noted by staff.

5.21 Wastewater Utilities and Roading Staff Submission to the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan – C Parton (Wastewater Asset Manager)

C Parton spoke to the report, outlining the two key aspects and commented on adjustments made which include deferring some projects to enable an achievable project plan for the 2018/19 financial year.

Councillor Barnett referred to Woodend and Kaiapoi integration works. C Parton explained the efficiency.

Councillor Williams queried the quality now at the ocean outfall in comparison to what may have to be achieved when the resource consent is due for renewal, and whether the Council should be preparing now. C Parton advised the consent renewal is 21 years away, however staff are turning their mind to the matter now. J Palmer responded that standards are likely to rise, as are technological changes and acknowledged the cultural issues that may impact in the future. Currently the staff are unsure of an affordable solution for coastal discharge and will be looking at options, including following Christchurch City developments with interest. Staff will look at both cultural and scientific issues and consider ecological ways to enhance the environment.
THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180327032669.

(b) Approves the request for additional funding in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan for $14,000 from the wastewater renewals account for upgrades to the Ohoka Road wastewater catchment in Kaiapoi. The cost will be recovered through Eastern District Sewer Scheme rates.

(c) Approves the request to increase the budget for a main extension in Tuahiwi Road by $33,000 in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan to account for a contribution from the Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga.

(d) Approves the request for funding of $86,109 in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan for a reticulation main extension in Topito Road in Tuahiwi. This cost will be recovered through development contributions.

(e) Approves the request to investigate inflow and infiltration on the Tuahiwi scheme in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan. This cost will be managed through existing operations and maintenance budgets.

(f) Approves the request to develop a contingency plan for minimizing wastewater overflows as required by the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan. This work will be completed in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan. The cost will be managed through existing resource consent budgets.

(g) Approves the request to analyse the configuration of the Kaiapoi wastewater treatment plant to determine if a more efficient configuration is possible. This work will be completed in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan. This cost will be managed through existing resource consent budgets.

(h) Approves the request to mitigate hazards at wastewater facilities on the Eastern District Sewer Scheme. This work will be completed in years 1 through 9 of the draft Long Term Plan, with the bulk of the work occurring in years 1 through 5. This cost will be managed through existing maintenance and renewal budgets.

(i) Approves the request to mitigate hazards at wastewater facilities on the Oxford scheme. This work will be completed in years 1 through 5 of the draft Long Term Plan. This cost will be managed through existing maintenance and renewal budgets.

(j) Approves the request to mitigate hazards at wastewater facilities on the Loburn Lea scheme. This work will be completed in years 1 through 4 of the draft Long Term Plan. This cost will be managed through existing maintenance and renewal budgets.

(k) Approves the deferral of the projects as set out in the following table to provide an achievable capital works programme for 2018/19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme - Project</th>
<th>Budget Type</th>
<th>Draft LTP Budget</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Sewer - Central Capacity Upgrade Stage 3</td>
<td>Solely Growth</td>
<td>$1,011,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$505,500 (2018/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$92,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$46,000 (2018/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renewals</td>
<td>$807,000 (2021/22)</td>
<td>$403,500 (2018/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Sewer - WWTP Inlet Works – Septage Disposal Facility</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$500,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$500,000 (2020/21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Sewer - Additional WWTP Ponds</td>
<td>Solely Growth</td>
<td>$500,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$500,000 (2024/25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solely Growth</td>
<td>$93,000 (2018/19)</td>
<td>$46,500 (2018/19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5.22 Carryovers from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019 – P Christensen (Finance Manager)

J Palmer commented briefly on the report.

Moved: Councillor Gordon  
Seconded: Councillor Williams

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180517054036.
(b) **Adopts** the carryovers as listed for inclusion in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

CARRIED

### 6. Matter Referred from Rangiora-Ashley Community Board Meeting of 16 May 2018

#### 6.1 Garrymere Water Supply Upgrade - Feedback from Community Consultation—C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager) and G Boot (Senior Engineering Advisor) (referred to report no. 180504048871)

J Palmer commented that there was approximately a $30 rate increase from last year and this was not what was signalled in the draft LTP.

Moved: Councillor Barnett  
Seconded: Councillor Williams

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Delays** the upgrade of the Garrymere Water Supply 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.

(b) Approves membership of the Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group to comprise:

- 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.

(c) Approve 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.

(d) Notes that the current programme is based on the project being funded entirely from the Garrymere water supply scheme members.

CARRIED

Mayor Ayers commented that the general feeling from the Garrymere community was that this was a reasonable step to take at this time.

Councillor Barnett commented on there being much feedback and it was sensible to have more discussion with the community. The risk to the scheme had been ascertained as reasonably low, acknowledging it was a difficult scheme to manage, however she was hopeful future conversations will bring acceptable results.

Councillor Williams stated this is an important step and an example of action being asked from the community.

Mayor Ayers stated the outcome does not have a huge effect on the overall LTP and was supportive of the motion.

At the commencement of Day Three, Councillor Stewart provided a brief update on matters arising from Environment Canterbury LTP Deliberations. Of particular note was the Kaiapoi River dredging funding matters.

7. CONSIDERATION OF SUBMISSIONS TO THE DRAFT LONG TERM PLAN 2018-2028

Moved: Mayor Ayers Seconded: Councillor Doody

THAT the Council accepts recommendations as pro forma, noting that they will be formally adopted at the end of the meeting.

CARRIED
Cust Domain
20182028.16.1 in Submission 20182028.16 by Mr Bernard Kingsbury
20182028.617.1 in Submission 20182028.617 by Cust Community Network

THAT the Council:
  (a) Receives the submission.
  (b) Notes that currently Council is committed to a large programme of reserve asset renewals and the development of a number of new reserves. This work is considered a priority and prevents any major asset improvements being undertaken within Cust Domain.

CARRIED

Councillor Gordon requested staff refer the matter to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board as the Community Board may be able to consider a project with the aid of their landscape budget.

Freedom Camping Infrastructure
20182028.26.1 in Submission 20182028.26 by New Zealand Motor Caravan Association Inc.

THAT the Council:
  (a) Receives the submission.
  (b) Advises that monitoring of camping in the District has, to date, not identified need for an increased level of service of caravan/motor home waste services.

CARRIED

Following a question, staff advised where dump stations were located within the district, and near boundaries of neighbouring districts, commenting on their usage. Staff believe the facility is well covered within the district.

Freedom Camping Management
20182028.26.2 in Submission 20182028.26 by New Zealand Motor Caravan Association Inc.

THAT the Council:
  (a) Receives the submission.
  (b) Confirms that ongoing monitoring of freedom camping will be undertaken via the Council’s service request and complaints systems, in consultation with the Environmental Health and Greenspace Teams, Environment Canterbury, the Department of Conservation and the New Zealand Police. If the situation should change the Council will be able to reassess the issue.

CARRIED

Freedom Camping Motorhome Friendly Scheme
20182028.26.3 in Submission 20182028.26 by New Zealand Motor Caravan Association Inc.

THAT the Council:
  (a) Receives the submission.
  (b) Advises that camping in the Waimakariri is managed conservatively on an education rather than punitive basis which is working well for the District.

CARRIED
Community Hall – Rangiora
20182028.52.6 in Submission 20182028.52 by Mr Ian Sissons

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for the suggestion of a further hall in Rangiora. The Council is satisfied with the current level of provision of community facilities in Rangiora. The Council provides meeting facilities at the Rangiora Town Hall which has been designed to cater for varying sized groups, Rangiora War Memorial Hall and a smaller meeting venue at Dudley Park. Those facilities are complemented by various meeting venues provided by Churches and other providers.
(c) Notes that the Rangiora Town Hall does provide two spaces for larger groups with the Auditorium seating approximately 380 persons and the Small Theatre accommodating up to 150 persons.
(d) Notes that the Council Customer Services team assists people to find suitable venues in the District.

CARRIED

Councillor Gordon requested the response to be broadened, including comment on the 150 seat theatre at the Rangiora Town Hall.

Councillor Barnett believed the submitter was seeking a larger venue and suggested a list of facilities be sent with the response letter, as well as listed on the website. C Sargison advised that that Council website contained information on Council facilities, and commented that the Customer Services staff try to inform the public of other (non-council) venues and their contact information, where known.

North Canterbury BMX Club - Boundary Extension
20182028.70.1 in Submission 20182028.70 by North Canterbury BMX Club

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Notes that provision for the BMX club to expand has already been approved. If any assets owned by the North Canterbury Equine Trust need to be moved to accommodate the expansion then these will have to be replaced by the BMX Club in consultation with the Equine Trust.

CARRIED

North Canterbury BMX Club – Resource Consent
20182028.70.1 in Submission 20182028.70 by North Canterbury BMX Club

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
   Notes that staff from the Community Green Space Unit will work with the North Canterbury BMX Club in regards to resource consent for the proposed BMX track redevelopment.

CARRIED

Disability Swing
20182028.118.10 in Submission 20182028.118 by Mrs Colleen McDonald

C Sargison provided an update to the Council on other potential options and suggested staff hold a conversation with the submitter. Staff would also provide an update to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board.
Councillor Atkinson queried the Darnley Club area as a potential area for a disability swing. Staff advised that due to the Deed, the Darnley Club recreation area cannot be expanded.

Councillor Blackie enquired as to the cost of a disability swing. Staff advised it was approximately upwards of $10,000, with some models having the ability to take a wheelchair, could be in excess of $50,000.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Declines the request for a wheelchair swing for the Kaiapoi area as requested.
(c) Notes that staff will look, in all new and replacement playgrounds, to ensure inclusive play and universal design principles are followed to ensure that the playgrounds are able to be accessed by all.
(d) Supports the provision of a wheelchair swing in the Kaiapoi area and that staff will continue to liaise with the submitter and the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board on options for location.

CARRIED

Skatepark for Pegasus
20182028.215.5 in Submission 20182028.215 by Miss Mel Stevens
20182028.536.5 in Submission 20182028.536 by Ms Jenefer Bimler
20182028.601.1 in Submission 20182028.601 by Mr Damien Bimler
20182028.738.1 in Submission 20182028.738 by Mr Matt and Nadene and Mrs Dalzell
20182028.507.5 in Submission 20182028.507 by Miss Sarah Carmody

Councillor Gordon suggested a wording change to the resolution.

Mayor Ayers indicated it was hard to undertake a skate park to service Pegasus and Ravenswood due to accessibility with the State Highway. C Brown advised staff had spoken to Ravenswood developers about the potential possibility longer term.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Notes that the Draft Long Term Plan has $150,000 identified for a skate park facility in the Woodend/Pegasus area in the 2020/21 financial year.
(c) Notes that staff will work with the Woodend-Sefton Community Board on the design and location of a facility.

CARRIED

Community Pool for Pegasus
20182028.215.6 in Submission 20182028.215 by Miss Mel Stevens

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Declines the request for a community pool in Pegasus.
(c) Notes the development of a pool in the Pegasus area is not currently included in the Recreation Strategy.

CARRIED

Lake Pegasus
20182028.283.11 in Submission 20182028.283 by Canterbury District Health Board
THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** the submission.

(d) **Notes** that operational and maintenance funding of Lake Pegasus is through targeted rates and District general rates.

(e) **Notes** Lake Pegasus is currently owned and operated by the developer, Todd Property Ltd and will vest to Council following resolution of ongoing compliance issues and completion of the lake subdivision and vesting process.

(f) **Notes** that further work on funding to maintain water quality within Lake Pegasus will be required once it is understood what future maintenance requirements will be to maintain compliance.

CARRIED

**Bike Track / Park for Oxford**

20182028.354.5 in Submission 20182028.354 by Mrs Shara Kelsey-Ross

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** the submission.

(b) **Declines** the request for additional funding but supports staff working with the submitter and the Pearson Park Advisory Board on a potential development in Pearson Park that could be eligible for a grant from the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board.

CARRIED

Councillor Felstead suggested a group could apply to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board for potential funding towards such a project, and should be mentioned in the response.

**Sealed Pump Track for Gladstone Park**

20182028.536.6 in Submission 20182028.536 by Ms Jenefer Bimler

20182028.601.2 in Submission 20182028.601 by Mr Damien Bimler

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** the submission.

(b) **Notes** that while there is currently no funding for a pump track for Gladstone Park staff would be happy to work with the community to look at locations and will also approach the Woodend-Sefton Community Board for consideration of funding.

CARRIED

Councillor Gordon suggested the submitter work with the Woodend-Sefton Community Board as there may be potential funding within the Community Board’s discretionary grant.

**Multi-Use Walking / Cycleways along Tram and Oxford Roads**

20182028.554.6 in Submission 20182028.554 by Mrs Courtney Starbuck

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** the submission.

(b) **Thanks** the submitter for their submission.

(c) **Notes** that included in the LTP is $500,000 per year for walking and cycling projects. To construct a walkway/cycleway linking Christchurch/Rangiora/Woodend to Oxford along both Tram Road and Oxford Road would be hugely
expensive and probably unaffordable in the short to medium term and is not recommended.

(d) Notes that sections on the route could be considered as part of the walking and cycling programme which will be presented to Council shortly. For example Fernside to Rangiora and Swannaona School to Mandeville have been suggested in submissions to the LTP.

CARRIED

Bridle ways
20182028.631.1 in Submission 20182028.631 by Ms Cathy Dee

Staff commented on education and a national interest for bridle (horse) trails. The reality was there were places in the district that are unsafe to ride horses. Brief general discussion occurred.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Notes that there are designated horse trails in the District, with the principal trails being at Baynons Brake and Tuhaitara Coastal Park.
(c) Supports staff undertaking further investigation and opportunities for Bridle ways in the District.

CARRIED

Koura Reserve/Northbrook Connections
20182028.705.2 in Submission 20182028.705 by Keep New Zealand Beautiful

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Supports the recommendations put forward by Keep New Zealand Beautiful for the development of the land next to Northbrook Ponds.
(c) Notes that currently $15,000 is already allocated towards this project.
(d) Notes that $15,000 will not be enough funding to implement the full development of the site however there is possible external funding opportunities which staff will explore.
(e) Notes that staff will continue to liaise with Keep NZ Beautiful and the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board on the development of the area.

CARRIED

Woodend Beach Enhancements
20182028.755.5 in Submission 20182028.755 by Woodend Community Association

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Approves staff working with the Woodend Community Association on the development of a concept plan for Woodend Beach Domain.

CARRIED

Ohoka Domain Upgrade
20182028.756.5 in Submission 20182028.756 by Ohoka Residents Association
20182028.499.5 in Submission 20182028.499 by Oxford-Ohoka Community Board
Staff noted that the work on the Ohoka Domain Pavilion was expected to be completed by early June.

**THAT** the Council:
(a) **Receives** the submission.
(b) **Thanks** the Ohoka Residents Association for their support towards the redevelopment Ohoka Domain and the earthquake strengthening of the Ohoka Domain Pavilion.

**CARRIED**

**Woodend Community Centre – Stage**  
20182028.755.7 in Submission 20182028.755 by Woodend Community Association

Staff explained the issues with movability and storage of such an item at the Woodend Community Centre, and discussed health and safety matters and volume of usage.

**THAT** the Council:
(a) **Receives** the submission.
(b) **Acknowledges** the submission but considers it is more practical to hire in a stage for a particular event and then the stage can be appropriately sized for the intended purpose and there are no consequential storage issues.

**CARRIED**

**Woodend Community Centre – Parking**  
20182028.755.8 in Submission 20182028.755 by Woodend Community Association

Staff provided a brief update of the situation. Councillor Barnett queried the carpark area and safety of people accessing the shops from the community centre, enquiring if anything could be done to improve safety. Staff suggested a pedestrian crossing point could be painted and would also note that in the submission.

**THAT** the Council:
(a) **Receives** the submission.
(b) **Notes** staff regularly monitor the condition of the carpark and paint markers have recently been renewed. The carpark was designed in 2011 to create a slow environment for vehicle movements and there are clear pedestrian ways highlighted but it is inevitable that there will be potential conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles particularly with a number of children using the building at times. If all parties are careful the Council is satisfied that the carpark design is fit for purpose.
(c) **Requests** staff to undertake the marking of a pedestrian crossing between the community centre and the across the carpark eastwards, to enable pedestrians accessing the shops safer.

**CARRIED**

**Oxford Skate Park**  
20182028.499.8 in Submission 20182028.499 by Oxford-Ohoka Community Board

Staff commented that the skate park does not need to be increased in size.

**THAT** the Council:
(a) **Receives** the submission.
(b) **Notes** that applying the current levels of service for the size of skate parks in each of the five main towns determines that currently the skate park in Oxford does not require an upgrade.

(c) **Notes** that the Pearson Park Advisory Group will receive ongoing capital funding for the development of Pearson Park which could be used for a skate park extension.

**CARRIED**

Reserve Management Plan - Cust Community Centre
20182028.617.9 in Submission 20182028.617 by Cust Community Network

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** the submission.

(b) **Notes** that staff have undertaken a review of all play spaces in the district and developed a priority list for redevelopment. Jack Graham Reserve is in relatively good quality with good asset provision provided and therefore no money has been allocated in the Long Term Plan.

(c) **Notes** that staff do have budget to look at renewing assets which have reached the end of their useful lives and using this budget staff will look into what can be done to the car park at Cust Community Centre.

(d) **Notes** that the Cust Community Network’s request will be referred to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board for consideration of funding.

(e) **Notes** that staff have a budget for the installation of new signs and will work with the Cust Community Network on the installation of signs where appropriate.

**CARRIED**

Council Reserves
20182028.496.18 in Submission 20182028.496 by the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** the submission.

(b) **Notes** that staff will continue to install bike racks in town centres, community facilities and major recreation facilities with community or district catchments such as sport and recreation reserves.

(c) **Notes** that instruction signage for Baker Park is being installed utilising funding from the current 2017/18 financial year and that staff will consider the installation of signage for all new fitness stations as these are developed.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Barnett queried the term ‘cycle park’. C Sargison explained that a cycle park as a ‘learn to ride’ area was being considered by the Regeneration Steering Group. This submission related to a place to park and lock cycles. Staff explained that cycle racks do get used at indoor facilities such as libraries and community centres, but not at reserves or parks.

Councillor Stewart queried fitness stations as a gift from the Kaiapoi Lions before the earthquakes that was intended to be installed along the Kaiapoi Walkway. Staff advised the Kaiapoi Lions have since ceased and that the funding for the intended fitness stations had not been transferred at the time of the earthquakes. Subsequently the Lions funded the ‘mouse house’ wheel in Trousselot Park as part of the recreation precinct. This was a $30,000 contribution.

Reserves and Recreation - Woodend-Sefton
20182028.497.13 in Submission 20182028.497 by the Woodend-Sefton Community Board
THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Notes that staff will work with the Community Board on development of reserves in Pegasus and Owen Stalker Park.

CARRIED

Toilets for Pegasus Beach
20182028.215.7 in Submission 20182028.215 by Miss Mel Stevens

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Notes that the new Pegasus Beach Toilets have been built in line with Councils Toilet Strategy in regards to provision of cubicles and showers. No money has at this stage been identified for an expansion to the toilet however staff will continue to monitor use as the Pegasus Beach becomes more used.

(c) Notes that a tap is currently located at the back of the toilets at the Pegasus Lake Playground within Karen Eastwood Park. This can be used for the washing off of sand.

CARRIED

Toilet for Coopers Creek - Oxford Forest Conservation Area
20182028.540.5 in Submission 20182028.540 by Department of Conservation

Staff spoke of the provision for two toilets and referenced the Toilet Strategy. Staff advised that DoC maintain, clean and stock paper in the current toilets.

Councillor Atkinson queried freedom campers and toilet use. Staff commented on Salt Water Creek, funding options and criteria (which has been applied for). Staff acknowledged there is an increased risk of freedom campers using new toilets on DoC land in Oxford and the nuisance potential.

Councillor Gordon enquired about DoC continuing to fund the toilets. Staff advised DoC could and would with the current standard which is a portaloo. If WDC funded the project a higher standard of toilet would be supplied. C Sargison spoke of the potential to go back to DoC and staff to change the response to the submitter. If DoC advise they no longer would supply the portalooos then staff would come back to the Council to seek funding which could be spread over a couple of years from current budgets.

Councillor Doody queried the location of the current DoC portaloos. Staff explained they were located at the start of the Wharfdale track.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Declines the funding request at this stage and requests staff to undertake further investigations with DoC on the provision of toilet facilities in the area and to report back to the Council.

(c) Notes that ongoing cleaning of the toilet would be the responsibility of the Department of Conservation.

CARRIED

Toilet for View Hill - Oxford Forest Conservation Area
20182028.870.1 in Submission 20182028.870 by Mr Chris Brown (on behalf of DoC)
THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Declines the funding request at this stage and requests staff to undertake further investigations with DoC on the provision of toilet facilities in the area and to report back to the Council.

(c) Notes that ongoing cleaning of the toilet would be the responsibility of the Department of Conservation.

CARRIED

Public Toilet – Silverstream
20182028.496.8 in Submission 20182028.496 by the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Notes that staff are working with the developer of Silverstream Estates on the design of a toilet to be installed within Tirikatene Reserve. It is anticipated that this reserve be installed in the 2018 calendar year.

CARRIED

Kaiapoi Museum
20182028.493.1 in Submission 20182028.493 by Kaiapoi District Historical Society
20182028.495.1 in Submission 20182028.495 by Kaiapoi Maritime Heritage Trust

Councillor Gordon sought a report to the Community & Recreation Committee on more information of the situation and spoke of assess issues. C Sargison spoke of the original place, space use and design of the Museum space.

Councillor Atkinson was also interested in a report, with J Palmer acknowledging it would provide a useful summary of documenting events to this point in time.

Mayor Ayers commented on lack of storage space for museums generally.

Councillor Doody enquired where the Waimakariri Arts Trust store their non-displayed paintings. Mayor Ayers responded.

Councillor Stewart enquired if the brief for the remodelled Rangiora Service Centre could include an expanded area for storage which could be useful for archives. J Palmer explained archives are now off-site and digital records are taken whenever possible. Management was reluctant for any extension work to include a repository for other organisations.

Councillor Stewart sought a report on storage issues to assist options for consideration with future building developments. Staff advised that information could be included in the report Councillor Gordon had requested. Staff spoke of the independent assessment of the Museum requirements and digitalisation.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Declines the request for an extension to the Kaiapoi Museum space.

(c) Requests staff to prepare a report for the Council on the allocation of space in the Kaiapoi Museum and the potential for improving access to existing storage areas.
(d) **Requests** staff to prepare a report on storage of artworks in the District owned by the Waimakariri District Arts Trust.

**CARRIED**

**Community Grants**
20182028.32.1 in Submission 20182028.32 by Community Wellbeing North Canterbury Trust
20182028.71.1 in Submission 20182028.71 by Te Kohaka o Tuhaitara Trust
20182028.497.6 in Submission 20182028.497 by the Woodend-Sefton Community Board

**THAT** the Council:
(a) **Receives** the submission.
(b) **Notes** that these amounts are already included in the Draft LTP so no further adjustments are required.
(c) **Thanks** the submitters and looks forward to continuing to work with them over the next year.

**CARRIED**

**Sefton Public Hall Society Grant**
20182028.769.1 in Submission 20182028.769 by Sefton Public Hall Society

**THAT** the Council:
(a) **Receives** the submission.
(b) **Thanks** the submitter and acknowledges the work of the Hall Committee in maintaining the Sefton Hall for the community.

**CARRIED**

**Request for Funding – Satisfy Food Rescue**
20182028.834.1 in Submission 20182028.834 by Satisfy Food Rescue

Following a waste minimisation related question from Councillor Barnett, staff explained the purpose of the group was re-purposing of food to help groups/families in the community, explaining there were a growing number of groups contributing to the supply. It was also explained how this group worked with other community-based social support groups in the community, sharing knowledge and support to better assist those in need.

Councillor Doody sought clarification on the group supplying schools with breakfast. Staff explained the group supply breakfasts to seven schools, including Belfast.

Councillor Barnett requested further information from K Waghorn on other funding sourcing. This information was supplied at the beginning of Day Three.

**THAT** the Council:
(a) **Receives** the submission.
(b) **Acknowledges** the work that Satisfy Food Rescue is doing in the community and the way it is supporting other community groups in their roles. The is mindful of the number of groups that would like to have funding for staff support and advises that it is not in a position to fund further staffing resources for community groups and organisations.

**CARRIED**

**Request for Funding – Rangiora Smallbore Rifle Club**
20182028.38.5 in Submission 20182028.38 by Mr Quintin Jane
General discussion occurred of rifle clubs in the district, Rangiora High School Skeet shooting and viability of locations.

**THAT** the Council:
(a) **Receives** the submission.
(b) **Requests** staff to work with the Rangiora Small bore Rifle Club to determine their requirements, and explore the possibility of using another facility.

**CARRIED**

**Request for Funding - Te Kohaka o Tuhaitara Trust**
20182028.69.5 in Submission 20182028.69 by Mr Pete Johnson
20182028.755.9 in Submission 20182028.755 by Woodend Community Association
20182028.871.16 in Submission 20182028.871 by Pegasus Residents Group

**THAT** the Council:
(a) **Receives** the submission.
(b) **Thanks** the submitters and acknowledges the significant work that Te Kohaka o Tuhaitara Trust is doing on behalf of the community and the Council has significantly increased its operational grant to the Trust commencing on 1 July 2018.

**CARRIED**

At the conclusion of Day One, five submissions seeking funding were placed on the whiteboard for further consideration and staff advice the next day. It was confirmed that funding the five specific groups sought was not included in the current budgets. The groups were: North Canterbury BMX Club ($20,000 one off grant); Big Brothers Big Sisters ($5,000 per annum); Silverstream Advisory Group ($5,000 one off grant); Country Cricket ($34,000), Pines Beach Hall ($6,500 per annum).

**Request for Funding - North Canterbury BMX Club**
20182028.70.3 in Submission 20182028.70 by North Canterbury BMX Club

Moved: Councillor Barnett    Seconded: Councillor Gordon

**THAT** the Council:
(a) **Receives** the submission.
(b) **Notes** the work that that the Club has put into its planning of the site and the Council is agreeable for the expansion of the area of land and that this has the approval of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board.
(c) **Approves** the Council making a one-off grant of $20,000 to the Club, noting that this matches the fundraising that the Club has done to date and the Council will also be happy to support the Club’s application to the RATA Foundation.

**CARRIED**

**Request for Funding - Silverstream Volunteer Group**
20182028.248.1 in Submission 20182028.248 by Silverstream Volunteer Group

**THAT** the Council:
(a) **Receives** the submission.
(b) **Acknowledges** the success that the Silverstream Group has had in developing the Silverstream Reserve and congratulates the Group on the way that they have
sourced alternative funding for plants and the time that the Community is continuing to devote to maintaining the reserve.

(c) **Acknowledges** the need to be utilising social media to keep the development momentum and accordingly grants an additional $5,000 per annum for supporting those initiatives.

**CARRIED**

**Request for Funding - Cure Boating Club Incorporated**

20182028.249.1 in Submission 20182028.249 by Cure Boating Club Inc.

Councillor Gordon sought clarification on the loan. Staff advised the Club sought external funding with the Council acting as guarantor rather than supplier of funds.

Councillor Atkinson commented on costs of building consents and potentially include in the response of staff/council costs already and further report back to the Council.

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** the submission.

(b) **Notes** the work that the Cure Club has done on progressing the rebuild of its Club premises and Council would like to work with the Club to investigate options for securing an interest free loan to cover the shortfall in funding and report back to the Council.

(c) **Notes** that the Council will meet the costs of the necessary consents for the rebuild of the clubrooms.

**CARRIED**

**Request for Funding - North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support**

20182028.272.1 in Submission 20182028.272 by North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support

**Having declared a conflict of interest, as Chair of the North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support Group, Councillor Doody withdrew from the table.**

Mayor Ayers remarked he was unsure if the Council was fully aware of what the group are trying to do. This is about Civil Defence as well as building a sense of neighbourhood and communities. Mayor Ayers stated the Council has its own Civil Defence systems and networks however this group’s network could potentially be integrated and utilised. Mayor Ayers acknowledged national issues with the organisation.

J Palmer commented that the issue has been mooted for several months, reflecting on previous discussions. He reflected on the January budget meeting when funding support was removed, and noted in the commentary at the time. Management had discussed the group with acknowledgment of potential support of the group however there was concern relating to funding and that this may not be the best spend, as there are other groups potentially better situated for co-ordination.

Councillor Atkinson remarked on his understanding of Civil Defence (CD) and that the Council CD is well resourced for our size. Councillor Atkinson queried, if by supporting NCNS, the Council was effectively asking for a subcommittee to be set up with the community. J Palmer responded that following the earthquakes, the Council increased its resource to two full time CD staff. He commented on the operation of Selwyn District Council with the NCNS group. The Chief Executive acknowledged the Council were well resourced for Civil Defence matters.

Councillor Barnett remarked on her personal involvement on NCNS and CD and synergies between the two groups, however acknowledged that when there had been
discussions on joining the two groups, NCNS, as a national organisation went downhill. Councillor Barnett believed the NCNS argument was not strong enough for her to have the confidence that they would provide value for funding and therefore believed it was not a good investment at this point in time.

Councillor Blackie sought clarification of the “Get Ready” project. J Palmer spoke of a database with member details and NCNS provided connections of who has what resource in the community.

Both Councillors Blackie and Barnett commented on their personal lack of contact with the group that they had personally joined over the past five years.

Mayor Ayers allowed Councillor Doody to comment from the public gallery, as a deputation. W Doody stated things have changed, explaining how she ended up with the Chair role and spoke of the co-ordinators. It was advised that NCNS have a large number of people signed up for Gets Ready project. The NCNS had recently employed another person due to the group covering the areas of Kaikoura, Hurunui and Selwyn. W Doody spoke of the workload in Kaikoura with over 300 families joined up to the scheme. W Doody stated NCNS is not dysfunctional and are proactive. The Police are supportive of the group and are contributing funds for the Kaikoura operation to get up and running. The Get Ready scheme is for emergencies only and operates through the Police co-ordination and communication linkages.

Moved: Councillor Gordon Seconded: Mayor Ayers

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Declines at this stage the current request for financial contribution to North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support.
(c) Requests staff to prepare a report to the District Planning & Regulation Committee on North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support, specifically the ‘Gets Ready’ programme and other provisions within the district.

CARRIED

Mayor Ayers spoke of the merit of the group and the potential of funding through the Annual Plan (2019/20), and therefore would like more information regarding an integrated system of operation.

Request for Funding - Pines Beach Hall
20182028.281.1 in Submission 20182028.281 by Pines Beach Hall

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Acknowledges the outstanding work that the Pines Kairaki Association has done on building the new hall at Pines Beach and compliments the Association on the standard of the hall and the way it links with the Pines Oval and agrees to make an annual grant of $6,500 to assist with the annual insurance cost.

CARRIED

Request for Funding – Big Brothers Big Sisters
20182028.101.1 in Submission 20182028.101 by Big Brothers Big Sisters

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) **Acknowledges** the work that Big Brothers Big Sisters undertakes in the community and notes that the Council does provide free office accommodation, including utilities, to the Group. The Group is, however, the only organisation operating in the District in this area. Big Brothers is an empowerment model of early intervention and prevention and it has a track record of success both locally and nationally.

(c) **Approves** an annual grant of $5,000. **CARRIED**

---

**Request for Funding - Compass FM**

20182028.296.1 in Submission 20182028.296 by Compass FM

*Day One,* Mayor Ayers, having declared a conflict of interest as a Trustee, left the room at 4.41pm, returning at 4.44pm. Deputy Mayor Felstead assumed the Chair.

Councillor Gordon advised Hurunui District Council had granted $5,000 to Compass FM the previous day, during their LTP deliberations. It was suggested the group be placed on the whiteboard for further discussion and consideration the next day.

C Sargison spoke about the change to funding use requested of Hurunui District Council and the group were now seeking $10,000 from WDC as a one off payment towards an equipment upgrade.

*Day Two,* Mayor Ayers, having declared a conflict of interest, departed the room at 10.36am and returned at 10.42am. Deputy Mayor Felstead assumed the Chair.

Councillor Atkinson asked how many community radio stations existed in the District. Staff were unsure of the quantity.

Moved: Councillor Gordon Seconded: Councillor Doody

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** the submission.

(b) **Approves** the funding of $10,000 as a one off contribution towards new capital equipment. **CARRIED**

A Division was called by Councillor Barnett

For: Councillors Felstead, Blackie, Doody, Gordon and Meyer.
Against: Councillors Atkinson, Barnett, Stewart and Williams.
**CARRIED 5:4**

Councillor Gordon reflected on the contribution from Hurunui District Council and the benefits of the station to the Waimakariri District.

Councillor Doody spoke of the benefits of the radio station to the community.

Councillor Williams stated he believed the station was semi commercial and should therefore stand on its own for capital expenditure.

Councillor Barnett stated she was unable to support the radio station but acknowledged they do good job, however she believed radio should not be funded by the Council. Councillor Barnett was comfortable to use the radio services by paying for the Mayor’s weekly spot or advertisements. Councillor Barnett believed the station was a hobby station, remarking that the Council has not received listening statistics, and believed the station did not appeal to most persons of the district. Councillor Barnett believed this funding is excessive and ratepayers do not receive value for money.
Councillor Atkinson, agreed with Councillors Barnett and Williams and clarified that the station was a Trust. Councillor Atkinson stated that the request, could be perceived as a grant for favours coming back and he was a little uncomfortable with that. Councillor Atkinson reflected on his personal involvement with radio in his early years, commenting on radio stations legislated responsibility to broadcast information for community related events, therefore he saw no obligation on this Council to contribute funding. Councillor Atkinson stated that he did hold some sympathy for the Trust’s request and personally liked the station and the people involved.

Councillor Felstead stated he would support the motion for funding capital equipment and believed the station served a need for the community.

Councillor Gordon stated he was only supporting the funding for capital equipment. He remarked on measuring statistics cannot be recorded because Compass FM is not a commercial station and official statistic would cost a significant amount, as had been explained by the station’s representatives during the hearings. Councillor Gordon commented that the station broadcast through the Kaikoura earthquake, and that this Council has not invested funds before in the station, however he was aware other groups from the community have invested, such as Rotary. Councillor Gordon stated he believed it was worth supporting Compass FM for the community benefits.

Request for Funding - Flora and Fauna
20182028.558.5 in Submission 20182028.558 by Mrs Gillian Giller

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Thanks the submitter for her interest in protecting flora and fauna. The Council is mindful of protecting remnants of flora and fauna in the District and works closely with developers to protect areas of interest on proposed development sites. The Council is also supporting the regeneration of the Silverstream Reserve as a native reserve and also supports the Te Kohaka o Tuhaitara Trust in the development and restoration of the Trust land. The Council does not wish to increase the general provision of $15,000 per annum but notes that there is a greater actual sum spent each year with other projects in the District.

CARRIED

Request for Funding – Canterbury Biodiversity Strategy
20182028.640.1 in Submission 20182028.640 by Edge Landscapes

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Notes that recent regional and national initiatives towards affording a greater priority to biodiversity enhancement are included in ECAN’s LTP and the government’s programme. This includes the Provincial Growth Fund with funding for a major programme of revegetation/afforestation. It will take some time for the shape and nature of new regional and national policy in this area to become clear. In light of this and the prospect of substantial external funding the Council does not wish to establish unspecified project funding which is unrelated to a specific programme.

CARRIED

Request for Funding – Oxford Arts Trust
20182028.790.1 in Submission 20182028.790 by Oxford Arts Trust

Councillor Barnett enquired if the current $4,680 grant was inflation adjusted. Staff confirmed that was the case.
The request for an additional $1,000 towards insurance costs was placed on the whiteboard, for further discussion on Day Two.

Moved: Councillor Gordon    Seconded: Councillor Felstead

THAT the Council:
   (a) Receives the submission.
   (b) Notes that the Council currently provides an operational grant to the Oxford Arts Trust of $4,680 to assist with insurance and other overheads.
   (c) Approves an additional $1,000 for insurance costs, subject to receiving a satisfactory financial report to the Council.
   (d) Noting the total grant to the Oxford Arts Trust would be $5,680 to assist with insurance and other overheads, subject to the supply of financial information.
   (e) Requests staff to prepare a report for the Council on the current provision of grants to the halls in the District.

CARRIED

Councillor Gordon commented that the group had asked for other funding for a number of aspects to their operation however the main benefit would be funding to cover the increased insurance, which is an operational cost. Councillor Gordon commented on how difficult it was to seek operational funding through other grant bodies. Councillor Gordon suggested members view the Oxford Arts Trust in a similar way to museums, which also run a lean operation, primarily with volunteers, also noting the facility is located on a Council reserve.

Councillor Barnett suggested an amendment, that the Oxford Arts Trust provide the Audit and Risk Committee a set of full financial statements prior to any Council decision. This amendment was supported by Councillor Williams. Councillor Barnett believed the Trust was an asset to the district, but the submission spoke about hiring a paid administrator and issues seeking funding. Councillor Barnett reflected on when she had sought financial information, the Trust were unable to provide it. Councillor Barnett remarked that the group may need more than the $1,000 and would prefer to wait until she had an opportunity to review the financial information.

Following discussion and mutual agreement with Councillors Gordon and Felstead the amendment was absorbed into the motion.

Councillor Atkinson queried Pines Beach Hall. Mayor Ayers asked staff for a list of halls that the Council provide grants to and how much those grants were.

Request for Funding – Canterbury Country Cricket Association

THAT the Council:
   (a) Receives the submission.
   (b) Notes the work that the Canterbury Country Cricket puts into maintaining Mainpower Oval and recognises the additional requirements to have the grounds to a standard to host representative matches.
   (c) Recommends that the Council make a total annual grant of $56,000.

CARRIED
Councillor Williams remarked on the upgrade to the pitch and suggested holding back; querying if the Council were going to support other sporting codes such as croquet with similar funding support.

Councillor Doody asked for an explanation of how Country Cricket works at the Oval. C Brown explained 1.5 person groundsmen, who also undertake other cricket maintenance at other parks across the district, under guidance from the NZ Cricket Association. Staff spoke of the national standards required of the grounds, which related to player expectations and health and safety. The Council has funded turf renovation after the first class game was cancelled. A report recommends renovation should be done every three years. Staff commented on the groundsmen requirements to obtain a “WOF” from the national body, for the grounds, ensuring appropriate standards were maintained. Canterbury Country Cricket require additional funding to ensure the pitch standards are maintained. The options of not funding were outlined which include not hosting first class games or the Council employing staff to undertake the work, (which would be more expensive overall). This requested grant does not cover all costs, and the Association continue to seek additional outside funding.

Mayor Ayers enquired about professional cricket. C Brown commented on match fees (Canterbury first class) where this field receive approximately $30,000 to $40,000 per year for enabling Canterbury to use the ground, however approximately $150,000 is required per year to keep the pitch to the appropriate approved national standards.

Councillor Doody remarked on the age range of players coming through the ranks. She stated cricket comes to Rangiora because under the new rules there are only limited games able to be played in Hagley Park, so some games have to play at Lincoln or Rangiora (providing the grounds are maintained to the appropriate standard), and these visitors to our district create a benefit and vibrancy to the greater community.

Councillor Atkinson sought clarification, if the Council was effectively buying cricket matches by funding this request. Staff advised funding enables the first class games to be played in Rangiora by the ground being up to the appropriate standards required by the New Zealand body.

Councillor Atkinson enquired if other Councils undertake similar funding with their turf such as hockey. Staff confirmed that was the case. In a supplementary question, Councillor Atkinson enquired what the alternative was. Staff advised that first class cricket will not be able to be played (and watched) in this area as the group cannot fund maintenance full time. Staff also commented that if representative games are not played at the Oval then MainPower may potentially withdraw sponsorship, and this would put additional strain on funding and maintaining the grounds.

Councillor Gordon appreciated comments and concerns, and reflected on his awareness of how the cricket facility is run, primarily by volunteers, and the benefits to the district. Councillor Gordon commented on the stringent health and safety requirements imposed from the national body. Councillor Gordon spoke positively on the partnership between Canterbury Country Cricket, the clubs, the Council, MainPower and the community.

Councillor Atkinson enquired if staff were aware if the group had applied to other funding sources. Staff were unsure, but knew that every year the group do apply to other outside funding sources.

Request for Funding – Cust Bowling Club
20182028.853.1 in Submission 20182028.853 by Cust Bowling Club

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Thanks the Submitter and acknowledges the work that the Club does for the Cust community. Residents of Cust do have the option of using the Council funded heated swimming pool at Oxford, or the pools at Rangiora and Kaiapoi.
(c) **Notes** that in the light of increasing compliance costs the Club may wish to consider whether it is going to be affordable for the Club to repair the pool and keep it open for community use as the Council does not wish to provide funding for the retention of the Cust pool.

**CARRIED**

**Request for Funding – The Ohoka Gatekeeper’s Lodge**
20182028.866.1 in Submission 20182028.866 by Ohoka Domain Advisory Group

Staff provided an update on the situation, with the possibility of a heritage grant.

Councillor Gordon enquired if the group can apply to other funding agencies for grants. Staff confirmed this is the case. The Lotteries Commission had supplied funding to enable a heritage assessment to occur.

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** the submission.

(b) **Thanks** the submitters for the work that they are doing on restoring the Gatekeepers Lodge.

(c) **Notes** that the agreement to have the lodge located at Ohoka Domain and for the Council to take ownership of the building was on the basis that the restoration would be at no cost to the Council.

(d) **Notes** that staff will work with the Advisory Group on exploring options for sourcing non-Council funding for the restoration of the building.

**CARRIED**

**Oxford Pool**
20182028.21.6 in Submission 20182028.21 by Mr Dannie Mabey

Staff explained the situation with View Hill School and use of Council facilities.

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** the submission.

(b) **Acknowledges** the frustration of View Hill School in not getting access to the Oxford Pool.

(c) **Advise**s that staff have made changes to the WaiSwim booking system to better manage allocation of space across the various schools.

(d) **Recommend**s staff work with View Hill School to try and achieve suitable dates and times for the 2018/19 swim season.

**CARRIED**

**Swimming Membership Fees**
20182028.543.5 in Submission 20182028.543 by Sport Canterbury

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** the submission.

(b) **Notes** the concern of Sport Canterbury over the proposed increases for platinum fees and notes that a platinum membership provides for unlimited access to swimming and aquarobics classes. The proposed increases reflect the increased cost in providing those services.

**CARRIED**
Rangiora Airfield Ground Rental for Hangars
20182028.4.1 in Submission 20182028.4 by SprintAero Limited
20182028.27.1 in Submission 20182028.27 by Mr Grant Goodland
20182028.28.1 in Submission 20182028.28 by Mr Pat Scotter
20182028.111.1 in Submission 20182028.111 by Mr Graeme Main
20182028.597.1 in Submission 20182028.597 by Mr Stephen Witte
20182028.687.1 in Submission 20182028.687 by Mr John (Buzz) Harvey

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Notes that there is a separate report on Community Facilities Fees and Charges and that once the Council has made a decision on that report individual responses will be written for each submitter.

CARRIED

Civil Defence
20182028.496.5 in Submission 20182028.496 by the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Notes that Tsunami plans already exist and are in the public domain through the Council's website and provided in hard copy to every property in the affected beaches.
(c) Notes that these plans include signage locations which follow international tsunami convention. Road marking whilst an option is not considered necessary.

CARRIED

Parking Restrictions – Kaiapoi
20182028.496.20 in Submission 20182028.496 by the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Recommends that any charges be suspended for the moment until completion of the parking restrictions review in June 2018.

CARRIED

Pegasus Community Centre
20182028.278.5 in Submission 20182028.278 by Mrs Ronel Stephens
20182028.279.5 in Submission 20182028.279 by Mr Roger Rule

Councillor Barnett queried the Woodend Methodist Church and Hall availability. Mayor Ayers advised that strengthening work was currently being undertaken and due for completion in the next few months. It was anticipated that on completion of the works, the Church Hall would be then available for community use.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Acknowledges the significance of community support for people addressing emotional and mental health issues. The Council has committed to developing a library and community facility for the Ravenswood/Pegasus area but this is not scheduled for another ten years.
(c) Suggests in the short term that discussions are held with the Pegasus Residents Association around options for the configuration of the Pegasus community facility to make it more suitable for the interim.
(d) **Notes** the availability of other community meeting spaces in the area including Gladstone Park Rugby Clubrooms and the Churches in Woodend.

CARRIED

**Ravenswood - High School**

20182028.755.11 in Submission 20182028.755 by Woodend Community Association

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** the submission.

(b) **Notes** that the Ministry of Education has recently completed a planning exercise for the provision of schools in Waimakariri District which included examining the population projections for the District.

(c) **Notes** that the Ministry is satisfied that with the redevelopment of Kaiapoi High School along with the redevelopment of Rangiora High School combined with the recent enrolment zones that there is sufficient secondary school capacity in the District.

CARRIED

**Community Facility Fees & Charges**

20182028.14.5 in Submission 20182028.14 by Mrs Sarah Shore
20182028.178.5 in Submission 20182028.178 by Mrs Alexandra Foerstmann
20182028.349.5 in Submission 20182028.349 by Mrs Charmaine McGregor
20182028.355.5 in Submission 20182028.355 by PT on Panckhurst
20182028.497.9 in Submission 20182028.497 by the Woodend-Sefton Community Board
20182028.871.5 in Submission 20182028.871 by Pegasus Residents Group

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** the submission.

(b) **Refers** to the separate report on fees and charges. Once the Council has made a decision individual responses will be written to the submitters.

CARRIED

**Fernside Hall - Fees & Charges**

20182028.103.1 in Submission 20182028.103 by Zumba Zing NZ

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** the submission.

(b) **Refer** to separate report on fees and charges.

CARRIED

**Woodend Community Centre - Fees & Charges**

20182028.25.5 in Submission 20182028.25 by Woodend Combined Club
20182028.121.6 in Submission 20182028.121 by Woodend Combined Friendship Club
20182028.217.1 in Submission 20182028.217 by Mr A H Power
20182028.218.1 in Submission 20182028.218 by Woodend Indoor Bowling Club
20182028.241.1 in Submission 20182028.241 by Woodend Garden Club
20182028.415.5 in Submission 20182028.415 by Mr M and Barbara and Mrs Liddicoat
20182028.494.5 in Submission 20182028.494 by Mrs Elaine H B Cole
20182028.608.1 in Submission 20182028.608 by Pegasus Woodend Women's Institute
20182028.755.6 in Submission 20182028.755 by Woodend Community Association
20182028.871.6 in Submission 20182028.871 by Pegasus Residents Group

**THAT** the Council:
(a) **Receives** the submission.

(b) **Refers** to the separate report on fees and charges.

(c) **Notes** that once the Council has made a decision individual responses will be written to the submitters.

**CARRIED**

**Oxford Town Hall and Pavilion - Fees & Charges**
20182028.216.1 in Submission 20182028.216 by Agape Dance Academy
20182028.251.1 in Submission 20182028.251 by Oxford Craft Market
20182028.851.1 in Submission 20182028.851 by Hartfield Physio Ltd

**THAT** the Council:
(a) **Receives** the submission.

(b) **Refers** to a separate report on fees and charges. Once the Council has made a decision individual responses will be written to the submitters.

**CARRIED**

**Pegasus Community Centre - Fees & Charges**
20182028.389.5 in Submission 20182028.389 by Ms Amy
20182028.510.5 in Submission 20182028.510 by Mrs Rochelle & Joe Faimalo
20182028.608.2 in Submission 20182028.608 by Pegasus Woodend Women’s Institute

**THAT** the Council:
(a) **Receives** the submission.

(b) **Refers** to a separate report on fees and charges.

(c) **Notes** once the Council has made a decision individual responses will be written to the submitters.

**CARRIED**

**Rangiora Town Hall - Fees & Charges**
20182028.509.5 in Submission 20182028.509 by the North Canterbury Musical Society Inc.

**THAT** the Council:
(a) **Receives** the submission.

(b) **Refers** to a separate report on fees and charges.

(c) **Notes** once the Council has made a decision individual responses will be written to the submitters.

**CARRIED**

**Community Engagement**
20182028.40.7 in Submission 20182028.40 by Mr Rhys and Ms Alice
20182028.120.8 in Submission 20182028.120 by Mrs Suzanne Thurlow
20182028.358.9 in Submission 20182028.358 by Mr James A Ryan
20182028.511.5 in Submission 20182028.511 by Mr Mark Kenny
20182028.644.9 in Submission 20182028.644 by Mr C Pocock
20182028.667.8 in Submission 20182028.667 by Federated Farmers of New Zealand
20182028.498.10 in Submission 20182028.498 by Rangiora-Ashley Community Board
20182028.875.1 in Submission 20182028.875 by Mrs Heather Woods
Councillor Barnett queried information supplied with rates demands letters. J Palmer responded that when the rates first quarter account is sent, an accompanying letter sets out how the rates work. Other quarterly rate demands may have some other information on Council matters at the time. J Millward commented on staff trialling a “where rates go” programme on-line as another tool for the community to be informed. Staff will be able to update the Council in the coming weeks.

Councillor Barnett wondered if, in future, the February rates notice could share information on the Annual Plan consultation. J Palmer responded. Mayor Ayers commented that although the rates demand is one way to communicate, it does not go to all house owners ie landlords not renters or those that have automatic payments. Mayor Ayers commented on using other medium to convey where to find information on the Council, although acknowledged the rates envelope may be worth considering to advertise various Council aspects. Mayor Ayers cautioned that anything publicity that goes through the rates envelope should go through the communications team. Councillor Barnett reflected on community feedback, with a portion of the population reading newspapers and not necessarily using internet communications. Councillor Barnett believed the rate envelopes were an opportunity to share Council information.

Councillor Doody enquired if the people that pay rates by direct debit, if they still receive the first letter. Staff confirmed that was the case that all rate payers receive the first letter outlining the rates matters.

Councillor Gordon commented on the overall consultation process and documentation for this LTP, being the best he had seen. Councillor Gordon thanked the staff for including the elected members in the consultation processes and connecting with the community at numerous events during the consultation period. Councillor Gordon referenced the solid waste matters and suggested staff look at using the rates letters as a timing mechanism to keep the community informed.

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Thanks the submitters for their comments.

(c) Advises that significant efforts are made to promote the opportunity to consider Council’s proposals through consultations such as that for the Draft LTP. This was extensively promoted through the media and online and over 800 submissions have been received. We constantly look to how we can improve such promotion and the presentation and ease of use of consultation materials such as the consultation document.

CARRIED

Kaiapoi Garden Competition
20182028.102.1 in Submission 20182028.102 by You Me We Us Kaiapoi Trust

C Sargison spoke on the running of the competition.

Councillor Stewart enquired what happened with the wind up of the Keep Kaiapoi Beautiful assets. C Brown advised that the primary organiser had moved house, however more seating was installed in the walkway before the club dissolved. The trailer was also stolen so there was very little asset left. It was understood the shed had been given away to another community group ie food forest.

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Acknowledges that You Me We Us are willing to continue with the running of the annual Kaiapoi Garden Competition and will provide an annual grant of $500 to assist with expenses associated with the competition.

CARRIED

Councillor Felstead stated he had no objection to the proposal.
Landscaping for Kaiapoi
20182028.496.17 in Submission 20182028.496 by the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board

C Brown provided an update on various aspects of Kaiapoi landscaping and commented on the current level of service provided.

Councillor Stewart enquired on the progress of the linkage. C Sargison referred to a recent Community and Recreation Committee briefing, with further discussion to occur with the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board. Staff briefly mentioned the amenity area, drainage and continuing work with Ecan.

Councillor Blackie enquired about the Fuller Street land. C Sargison advised the concept is if the Council take ownership it is not in exchange for dollars, but perhaps a long term lease. The land has very limited appeal, however securing it enables access for maintenance operations.

Councillor Doody queried land further along the railway line and beautification. C Brown advised staff continue to negotiate with Kiwi Rail.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Notes that Green Space staff are currently investigating options for the ownership and / or maintenance of the land and will report back to the Board.
(c) Declines the request for landscape planting to be installed to soften the fence around Silverstream Estates due to insufficient land being available now that the new arterial road and swale has been installed.
(d) Notes that staff are working closely with Environment Canterbury to look at options of creating a concept plan for the Kaiapoi River with a focus on the town centre area.
(e) Notes that a new levels of service for tree maintenance has been proposed to Council that would significantly increase the amount of epicormic growth removal undertaken at Kaiapoi Domain from once every three years to annually.

CARRIED

Sefton Community Facilities
20182028.497.11 in Submission 20182028.497 by the Woodend-Sefton Community Board

Staff advised that the group were currently satisfied with their annual Council grant.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the Board and notes that there has been a submission from the Sefton Public Hall Society which confirms they are happy with their current grant amount.

CARRIED

Waikuku Hall
20182028.497.10 in Submission 20182028.497 by the Woodend-Sefton Community Board

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the Board for their support for acoustic panelling for the Waikuku Beach Hall.

CARRIED
Youth Facilities – Pegasus
20182028.497.12 in Submission 20182028.497 by the Woodend-Sefton Community Board

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Supports the submission from the Woodend-Sefton Community Board relating to older youth facilities.
(c) Notes that $150,000 is identified in the Long Term Plan for the 2020/2021 for a skate facility in the Woodend/Pegasus area and that the Board will be involved in investigating the appropriate location for this facility.

CARRIED

Youth Centre
20182028.274.5 in Submission 20182028.274 by Waimakariri Youth Council

C Sargison advised the group had applied to the Lotteries Commission for funding.

Mayor Ayers commented on the Youth Council in general.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Notes the suggestion around a more coordinated support base for providing services to the community and this is currently being further researched by the Community House Steering Group. The Group is currently sourcing funding for a formal feasibility study. The Youth Council is identified as a key stakeholder in the research.

CARRIED

Corporate Accommodation
20182028.275.5 in Submission 20182028.275 by Mr Steve Chandler
20182028.498.5 in Submission 20182028.498 by Rangiora-Ashley Community Board
20182028.497.5 in Submission 20182028.497 by The Woodend-Sefton Community Board
20182028.871.12 in Submission 20182028.871 by Pegasus Residents Group

Following a question from Councillor Gordon, staff advised that further information and discussion would occur in six to eight weeks regarding future development of the Rangiora Service Centre. J Palmer commented generally on government views and accommodation matters.

Councillor Stewart commented on fit for purpose, conveying her disappointment at the recent renovation of downstairs kitchen, with no oven included. J Palmer explained the renovation was due to the fire alternations and replacement with the same arrangement, acknowledging the kitchen was not fit for purpose for ground floor catering for events, but a kitchenette. Compared to similar Councils it is considered poorly setup however the Council has other priorities. J Palmer advised that when consultation occurs over next six months on accommodation matters, a workshop will be held with councillors to ascertain their views. Mayor Ayers commented for councillors to think about the Chambers layout, new furniture, screens, etc in readiness of that workshop.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Notes careful analysis has also been given to reasonably foreseeable staffing requirements consistent with a growing district. There are no current or foreseeable prospects for amalgamation that would in itself eliminate the need to provide for future growth. Instead of leasing additional space consideration has been given to better utilisation of the existing
space within the building and the proposed project enables this to happen within the existing building footprint.

(c) **Acknowledges** the support of the Woodend-Sefton and Rangiora-Ashley Community Boards and Pegasus Resident’s Group.

CARRIED

**Establishing a CCO - Waimakariri Public Art Advisory Trust**
20182028.39.7 in Submission 20182028.39 by Ms Barb Warren
20182028.498.7 in Submission 20182028.498 by Rangiora-Ashley Community Board

THAT the Council:
(a) **Receives** the submission.
(b) **Thanks** the submitters for their support of the Public Art Advisory Trust and looks forward to establishing the Trust with the support of the Community.

CARRIED

**Public Art Policy - Implementation in Oxford Township**
20182028.790.2 in Submission 20182028.790 by Oxford Arts Trust

THAT the Council:
(a) **Receives** the submission.
(b) **Acknowledges** the support of the Oxford Arts Trust for the formation of the Public Arts Trust.
(c) **Notes** that one of the roles of the Trust will be to seek funding for public art works in the District.

CARRIED

**Enterprise North Canterbury**
20182028.497.16 in Submission 20182028.497 by the Woodend-Sefton Community Board

THAT the Council:
(a) **Receives** the submission.
(b) **Acknowledges** that ENC held a briefing with the Community Board on their business attraction activities during May.

CARRIED

**Rates Affordability**
20182028.52.5 in Submission 20182028.52 by Mr Ian Sissons
20182028.72.5 in Submission 20182028.72 by Mrs Linda Marion McKitterick
20182028.122.5 in Submission 20182028.122 by Mr Jeremy Richards
20182028.213.5 in Submission 20182028.213 by Ms Cheryl York
20182028.247.10 in Submission 20182028.247 by Mr Jeff Rogers
20182028.283.5 in Submission 20182028.283 by Canterbury District Health Board
20182028.383.10 in Submission 20182028.383 by Mr Lawrence Roberts
20182028.528.10 in Submission 20182028.528 by Mr Garry Leech
20182028.582.1 in Submission 20182028.582 by Body Corporate Northbrook Villas
20182028.602.7 in Submission 20182028.602 by Mr K J Claxton
20182028.683.5 in Submission 20182028.683 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous
20182028.784.10 in Submission 20182028.784 by Penrith Trust
20182028.844.5 in Submission 20182028.844 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous
20182028.498.6 in Submission 20182028.498 by Rangiora-Ashley Community Board
20182028.46.10 in Submission 20182028.46 by Mr Neil Wilkinson
It was suggested to add a comment to the responses that Audit NZ independently audit each year and also mention Standard and Poors reviewing the Council financial position. The response to include commented on the Council responsibility to provide services for the community.

Councillor Atkinson queried Anonymous submission. J Palmer responded, that whilst no name had been supplied, an address had, hence the response would be sent.

Councillor Stewart commented on level of service and the cost of providing service divided by the number of ratepayers. She remarked that it does effect the overall level of service, believing people need to better understand that. Mayor Ayers responded by citing a comparison with Christchurch City. J Palmer commented on differential ratings on reserves and cautioned against a comparison on Council against Council on rates. The basis of rates is what level of service do the Council supply and what do the community want to pay for that level of service. The Council try to make the best decision for the community as a whole.

Councillor Williams commented on comparisons with other Councils. J Palmer responded on how matters are dealt with, citing an example of swimming pool charges. The Council and staff cannot ignore what happens in neighbouring councils, however ultimately the decision lies with the governance of this Council. Councillor Williams remarked on how good Waimakariri facilities are compared to many councils. General discussion on level of service, facilities and comparisons with other districts occurred.

Councillor Williams queried why this Council does not promote itself more. J Palmer spoke of demonstrating great value for money and the issues grappling with the overall issues.

Councillor Barnett raised an issue on the Retirement Village Rate Rebate Act, and sought a report on the impact, which was believed to be enacted from 1 July. J Palmer advised a memo from M Harris would provide an update.

Councillor Stewart sought an update on the Rivertown model. Staff advised it was the same model as Northbrook and provided a response.

THAT the Council:
   (a) Receives the submission.
   (b) Provides the following response for each submitter:

   **20182028.52 by Mr Ian Sissons:** The Council aims to minimize rate increase when proposing its rates and charges. The overall rate percentage increase being proposed is understood to be one of the lowest in Canterbury and understood mid-range for New Zealand. As a District, Waimakariri has a high decile rating and high GDP per capita. According to LGNZ’s assessment the District’s rates as a percentage of GDP is one of the lowest in the country, at about 4%. The Council is also however conscious that averages do not reflect was is affordable for low income earners and sets its rating policy accordingly to what is fair and equitable. The costs arising from the earthquake to our district has been substantial and about 1% each year of the increases through-out the Long Term Plan is attributable to the earthquake and regeneration costs. Growth is not always beneficial and does come with its challenges as well, providing for new and relocated homes within our district. We were fortunate that we had planned and had much of the infrastructure in place and be in a good position of being able to cater for ongoing growth. The Minister for Local Government has requested that the Productivity commission will hold an inquiry into local government funding stating “Local government is facing increasing costs for things like three waters, roading, housing, and tourism infrastructure as well as adapting to climate change. Some of the councils facing the biggest cost increases also have shrinking rating bases” The Productivity Commission is to look at how local government can fund activities most effectively and fairly and that Councils have alternative options other than rates funding.
The Council has no hidden agendas and provides open and honest discussions with its community. It is not proposing to charge for water through water metering. A review undertaken some years ago did not provide compelling benefits of going to the cost of installing water meters as a basis to charge. If this was to be reviewed either through Central Government and/or sustainability being the catalyst, it would be consulted with the community effected.

20182028.72 by Mrs Linda Marion McKitterick: The Council when setting service levels and rating always takes into consideration the ratepayer’s interests.

20182028.122 by Mr Jeremy Richards: The Council rates are increasing at an average rate of just over 4% over the next 4 years before returning to Local Government cost index inflation. 1% per annum of rate movement is attributed to progressively funding the Earthquake and Regeneration costs. The rating forecast values do include inflation that is provided by Business and Economic Research Limited. The Council finances are audited by Audit NZ every year. (BERL). This makes up about 30% of the increase. If your property is located in an area that requires substantial upgrades for services such as water, the cost will be much higher and these factors could be attributing to the rates increase over the ten years. The Council has set up an advisory group this year to look the Rural Water supply costs, which could also be attributing to the outer year rates increases to your property that you are experiencing.

For your information the Minister for Local Government has requested that the Productivity commission will hold an inquiry into local government funding stating “Local government is facing increasing costs for things like three waters, roading, housing, and tourism infrastructure as well as adapting to climate change. Some of the councils facing the biggest cost increases also have shrinking rating bases” The Productivity Commission is to look at how local government can fund activities most effectively and fairly and that Councils have alternative options other than rates funding.

20182028.213 by Ms Cheryl York: The Council aims to minimize rate increases when proposing its rates and charges. The overall rate percentage increase being proposed is understood to be one of the lowest in Canterbury and understood mid-range for New Zealand. As a District, Waimakariri has a high decile rating and high GDP per capita. According to LGNZ’s assessment the District’s rates as a percentage of GDP is one of the lowest in the country, at about 4%. The Council is also however conscious that averages do not reflect was is affordable for low income earners and sets its rating policy accordingly to what is fair and equitable.

The costs arising from the earthquake to our district has been substantial and about 1% each year of the increases through-out the Long Term Plan is attributable to the earthquake and regeneration costs.

The Minister for Local Government has requested that the Productivity commission will hold an inquiry into local government funding stating “Local government is facing increasing costs for things like three waters, roading, housing, and tourism infrastructure as well as adapting to climate change. Some of the councils facing the biggest cost increases also have shrinking rating bases” The Productivity Commission is to look at how local government can fund activities most effectively and fairly and that Councils have alternative options other than rates funding.

The Government provides a Rates Rebates scheme for low income earners which currently provides for a maximum rebate of $630 for low income earners.

20182028.247 by Mr Jeff Rogers: Rates affordability is always a serious consideration assessed by the Council. The Council aims to minimize rate increases when proposing its rates and charges. The overall rate percentage increase being proposed is understood to be one of the lowest in Canterbury region and understood mid-range for New Zealand. Trying to objectively assess the affordability of rates is difficult. As a District, Waimakariri has a high decile rating and high GDP per capita. According to LGNZ’s assessment the District’s rates as a percentage of GDP is one of the lowest in the country, at about 4%. The Council is also however conscious that averages do not reflect was is affordable for low income earners and sets its rating policy accordingly to what is fair and equitable.
The costs arising from the earthquake to our district has been substantial and about 1% each year of the increases through-out the Long Term Plan is attributable to the earthquake and regeneration costs.

The Minister for Local Government has requested that the Productivity commission will hold an inquiry into local government funding stating “Local government is facing increasing costs for things like three waters, roading, housing, and tourism infrastructure as well as adapting to climate change. Some of the councils facing the biggest cost increases also have shrinking rating bases” The Productivity Commission is to look at how local government can fund activities most effectively and fairly and that Councils have alternative options other than rates funding.

The Government provides a Rates Rebates scheme for low income earners which currently provides for a maximum rebate of $630 for low income earners.

20182028.283 by Canterbury District Health Board: Rates affordability is always a serious consideration assessed by the Council. The Council aims to minimize rate increases when proposing its rates and charges. The overall rate percentage increase being proposed is understood to be one of the lowest in Canterbury region and understood mid-range for New Zealand. Trying to objectively assess the affordability of rates is difficult. As a District, Waimakariri has a high decile rating and high GDP per capita. According to LGNZ’s assessment the District’s rates as a percentage of GDP is one of the lowest in the country, at about 4%. The Council is also however conscious that averages do not reflect was is affordable for low income earners and sets its rating policy accordingly to what is fair and equitable.

The costs arising from the earthquake to our district has been substantial and about 1% each year of the increases through-out the Long Term Plan is attributable to the earthquake and regeneration costs.

The Minister for Local Government has requested that the Productivity commission will hold an inquiry into local government funding stating “Local government is facing increasing costs for things like three waters, roading, housing, and tourism infrastructure as well as adapting to climate change. Some of the councils facing the biggest cost increases also have shrinking rating bases” The Productivity Commission is to look at how local government can fund activities most effectively and fairly and that Councils have alternative options other than rates funding.

As noted, the Government provides a Rates Rebates scheme for low income earners which currently provides for a maximum rebate of $630 for low income earners.

20182028.383 by Mr Lawrence Roberts: Rates affordability is always a serious consideration assessed by the Council. The Council aims to minimize rate increases when proposing its rates and charges. The overall rate percentage increase being proposed is understood to be one of the lowest in Canterbury region and understood mid-range for New Zealand. Trying to objectively assess the affordability of rates is difficult. As a District, Waimakariri has a high decile rating and high GDP per capita. According to LGNZ’s assessment the District’s rates as a percentage of GDP is one of the lowest in the country, at about 4%. The Council is also however conscious that averages do not reflect was is affordable for low income earners and sets its rating policy accordingly to what is fair and equitable.

The costs arising from the earthquake to our district has been substantial and about 1% each year of the increases through-out the Long Term Plan is attributable to the earthquake and regeneration costs.

The Minister for Local Government has requested that the Productivity commission will hold an inquiry into local government funding stating “Local government is facing increasing costs for things like three waters, roading, housing, and tourism infrastructure as well as adapting to climate change. Some of the councils facing the biggest cost increases also have shrinking rating bases” The Productivity Commission is to look at how local government can fund activities most effectively and fairly and that Councils have alternative options other than rates funding.

The Government provides a Rates Rebates scheme for low income earners which currently provides for a maximum rebate of $630 for low income earners.

20182028.528 by Mr Garry Leech: Rates are one of the components that make up the CPI figure. Local Governments inputs for like of materials and engineering contractors are
much higher than CPI and therefore Local Government use the Council uses rating forecast values for inflation that is provided by Business and Economic Research Limited (BERL). Overall the Long Term Plan this adds about 30% to the cost on rates.

Rates affordability is always a serious consideration assessed by the Council. The Council aims to minimize rate increases when proposing its rates and charges. The overall rate percentage increase being proposed is understood to be one of the lowest in Canterbury region and understood mid-range for New Zealand. Trying to objectively assess the affordability of rates is difficult. As a District, Waimakariri has a high decile rating and high GDP per capita. According to LGNZ’s assessment the District’s rates as a percentage of GDP is one of the lowest in the country, at about 4%. The Council is also however conscious that averages do not reflect was is affordable for low income earners and sets its rating policy accordingly to what is fair and equitable.

The costs arising from the earthquake to our district has been substantial and about 1% each year of the increases through-out the Long Term Plan is attributable to the earthquake and regeneration costs.

The Minister for Local Government has requested that the Productivity commission will hold an inquiry into local government funding stating “Local government is facing increasing costs for things like three waters, roading, housing, and tourism infrastructure as well as adapting to climate change. Some of the councils facing the biggest cost increases also have shrinking rating bases” The Productivity Commission is to look at how local government can fund activities most effectively and fairly and that Councils have alternative options other than rates funding.

The Government provides a Rates Rebates scheme for low income earners which currently provides for a maximum rebate of $630 for low income earners.

20182028.582 by Body Corporate Northbrook Villas: DIA has discovered a retirement village ownership structure that was not envisioned when the Act was being drafted and is not taken into account in the wording of the new section 7A(1) of the Rates Rebates Act 1973. The ownership structure in question is separate rating units (unit titles) that are owned by a retirement village operator and provided to residents under a licence to occupy contract.

From 1 July 2018, it is hoped the Government provides relief to Retirement villages through the Rates Rebates (Retirement Village Residents) Amendment Act 2018. This scheme allows those people who own and reside to be eligible to Rates rebates to a maximum of $630. The DIA is exploring options for amending the Rates Rebate Act 1973 to ensure that residents with this ownership structure will be eligible for the scheme, with the aim of getting any necessary amendment passed so that eligible residents are still able to apply for a rebate for the 2018/19 rating year.

With reference to the services reductions referred to, many of these circumstances are consistent with a number of other properties in the district. These services are charged for under the Revenue and Financing policy. Some services are charged based on a user approach and others are reflected by a charge in the dollar based on the capital value of the property.

20182028.602 by Mr K J Claxton: Rates affordability is always a serious consideration assessed by the Council. The Council aims to minimize rate increases when proposing its rates and charges. The overall rate percentage increase being proposed is understood to be one of the lowest in Canterbury region and understood mid-range for New Zealand. Trying to objectively assess the affordability of rates is difficult. As a District, Waimakariri has a high decile rating and high GDP per capita. According to LGNZ’s assessment the District’s rates as a percentage of GDP is one of the lowest in the country, at about 4%. The Council is also however conscious that averages do not reflect was is affordable for low income earners and sets its rating policy accordingly to what is fair and equitable.

The costs arising from the earthquake to our district has been substantial and about 1% each year of the increases through-out the Long Term Plan is attributable to the earthquake and regeneration costs. Growth is not always beneficial and does come with its challenges as well, providing for new and relocated homes within our district. We were fortunate that we had planned and had much of the infrastructure in place and be in a good position of being able to cater for ongoing growth.
The Minister for Local Government has requested that the Productivity commission will hold an inquiry into local government funding stating “Local government is facing increasing costs for things like three waters, roading, housing, and tourism infrastructure as well as adapting to climate change. Some of the councils facing the biggest cost increases also have shrinking rating bases” The Productivity Commission is to look at how local government can fund activities most effectively and fairly and that Councils have alternative options other than rates funding.

The Government provides a Rates Rebates scheme for low income earners which currently provides for a maximum rebate of $630 for low income earners.

20182028.683 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous: Rates affordability is always a serious consideration assessed by the Council. The Council aims to minimize rate increases when proposing its rates and charges. The overall rate percentage increase being proposed is understood to be one of the lowest in Canterbury region and understood mid-range for New Zealand. Trying to objectively assess the affordability of rates is difficult. As a District, Waimakariri has a high decile rating and high GDP per capita. According to LGNZ’s assessment the District’s rates as a percentage of GDP is one of the lowest in the country, at about 4%. The Council is also however conscious that averages do not reflect was is affordable for low income earners and sets its rating policy accordingly to what is fair and equitable.

The costs arising from the earthquake to our district has been substantial and about 1% each year of the increases through-out the Long Term Plan is attributable to the earthquake and regeneration costs. Growth is not always beneficial and does come with its challenges as well, providing for new and relocated homes within our district. We were fortunate that we had planned and had much of the infrastructure in place and be in a good position of being able to cater for ongoing growth.

The Minister for Local Government has requested that the Productivity commission will hold an inquiry into local government funding stating “Local government is facing increasing costs for things like three waters, roading, housing, and tourism infrastructure as well as adapting to climate change. Some of the councils facing the biggest cost increases also have shrinking rating bases” The Productivity Commission is to look at how local government can fund activities most effectively and fairly and that Councils have alternative options other than rates funding.

The Government provides a Rates Rebates scheme for low income earners which currently provides for a maximum rebate of $630 for low income earners.

20182028.784 by Penrith Trust: Rates affordability is always a serious consideration assessed by the Council. The Council aims to minimize rate increases when proposing its rates and charges. The overall rate percentage increase being proposed is understood to be one of the lowest in Canterbury region and understood mid-range for New Zealand. Trying to objectively assess the affordability of rates is difficult. As a District, Waimakariri has a high decile rating and high GDP per capita. According to LGNZ’s assessment the District’s rates as a percentage of GDP is one of the lowest in the country, at about 4%. The Council is also however conscious that averages do not reflect was is affordable for low income earners and sets its rating policy accordingly to what is fair and equitable.

The costs arising from the earthquake to our district has been substantial and about 1% each year of the increases through-out the Long Term Plan is attributable to the earthquake and regeneration costs. Growth is not always beneficial and does come with its challenges as well, providing for new and relocated homes within our district. We were fortunate that we had planned and had much of the infrastructure in place and be in a good position of being able to cater for ongoing growth.

The Minister for Local Government has requested that the Productivity commission will hold an inquiry into local government funding stating “Local government is facing increasing costs for things like three waters, roading, housing, and tourism infrastructure as well as adapting to climate change. Some of the councils facing the biggest cost increases also have shrinking rating bases” The Productivity Commission is to look at how local government can fund activities most effectively and fairly and that Councils have alternative options other than rates funding.

The Government provides a Rates Rebates scheme for low income earners which currently provides for a maximum rebate of $630 for low income earners.
20182028.844 by Mr Anonymous: Rates affordability is always a serious consideration assessed by the Council. The Council aims to minimize rate increases when proposing its rates and charges. The overall rate percentage increase being proposed is understood to be one of the lowest in Canterbury region and understood mid-range for New Zealand. Trying to objectively assess the affordability of rates is difficult. As a District, Waimakariri has a high decile rating and high GDP per capita. According to LGNZ’s assessment the District’s rates as a percentage of GDP is one of the lowest in the country, at about 4%. The Council is also however conscious that averages do not reflect what is affordable for low income earners and sets its rating policy accordingly to what is fair and equitable.

The costs arising from the earthquake to our district has been substantial and about 1% each year of the increases throughout the Long Term Plan is attributable to the earthquake and regeneration costs.

The Minister for Local Government has requested that the Productivity commission will hold an inquiry into local government funding stating “Local government is facing increasing costs for things like three waters, roading, housing, and tourism infrastructure as well as adapting to climate change. Some of the councils facing the biggest cost increases also have shrinking rating bases” The Productivity Commission is to look at how local government can fund activities most effectively and fairly and that Councils have alternative options other than rates funding.

The Government provides a Rates Rebates scheme for low income earners which currently provides for a maximum rebate of $630 for low income earners.

20182028.498 by Rangiora-Ashley Community Board: Rates affordability is always a serious consideration that is assessed by the Council. The Council aims to minimize rate increases when proposing its rates and charges. The overall rate percentage increase being proposed is understood to be one of the lowest in Canterbury region and understood mid-range for New Zealand. Trying to objectively assess the affordability of rates is difficult. As a District, Waimakariri has a high decile rating and high GDP per capita. According to LGNZ’s assessment the District’s rates as a percentage of GDP is one of the lowest in the country, at about 4%. The Council is also however conscious that averages do not reflect what is affordable for low income earners and sets its rating policy accordingly to what is fair and equitable.

The costs arising from the earthquake to our district has been substantial and about 1% each year of the increases throughout the Long Term Plan is attributable to the earthquake and regeneration costs.

Growth is not always beneficial and does come with its challenges as well, providing for new and relocated homes within our district. We were fortunate that we had planned and had much of the infrastructure in place and be in a good position of being able to cater for ongoing growth.

The Minister for Local Government has requested that the Productivity commission will hold an inquiry into local government funding stating “Local government is facing increasing costs for things like three waters, roading, housing, and tourism infrastructure as well as adapting to climate change. Some of the councils facing the biggest cost increases also have shrinking rating bases” The Productivity Commission is to look at how local government can fund activities most effectively and fairly and that Councils have alternative options other than rates funding.

The Government provides a Rates Rebates scheme for low income earners which currently provides for a maximum rebate of $630 for low income earners.

20182028.46 by Mr Neil Wilkinson: Rates affordability is always a serious consideration that is assessed by the Council. The Council aims to minimize rate increases when proposing its rates and charges. The overall rate percentage increase being proposed is understood to be one of the lowest in Canterbury region and understood mid-range for New Zealand. Trying to objectively assess the affordability of rates is difficult. As a District, Waimakariri has a high decile rating and high GDP per capita. According to LGNZ’s assessment the District’s rates as a percentage of GDP is one of the lowest in the country, at about 4%. The Council is also however conscious that averages do not reflect what is affordable for low income earners and sets its rating policy accordingly to what is fair and equitable.
The costs arising from the earthquake to our district has been substantial and about 1\% each year of the increases through-out the Long Term Plan is attributable to the earthquake and regeneration costs.

Growth is not always beneficial and does come with its challenges as well, providing for new and relocated homes within our district. We were fortunate that we had planned and had much of the infrastructure in place and be in a good position of being able to cater for ongoing growth.

The Minister for Local Government has requested that the Productivity commission will hold an inquiry into local government funding stating “Local government is facing increasing costs for things like three waters, roading, housing, and tourism infrastructure as well as adapting to climate change. Some of the councils facing the biggest cost increases also have shrinking rating bases” The Productivity Commission is to look at how local government can fund activities most effectively and fairly and that Councils have alternative options other than rates funding. The Government provides a Rates Rebates scheme for low income earners which currently provides for a maximum rebate of $630 for low income earners.

20182028.511 by Mr Mark Kenny: Rates affordability is always a serious consideration that is assessed by the Council. The Council aims to minimize rate increases when proposing its rates and charges. The overall rate percentage increase being proposed is understood to be one of the lowest in Canterbury region and understood mid-range for New Zealand. Trying to objectively assess the affordability of rates is difficult. As a District, Waimakariri has a high decile rating and high GDP per capita. According to LGNZ’s assessment the District’s rates as a percentage of GDP is one of the lowest in the country, at about 4\%. The Council is also however conscious that averages do not reflect was is affordable for low income earners and sets its rating policy accordingly to what is fair and equitable.

The costs arising from the earthquake to our district has been substantial and about 1\% each year of the increases through-out the Long Term Plan is attributable to the earthquake and regeneration costs.

The Minister for Local Government has requested that the Productivity commission will hold an inquiry into local government funding stating “Local government is facing increasing costs for things like three waters, roading, housing, and tourism infrastructure as well as adapting to climate change. Some of the councils facing the biggest cost increases also have shrinking rating bases” The Productivity Commission is to look at how local government can fund activities most effectively and fairly and that Councils have alternative options other than rates funding. The Government provides a Rates Rebates scheme for low income earners which currently provides for a maximum rebate of $630 for low income earners.

CARRIED

Rates and Levels of Service
20182028.15.5 in Submission 20182028.15 by Mr James Girvan
20182028.49.5 in Submission 20182028.49 by Mr Miles Dalton
20182028.344.5 in Submission 20182028.344 by Ms Trish Keen

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Provides the following response for each submitter:

20182028.15 by Mr James Girvan: Agrees. The Revenue and Financing Policy sets out how the Council achieves the fairest funding mix for the community as a whole.

20182028.49 by Mr Miles Dalton: Acknowledges the submission point being made.

20182028.344 by Ms Trish Keen: Acknowledges the submission point and assures the Council has a number of processes in place to ensure that the most prudent use of ratepayers funds is being exercised.

CARRIED
Development Contributions
20182028.637.5 in Submission 20182028.637 by Mr Martin Pinkham

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Notes that a probity audit was conducted in 2016 with recommendations adopted into the Development Contribution schedules.
(c) Notes that a legal review of the Development Contributions Policy will be undertaken in 2018.
(d) Notes that Council will engage with landowners in the West Kaiapoi ODP area as the scope of drainage works are more clearly defined and design is progressed.
(e) Notes that development contributions are consulted on with developers annually through the Long Term Plan and Annual Plan processes and that specific issues relating to specific development areas are discussed with developers and landowners in the area.

CARRIED

South West Rangiora - West Belt Extension to Townsend Road
20182028.577.1 in Submission 20182028.577 by Mr Gavin Billington

J Palmer advised there would be a report to an upcoming Council meeting to sign-off adjustments, however staff were not expecting huge movements.

J Palmer advised that a meeting had been held between staff and the submitter.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Notes that a probity audit was conducted in 2016 with recommendations adopted into the Development Contribution schedules.
(c) Notes that a legal review of the Development Contributions Policy will be undertaken in 2018.
(d) Notes that development contributions are consulted on with developers annually through the Long Term Plan and Annual Plan processes and that specific issues relating to specific development areas are discussed with developers and landowners in the area.

CARRIED

Council Expenditure
20182028.357.8 in Submission 20182028.357 by Mr Ray Freitag

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Accepts the submission point being made and confirms money received from rates and charges are applied consistently and aligned to the Revenue and Financing Policy.

CARRIED

Council Expenditure
20182028.510.6 in Submission 20182028.510 by Mrs Rochelle & Joe Faimal
THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Notes that the Council receives an 85% discount off the normal advertising rate for advertising in the community noticeboard.

CARRIED

Rate Increases
20182028.667.9 in Submission 20182028.667 by Federated Farmers of New Zealand

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Acknowledges the submission point being raised.

(c) Notes that this Council already has a relatively high percentage of rates that are charged by way of a fixed charge and therefore the Council is not proposing to increase the UAGC in the 2017/18 financial year.

CARRIED

Property Rate Sample Areas
20182028.667.10 in Submission 20182028.667 by Federated Farmers of New Zealand

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Declines including more examples of rating movements within the formal document, given they are to represent averages.

(c) Notes that the Council developed a website tool that provides for any property within the district, rates for the first 5 years of the LTP. This rating tool is also interactive by allowing viewers to include or exclude rating proposals provided within the Long Term Plan and see what effects these options would have on their rates.

CARRIED

Targeted Rates
20182028.667.5 in Submission 20182028.667 by Federated Farmers of New Zealand

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Confirms that the Council is not proposing to change the basis for targeted rating for Roading.

CARRIED

Council and Runanga Co-Governance
20182028.839.8 in Submission 20182028.839 by Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga


THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Notes the Runanga's comments and discuss them with Ngai Tuahuriri through our collaborative forum to progress co-governance arrangements.

CARRIED
Genetic Engineering
20182028.6.3 in Submission 20182028.6 by Physicians and Scientists for Global Responsibility

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Notes the submitter’s comments but advises this is a matter the Council considers to be of national policy.

CARRIED

Climate Change
20182028.211.6 in Submission 20182028.211 by Mrs Sonny Whitelaw
20182028.640.4 in Submission 20182028.640 by Edge Landscapes

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Notes the submitter’s comments and refer them to the District Plan and Regulation Committee for consideration in the course of the District Plan Review.
(c) Advise the submitter accordingly and ask them to note the commitment through the Infrastructure Strategy 2018-48 to progress sustainability policy for the Council.

CARRIED

Sea Level and Groundwater Rise
20182028.211.5 in Submission 20182028.211 by Mrs Sonny Whitelaw

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Notes the submitter’s comments for consideration in the course of responding to the technical reports currently under preparation.

CARRIED

ATM Machines
20182028.215.8 in Submission 20182028.215 by Miss Mel Stevens

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Recommends Council staff can make Enterprise North Canterbury (ENC) aware of this request, and ask them to make the appropriate enquiries in due course.

CARRIED

Mad Butcher Shop
20182028.215.9 in Submission 20182028.215 by Miss Mel Stevens

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Recommends Council staff can make Enterprise North Canterbury (ENC) aware of this request, and ask them to make the appropriate enquiries in due course.

CARRIED
Taxi Services
20182028.292.5 in Submission 20182028.292 by Mr Howard and Lynette and Mrs Fowler

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Notes that Council staff will communicate and display available information on current district transport services as appropriate.

(c) Notes organisations such as Driving Miss Daisy and the Mini Bus Trust operate within the District.

CARRIED

Rangiora Town Centre
20182028.54.7 in Submission 20182028.54 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous
20182028.683.10 in Submission 20182028.683 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous
20182028.419.7 in Submission 20182028.419 by Mrs Drucilla Kingi Patterson

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Notes that the current provisions made within the Draft Long Term Plan for events and district promotion are supported.

CARRIED

Non-Notified Consent - Woodend
20182028.345.10 in Submission 20182028.345 by Mr Kelvin Ashby

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Acknowledges the submission, explanation provided from Resource Consent officers report.

(c) Notes that the stormwater ponds have been designed to treat and limit discharges to McIntosh’s Drain to pre development levels. The top part of McIntosh’s Drain is shown on the Outline Development Plan as having a 10 metre wide access/cycle lane reserve. The Council’s Greenspace team expressed concern as to how this space would function and subsequently the 3Waters team considered the reserve area was not required for stormwater Management purposes provided a five metre wide access was available for maintenance of the underground pipe, as there was an existing one metre wide access there, a four metre access easement was proposed.

CARRIED

Roadside Trees in Pegasus
20182028.389.6 in Submission 20182028.389 by Ms Amy Johnston

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Notes that staff will be replanting all dead juvenile trees in Pegasus that have died and will be changing species where appropriate to increase ongoing survival rates.

CARRIED

Accessibility
20182028.521.5 in Submission 20182028.521 by Ms Greer Smith
THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Acknowledges the importance of implementing the Accessibility Strategy to ensure Council actively contributes towards an inclusive environment.

CARRIED

Population Growth
20182028.625.1 in Submission 20182028.625 by Mr Malc Dartnall
20182028.635.1 in Submission 20182028.635 by Mr Allen Cookson

Mayor Ayers commented about Waimakariri being a great place to live, and aware the District will grow, but the Council does not promote the district; other agencies such as ENC.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Provides the following response for each submitter:

20182028.625.1 by Mr Malc Dartnall: Notes, on points 1 and 2, the substantial budget and implementation provided for in relation to flood response and district roading and refers the submitter to relevant reports and asset management plans. Notes, in relation to item 3 advises the submitter of the business attraction programme under Enterprise North Canterbury and provides them with a copy of the relevant plan for the 2018/19 year.

20182028.635.1 by Mr Allen Cookson: Notes that substantial provision in the LTP is both for meeting the needs of growth as well as maintaining services to the existing population. It is true that growth does bring cost pressures but it also brings more ratepayers. The Council seeks to apportion costs equitably. The District remains an attractive prospect and it is impractical to entirely halt growth.

CARRIED

Kaiapoi Town Centre (KTC) Review
20182028.637.6 in Submission 20182028.637 by Mr Martin Pinkham
20182028.419.7 in Submission 20182028.419 by Mrs Drucilla Kingi Patterson

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Recommend that the Draft Kaiapoi Town Centre plan is first completed in draft form and then undergoes the appropriate public consultation.

(c) Notes that this will allow for the associated financial implications of the finalised Plan to be determined and then considered by Council during the Annual Plan Budget process that begins in November 2018.

CARRIED

District Development Strategy
20182028.40.5 in Submission 20182028.40 by Mr Rhys and Ms Alice
20182028.40.6 in Submission 20182028.40 by Mr Rhys and Ms Alice
20182028.637.8 in Submission 20182028.637 by Mr Martin Pinkham

Councillor Stewart commented on the environmental issues raised by submitter 40, referring to the previous weeks briefing, biodiversity agreements and not having a strategy for advancing a biodiversity strategy, and queried what forum is best to discuss the topic. J Palmer responded that
the Council and staff would be interested in any Water Zone recommendations related to biodiversity. Staff also spoke of the District Plan Review and implementation methods with biodiversity aspects. It was noted that Ecan had biodiversity as their second most important focus. This Council currently did not have any active specific piece of work other than Regeneration and Mahinga Kai areas. Mayor Ayers commented about drawing the strands together and the government putting a high priority on biodiversity with a likelihood of a GPS on biodiversity in the near future.

J Palmer recommended Councillor Stewart has a conversation with the policy managers.

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Provides the following response for each submitter:

20182028.40 by Mr Rhys and Ms Alice: Note and thank the submitter for their comments and advise very substantial work is underway in relation to the District Plan Review that addresses the topics of concern, especially the environmental impacts of activities in the rural zone. It remains important to note however that farming is a permitted activity.

20182028.40 by Mr Rhys and Ms Alice: Note and thank the submitter for their comments and advise very substantial work is underway in relation to the District Plan Review and review of Kaiapoi and Rangiora Town Centre Plans that address these topics of concern. Also to advise the submitter that the Council can influence the location of various store types, especially larger format stores, but cannot regulate the presence or not of particular types of outlets.

20182028.637 by Mr Martin Pinkham: Agree with the importance of transport as an element of district development and note that very substantial attention to this issue is occurring through the District Plan Review and the Council's involvement in the Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Review. The upcoming Government Policy Statement on Transport heralds a significantly different set of government priorities for investment and includes for the first time, rapid transit.

CARRIED

Heritage Incentives

20182028.642.1 in Submission 20182028.642 by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Continues the current funding through the contestable fund.

CARRIED

Biodiversity

20182028.662.8 in Submission 20182028.662 by Environment Canterbury

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Continues to work with Environment Canterbury regarding the protection of biodiversity in our District.

CARRIED

District Planning

20182028.662.9 in Submission 20182028.662 by Environment Canterbury
THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Thanks Environment Canterbury for its support of the District Plan review.

CARRIED

Resource Management Application Fees and Charges
20182028.667.7 in Submission 20182028.667 by Federated Farmers of New Zealand

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Provides an explanation: The rationale behind the increase in fees and charges for resource management applications are found in the draft Long Term Plan, Plan Implementation Unit, Service Plan and Budget. The main increase in land use consent application fees relates to the addition of an up-front consent monitoring fee of $200, which is currently invoiced as a separate charge as consent monitoring occurs. The reason for this charge is to provide certainty to applicants in the total cost of an application, and to reduce the administration required to prepare and process additional invoices. The $200 fee is proposed to be charged as a fixed rate for all applications, and is based on one hour of reporting officer time, vehicle use and administration cost.

CARRIED

Empty Sections in Pegasus
20182028.730.10 in Submission 20182028.730 by Mrs Jennie Marsh

Councillor Gordon mentioned the increasing issue that has been discussed with staff and would appreciate a discussion at a District Planning and Regulation Committee. Mayor Ayers offered a suggestion of sending the full cost of mowing the section, including administration fees, which may assist property owners to focus on the matter. Mayor Ayers acknowledged the matters at Pegasus do arise and commented on matters transferred to Fire Emergency NZ (FENZ). The Council could potentially initiate a Bylaw relating to untidy sections. Mayor Ayers commented on discussions with a local real estate company regarding absentee owners, and management of those properties.

Councillor Barnett stated her desire for a discussion at the Committee to include swales and stormwater areas and the difficulties for some residents to mow the areas.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Notes that the Council will not proceed with charging rates for clearing untidy properties.

CARRIED

Oxford Christmas Decorations
20182028.499.6 in Submission 20182028.499 by Oxford-Ohoka Community Board
20182028.865.1 in Submission 20182028.865 by Oxford Promotions Action Committee

Councillor Gordon enquired if the Community Board could fund the project. Staff advised it could be funding from the Boards landscaping budget, however that is not designed for ongoing projects.

Councillor Gordon advised he had held a discussion with MainPower and advised that the cost of $2,000 is for the traffic management plan, and that MainPower undertake the physical erection of flags as a community gift. Councillor Gordon also believed that OPAC could fund the flags, which last for two seasons, therefore he proposed a one off Council grant of $2,000 for the erections of Christmas flags in Oxford.
Councillor Atkinson queried the Council committing another group (OPAC) towards contributing to the project. Councillor Gordon reiterated his understanding that the group could be willing to fund the project for a year.

Moved: Councillor Gordon  Seconded: Councillor Doody

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Approves $2,000 as a one off grant towards the cost of a traffic management plan, to enable flags to be erected by MainPower prior to Christmas 2018 in Oxford.

(c) Recommends that the Oxford Promotions Association consider funding the purchase and installation of the Christmas flags in Oxford.

(d) Notes that there is currently no town centre business rate on Oxford unlike in Kaiapoi and Rangiora which is where flags are currently funded from.

CARRIED

Councillor Doody commented on the expenses involved and that Oxford businesses do not contribute towards OPAC promotions, and therefore this gesture would help towards the Christmas spirit.

Councillor Barnett stated she could not support the proposal, based on her personal dealings with OPAC, as she did not believe they were inclusive of the community and the discussion had not been held with the Oxford community. Councillor Barnett commented that Woodend and Pegasus do not have flags, and growth areas of Mandeville and Ohoka also do not have decorative flags in their settlements. Councillor Barnett commented that Oxford need assistance but did not believe this was the answer.

Councillor Felstead commented he had no issue with the OPAC group, and this this matter had arisen from discussions about Christmas lights. Decorative flags were seen as an alternative to assist with the Christmas spirit of the township. This is a suggested one-off grant and let us see what comes from it.

Councillor Atkinson stated he was not opposed to the idea, however he believed the issue was flags in general. Councillor Atkinson believed flags in main streets were old fashioned and a bad investment, but he expected further requests in future years.

Mayor Ayers believed flags were a better investment than lights, as they could be seen during the day, however he accepted the costs associated with changing/erection of the flags when the seasons change or they are damaged and dirty.

In his right of reply, Councillor Gordon commented about this being a specific request from OPAC, and that he had contacted the other promotional groups however they were not interested in the possibility.

Naming Subdivisions
20182028.496.6 in Submission 20182028.496 by the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board

Staff advised the matter was not LTP related and the Council could request a report to address the matter. Mayor Ayers suggested the topic could be discussed generally at a future All Boards Briefing.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) **Notes** this is not an LTP matter, and to consider the subject under the District Plan Review.

CARRIED

**Community Spatial Plan for cycleway and walkway networks**
20182028.496.11 in Submission 20182028.496 by the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board

**THAT** the Council:
(a) **Receives** the submission.

(b) **Advises** that the Walking and Cycling Strategy was reviewed in 2017 and included in the LTP is funding to implement the Strategy. This will provide the opportunity to consider what projects are worthwhile and the Community Boards and Council will be involved in that discussion and decision making.

(c) **Notes** mapping the cycleways/foot paths is a project within the Walking and Cycling Strategy action plan.

CARRIED

**Shuttle Bus Service**
20182028.496.12 in Submission 20182028.496 by the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board

Mayor Ayers noted it would be good to have a discussion on transport within the district.

Councillor Felstead commented about Ecans depleted finances for passenger transport, and the struggle to service Christchurch City.

Councillor Atkinson remarked on the community frustrations related to the changed Kaiapoi bus service.

**THAT** the Council:
(a) **Receives** the submission.

(b) **Thanks** the submitter for their submission.

(c) **Notes** that public transport (PT) in the Greater Christchurch area is managed by a Joint PT Committee and the Council is a member of that committee. So it is no longer Ecans sole responsibility to manage public transport in the Greater Christchurch area. The Waimakariri District Council is in the tent and is part of the decision making process.

(d) **Notes** that the Committee is currently reviewing the Public Transport Plan and this is a statutory document that must be reviewed every three years. The Committee is also working on a PT Futures Business Case. Both of these pieces of work will provide some direction on the future of PT in the Greater Christchurch area. It is also noted that the Government has announced increased funding for public transport so this might provide opportunities.

(e) **Notes** that once the Public Transport Plan is completed a review of services will get underway. That will be the time the Board can have some meaningful input. It is intended there will be more engagement with the Boards and community as part of this process and this will be managed by Council staff. In the past Ecans managed the reviews and they essentially put out a proposal for submissions. Early engagement will give the opportunity of input before a proposal is developed.

CARRIED

**Town Entrances**
20182028.496.14 in Submission 20182028.496 by the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board
20182028.498.8 in Submission 20182028.498 by Rangiora-Ashley Community Board
C Brown commented on town entrances, advising there is no LTP budget other than the Community Boards general landscaping budget.

Mayor Ayers queried a landscape tidy-up around the Pou at the entrance to Pegasus, which is on golf course land. Staff advised the matter is being addressed.

Councillor Gordon sought clarification that there was a town centres budget, but not a budget for town entrances. J Palmer spoke of the street lighting upgrade for Rangiora and the continuation of the Good Street upgrade which depletes the town centre budget. Kaiapoi Town Centre matters would be discussed at the upcoming Council meeting, particularly on a strategy that would be then reported back.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Notes The Draft Long Term Plan has an allocation of $50,000 towards the development of a Town Entrance Strategy. This strategy will be developed in consultation with the Boards and will determine the extent of town entrance development with regard to location and appropriate service level. Until the strategy has been completed it is difficult to determine the appropriate funding for any town entrance enhancement. Should the strategy identify funding is require, this will have to be discussed by Council as part of a future Annual or Long Term Plan process.

CARRIED

Christmas Festive Lights - Kaiapoi
20182028.496.19 in Submission 20182028.496 by the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Notes that Council is undertaking a peer review of feature lighting. Council will be studying the recommendations of the peer review before establishing a suitable strategy for potential Christmas decorations in the future.

CARRIED

Hazardous Substances and new Organisms Act 1996
20182028.864 by Environmental Protection Authority

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Notes as the District Plan review progresses the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 will be considered.

CARRIED

Electric Vehicle Charging Points
20182028.499.13 in Submission 20182028.499 by Oxford-Ohoka Community Board
20182028.617.5 in Submission 20182028.617 by Cust Community Network
20182028.863.6 in Submission 20182028.863 by Ms Shirley Cairns
20182028.865.2 in Submission 20182028.865 by Oxford Promotions Action Committee

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Recommends that Council staff gather more information on electric car charging stations, and investigate potential opportunities, partnerships and funding sources with a view to present the Council with a report on options for future Council involvement in this space.

CARRIED
Environmental Values
20182028.559.5 in Submission 20182028.559 by Ms Nancy Sutherland

THAT the Council:
   (a) Receives the submission.
   (b) Acknowledges Ms Sutherland’s support for Council’s contribution to community well-being.

CARRIED

Democratic Governance
20182028.177.4 in Submission 20182028.177 by Mr Greg Rzesniowieck

THAT the Council:
   (a) Receives the submission.
   (b) Recommends that the submitter’s comments are noted as important considerations in the Council exercising delegated powers by Parliament.

CARRIED

Trade and Investment Treaty Making
20182028.177.3 in Submission 20182028.177 by Mr Greg Rzesniowieck

THAT the Council:
   (a) Receives the submission.
   (b) Notes the comments made.

CARRIED

Constituency Well-Being
20182028.177.1 in Submission 20182028.177 by Mr Greg Rzesniowieck

THAT the Council:
   (a) Receives the submission.
   (b) Supports the submitter’s comments and reflect them in the Council’s submission on the Bill.

CARRIED

Sustainable Economics
20182028.177.2 in Submission 20182028.177 by Mr Greg Rzesniowieck

THAT the Council:
   (a) Receives the submission.
   (b) Notes that staff access and circulate the paper referred to.

CARRIED

Risk Management
20182028.283.12 in Submission 20182028.283 by Canterbury District Health Board

THAT the Council:
   (a) Receives the submission.
   (b) Agrees that a fire risk will be assessed and included into the risks section.

CARRIED
Consultant Reports
20182028.551.5 in Submission 20182028.551 by Mrs Norma McLaren

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Notes the council cannot hope to retain the breadth and depth of skills required to meet its responsibilities solely by staff on the payroll. It is cost effective to use consultants in certain circumstances. There is significant policy and process around contracting consultant assistance.

CARRIED

Mayoral Forum
20182028.662.6 in Submission 20182028.662 by Environment Canterbury

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Notes and thanks Environment Canterbury for its supportive comments and agree in relation to the Councils participation in regional affairs accordingly.

CARRIED

Mana Whenua Engagement
20182028.662.7 in Submission 20182028.662 by Environment Canterbury

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Notes and agrees with submitters comments.

CARRIED

Canterbury Water Management Strategy
20182028.662.10 in Submission 20182028.662 by Environment Canterbury

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Notes and agrees with Environment Canterbury's comments.

CARRIED

Draft Long Term Plan document
20182028.596.5 in Submission 20182028.596 by Mr Brent Cairns

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for bringing this to our attention.
(c) Notes that this will be addressed prior to the adoption and publication of the LTP 2018-2028 document.

CARRIED

Water Supply
20182028.616.6 in Submission 20182028.616 by Mr Christopher Storm
THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Acknowledge the submission.
(c) Notes that the Rangiora water is moderately soft and that reducing the hardness would make the water more corrosive.
(d) Notes that budget provisions exists to install both UV disinfection and chlorination depending on the Government's response to the Havelock North Inquiry.

CARRIED

We'd like to know if you think we're doing enough to manage Drinking Water quality
20182028.499.11 in Submission 20182028.499 by Oxford-Ohoka Community Board
20182028.497.7 in Submission 20182028.497 by the Woodend-Setton Community Board

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Acknowledges the support for the upgrades to meet the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand.
(c) Notes that it is proposed to develop a Water Supply Strategy that looks at the long term strategy for both public water supplies and also private individual supplies.

CARRIED

Garrymere Water Supply Scheme - Options
20182028.105.1 in Submission 20182028.105 by Mr Dickson Paterson
20182028.106.1 in Submission 20182028.106 by Mrs Beverly Paterson
20182028.107.1 in Submission 20182028.107 by Mr Errol & Rosemary and Mrs Hitt
20182028.108.1 in Submission 20182028.108 by Mr Matt Goddard and Ms Debbie Smith
20182028.109.1 in Submission 20182028.109 by Mr Brent & Desray and Mrs Lithgow
20182028.110.1 in Submission 20182028.110 by Mr Alastair & Carolyn and Mrs Ring
20182028.112.1 in Submission 20182028.112 by Ms Christine Levett
20182028.290.7 in Submission 20182028.290 by Mrs Desray Lithgow
20182028.869.2 in Submission 20182028.869 by Mr Steve & Janet and Mrs Gregory

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Notes that, of the options for upgrading the Garrymere water supply scheme to achieve compliance with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand, Option A (Treatment of the Existing Source) was supported by the majority of submitters who indicated a preference for an option.
(c) Notes that Council is bound by the Health Act to take all practicable steps to achieve compliance with the Drinking-water Standards, and therefore an upgrade to the scheme is essential.
(d) Notes that concerns have been raised that all options presented are not financially viable.
(e) Notes that the proposed mitigation to the concerns is that the project be deferred by up to 12 months, and that a Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group be formed to work through the issues with the community and that this will be brought to Council in a separate report.

CARRIED

Garrymere Water Supply Scheme - Consultation
20182028.112.2 in Submission 20182028.112 by Ms Christine Levett
THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Notes that there were some concerns from residents on the Garrymere water supply scheme that they did not get the opportunity for the desired level of input as part of the consultation process that was undertaken.

(c) Notes that the proposed mitigation to the concerns is that the project be deferred by up to 12 months, and that a Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group be formed to work through the issues with the community, and that this will be brought to Council in a separate report.

CARRIED

Garrymere Water Supply Scheme – Process
20182028.109.3 in Submission 20182028.109 by Mr Brent & Desray and Mrs Lithgow
20182028.112.3 in Submission 20182028.112 by Ms Christine Levett
20182028.246.1 in Submission 20182028.246 by Mr Ben Wijngaard
20182028.290.9 in Submission 20182028.290 by Mrs Desray Lithgow
20182028.518.7 in Submission 20182028.518 by Ms Amanda Black
20182028.868.1 in Submission 20182028.868 by Garrymere Landcare Group
20182028.869.1 in Submission 20182028.869 by Mr Steve & Janet and Mrs Gregory

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Acknowledges that there would be benefits to a more collaborative approach, and have taken a recommendation to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board to establish a Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group.

(c) Notes that the separate report on the Garrymere Water Supply Upgrade – Feedback from Community Consultation (TRIM 180504048871) approved the establishment of a Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group and the deferral of the project by an additional 12 months while the Advisory Group considers issues and options and reports back to Council.

CARRIED

Garrymere Water Supply Scheme - Rating and Costs
20182028.109.2 in Submission 20182028.109 by Mr Brent & Desray and Mrs Lithgow
20182028.110.2 in Submission 20182028.110 by Mr Alastair & Carolyn and Mrs Ring
20182028.112.4 in Submission 20182028.112 by Ms Christine Levett
20182028.290.10 in Submission 20182028.290 by Mrs Desray Lithgow
20182028.518.6 in Submission 20182028.518 by Ms Amanda Black
20182028.869.3 in Submission 20182028.869 by Mr Steve & Janet and Mrs Gregory

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Advises the submitters that the Council has capped the Garrymere water supply scheme increase for 2018/19 at 5%; and

(c) Notes that a Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group, that will include representatives from ratepayers on the scheme, is proposed to be established to explore options that will be reported back to Council.

CARRIED
Are we doing enough to: Manage Wastewater Over-flows

20182028.3.6 in Submission 20182028.3 by Mr Simon Green
20182028.14.7 in Submission 20182028.14 by Mrs Sarah Shore
20182028.17.6 in Submission 20182028.17 by Mr Daniel Thompson
20182028.24.6 in Submission 20182028.24 by Mrs Philippa Rickerby
20182028.29.6 in Submission 20182028.29 by Mr Michael Bate
20182028.31.6 in Submission 20182028.31 by Ms Karen Lees
20182028.36.6 in Submission 20182028.38 by Mr Quintin Jane
20182028.40.9 in Submission 20182028.40 by Mr Rhys and Ms Alice
20182028.41.6 in Submission 20182028.41 by Mr John Crawley
20182028.42.6 in Submission 20182028.42 by Mr Cathy and David and Mrs Price
20182028.46.6 in Submission 20182028.46 by Mr Neil Wilkinson
20182028.47.6 in Submission 20182028.47 by Mr Chris Bacon
20182028.49.7 in Submission 20182028.49 by Mr Miles Dalton
20182028.52.8 in Submission 20182028.52 by Mr Ian Sissons
20182028.53.6 in Submission 20182028.53 by Mrs Kelly Bint
20182028.62.6 in Submission 20182028.62 by Ms Andrea Clinick
20182028.64.6 in Submission 20182028.64 by Mr Luke Saunders
20182028.65.6 in Submission 20182028.65 by Mr Joshua Lees
20182028.66.6 in Submission 20182028.66 by Mr Caleb Oliver
20182028.69.7 in Submission 20182028.69 by Mr Pete Johnson
20182028.79.7 in Submission 20182028.79 by Ms Kiri Cave
20182028.81.6 in Submission 20182028.81 by Mr Liam O’Connell
20182028.88.6 in Submission 20182028.88 by Mr Ian MacDonald
20182028.94.6 in Submission 20182028.97 by Mr Alan & Joan and Mrs Orchard
20182028.95.6 in Submission 20182028.95 by Ms Emmy Saxton
20182028.96.6 in Submission 20182028.96 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous
20182028.97.6 in Submission 20182028.97 by Mr Brian Heron
20182028.98.6 in Submission 20182028.98 by Mr Paul Markholm
20182028.99.6 in Submission 20182028.99 by Mrs Karen Johnson
20182028.117.6 in Submission 20182028.117 by Mr Gerard Power and Ms Olive Ualesi
20182028.118.6 in Submission 20182028.118 by Mrs Colleen McDonald
20182028.120.6 in Submission 20182028.120 by Mrs Suzanne Thurlow
20182028.122.7 in Submission 20182028.122 by Mr Jeremy Richards
20182028.123.6 in Submission 20182028.123 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous
20182028.179.6 in Submission 20182028.179 by Mrs Anita Ward
20182028.207.6 in Submission 20182028.207 by Dr Rose Washbourne
20182028.209.6 in Submission 20182028.209 by Dr Clive Appleton
20182028.243.6 in Submission 20182028.243 by Mr John Watson
20182028.247.6 in Submission 20182028.247 by Mr Jeff Rogers
20182028.253.6 in Submission 20182028.253 by Mr Ross Ditmer
20182028.269.6 in Submission 20182028.269 by Mr Allen Kene
20182028.275.7 in Submission 20182028.275 by Mr Steve Chandler
20182028.283.8 in Submission 20182028.283 by Canterbury District Health Board
20182028.285.6 in Submission 20182028.285 by Mrs Tascha Lawry
20182028.291.6 in Submission 20182028.291 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous
20182028.292.7 in Submission 20182028.292 by Mr Howard and Lynette and Mrs Fowler
20182028.295.6 in Submission 20182028.295 by Ms Emmy Saxton
20182028.297.6 in Submission 20182028.297 by Mr John and Carole and Mrs Houghton
20182028.298.6 in Submission 20182028.298 by Mr Paul Markholm
20182028.343.6 in Submission 20182028.343 by Ms Debbie Booth
20182028.345.6 in Submission 20182028.345 by Mr Kelvin Ashby
20182028.346.6 in Submission 20182028.346 by Mr Thomas Bedford
20182028.352.6 in Submission 20182028.352 by Mr Brian Heron
20182028.358.6 in Submission 20182028.358 by Mr James A Ryan
20182028.359.5 in Submission 20182028.359 by Mr Chris Lawry
20182028.381.6 in Submission 20182028.381 by Mr Bill Byers
20182028.383.6 in Submission 20182028.383 by Mr Lawrence Roberts
20182028.401.6 in Submission 20182028.401 by Mrs Julie McCartney
20182028.410.6 in Submission 20182028.410 by Ms Linda Pocock
20182028.411.6 in Submission 20182028.411 by Ms Jos Baker
20182028.416.6 in Submission 20182028.416 by Ms Prue Baines
20182028.417.6 in Submission 20182028.417 by Mr J & P and Mrs Hardy
20182028.461.6 in Submission 20182028.461 by Mr Beccy & Joe and Mrs Creswick
Councillor Atkinson commented on an educational perspective.

Councillor Stewart commented wet weather/emergencies events.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Agrees that the management of wastewater overflows is of the highest importance to ensure that waterways are kept free of raw sewage to the greatest extent possible. Council is in year 3 of a 10-year program in Rangiora to upgrade wastewater service for the community and reduce overflows from the wastewater reticulation system.
(d) Advises that Council staff are also updating the hydraulic model for the Kaiapoi reticulation system to then develop a program for upgrading wastewater service and reducing overflows there.
(e) Notes that Council staff employees a number of measures during wet weather events to minimize overflows, including the use of sucker trucks at key locations throughout the reticulation systems and the placement of generators at pump stations and treatment plants to continue service in the event of a power cut.
(f) Notes that wastewater overflows generally occur only during extended wet weather periods or natural disasters.
(g) Advises that the Council owns and operate a number of wastewater reticulation systems and treatment plants throughout the District to collect wastewater and convey it to a treatment plant where it can be treated to the required extent before it is returned to the natural environment.

CARRIED

Are we doing enough to: Manage Flooding

Councillor Blackie referred to submitter 638 and enquired if Lidar had been undertaken since 2004. Staff advised some information had been gathered post 2014.

Councillor Doody stated that some residents believe the ground situation has changed since 2016. G Cleary responded that staff could arrange a drone flyover of the general area and compare information against the Lidar information.
Councillor Gordon referred to submitter 643 and suggested staff hold a meeting with the whole group, to understand the issues and for the group to broadly understand the Council information. Staff advised they would be happy to update the group on flooding matters.

20182028.3.7 in Submission 20182028.3 by Mr Simon Green
20182028.14.9 in Submission 20182028.14 by Mrs Sarah Shore
20182028.17.8 in Submission 20182028.17 by Mr Daniel Thompson
20182028.24.8 in Submission 20182028.24 by Mrs Phillipa Rickerby
20182028.29.8 in Submission 20182028.29 by Mr Michael Bate
20182028.31.8 in Submission 20182028.31 by Ms Karen Lees
20182028.40.11 in Submission 20182028.40 by Mr Rhys and Ms Alice
20182028.41.8 in Submission 20182028.41 by Mr John Crawley
20182028.42.7 in Submission 20182028.42 by Mr Cathy and David and Mrs Price
20182028.46.8 in Submission 20182028.46 by Mr Neil Wilkinson
20182028.47.8 in Submission 20182028.47 by Mr Chris Bacon
20182028.49.9 in Submission 20182028.49 by Mr Miles Dalton
20182028.52.10 in Submission 20182028.52 by Mr Ian Sissons
20182028.53.8 in Submission 20182028.53 by Mrs Kelly Bint
20182028.54.6 in Submission 20182028.54 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous
20182028.56.6 in Submission 20182028.56 by Mr Alex Vermuelen
20182028.57.5 in Submission 20182028.57 by Mrs Samantha Plows
20182028.58.5 in Submission 20182028.58 by Mrs Ella Gorton
20182028.61.5 in Submission 20182028.61 by Mr F B Walkyier
20182028.62.8 in Submission 20182028.62 by Ms Andrea Clinick
20182028.64.8 in Submission 20182028.64 by Mr Luke Saunders
20182028.65.8 in Submission 20182028.65 by Mr Joshua Lees
20182028.66.8 in Submission 20182028.66 by Mr Caleb Oliver
20182028.67.5 in Submission 20182028.67 by Ms Holly Maxwell
20182028.69.3 in Submission 20182028.69 by Mr Pete Johnson
20182028.71.9 in Submission 20182028.71 by Mrs Kiri Cave
20182028.81.8 in Submission 20182028.81 by Mr Liam O’Connell
20182028.87.7 in Submission 20182028.87 by Mr Ian MacDonald
20182028.94.7 in Submission 20182028.94 by Miss Tanya Whiteford
20182028.96.8 in Submission 20182028.96 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous
20182028.97.7 in Submission 20182028.97 by Mr Alan & Joan and Mrs Orchard
20182028.99.8 in Submission 20182028.99 by Mrs Karen Johnson
20182028.117.8 in Submission 20182028.117 by Mr Gerard Power and Ms Olive Ualesi
20182028.118.8 in Submission 20182028.118 by Mrs Colleen McDonald
20182028.122.9 in Submission 20182028.122 by Mr Jeremy Richards
20182028.123.8 in Submission 20182028.123 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous
20182028.179.8 in Submission 20182028.179 by Mrs Anita Ward
20182028.207.8 in Submission 20182028.207 by Dr Rose Washbourne
20182028.213.7 in Submission 20182028.213 by Ms Cheryl York
20182028.243.8 in Submission 20182028.243 by Mr John Watson
20182028.247.8 in Submission 20182028.247 by Mr Jeff Rogers
20182028.253.7 in Submission 20182028.253 by Mr Ross Ditmer
20182028.267.7 in Submission 20182028.267 by Mr John Richardson
20182028.268.6 in Submission 20182028.268 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous
20182028.269.8 in Submission 20182028.269 by Mr Allen Kene
20182028.275.9 in Submission 20182028.275 by Mr Steve Chandler
20182028.285.8 in Submission 20182028.285 by Mrs Tascha Lawry
20182028.291.8 in Submission 20182028.291 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous
20182028.295.8 in Submission 20182028.295 by Ms Emmy Saxton
20182028.297.8 in Submission 20182028.297 by Mr John and Carole and Mrs Houghton
20182028.298.8 in Submission 20182028.298 by Mr Paul Markholm
20182028.343.8 in Submission 20182028.343 by Ms Debbie Booth
20182028.345.8 in Submission 20182028.345 by Mr Kelvin Ashby
20182028.346.8 in Submission 20182028.346 by Mr Thomas Bedford
20182028.352.8 in Submission 20182028.352 by Mr Brian Heron
20182028.357.6 in Submission 20182028.357 by Mr Ray Freitag
20182028.358.7 in Submission 20182028.358 by Mr James A Ryan
20182028.359.7 in Submission 20182028.359 by Mr Chris Lawry
20182028.381.8 in Submission 20182028.381 by Mr Bill Byers
THAT the Council:

(a) Receives the submission.

(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.

(c) Advises that Council is aware of the predicted effect of climate change and staff have allowed for this in its flood prediction models. New rural drainage infrastructure is required to meet a 5 year level of service however new house floor levels are required to be set at 300mm above the predicted 1 in 200 year flood event. Properties in the rural areas, may experience flooding at times when a storm event exceeds Councils stated level of service. Council staff will continue to identify and upgrade drainage infrastructure that does not meet this level of service.

(d) Agrees with the need to check and clear drainage infrastructure prior to a predicted storm event.

(e) Recognises public education as key to getting public support in effectively managing the public and private drainage systems. Staff will undertake a series of initiatives aimed at public education, in 2018.

(f) Advises that new housing developments are required to manage stormwater such that the post development level of runoff is no greater than the pre-developed state. This is usually achieved through the use of Stormwater Management Areas (ponds) or stormwater holding tanks.

(g) Supports clearing of excessive exotic vegetation from braided rivers. It is noted that the management of the main rivers within the district is an Ecan function.
(h) Advises that drainage issues at Waikuku Beach are being investigated by staff and will be reported back to the Council’s Utilities and Roading Committee.

(i) Advises that staff have requested flood works budgets at Mandeville be bought forward, at the request of the Mandeville Residents Association.

(j) Advises that river bank protection works in Ashley River are the responsibility of Ecan.

CARRIED

McIntoshes Drain
20182028.857.5 in Submission 20182028.857; John, Michael, Ryan and Mary Anne Brown

Councillor Blackie commented that the submitter’s points one and two had already been addressed, although there may be some confusion relating to points three and four. He commented on historically high water levels on a low lying farm. The submitter’s point five raises a number of issues that are being worked through with Ecan. This is a continuous working matter with the property owner, acknowledging that the Council are unable to address the flooding issues.

Councillor Atkinson requested a workshop at the Utilities and Roading Committee, or the Community Board on the matters raised, and acknowledged more work is required to make any progress. K Simpson advised a consultant is preparing a scope report for consideration at the Utilities and Roading Committee August meeting.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.

CARRIED

Stockwater Races – Colliers Creek
20182028.876.1 in Submission 20182028.876 by Mr D J Marshal

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Advises Colliers Creek and is not part of the WDC stockwater system. Colliers Creek was upgraded following the flood event of June 2014 to provide increased flood capacity. Race R3M1 terminates where it meets Colliers Creek at a point approximately 240m upstream from Mr Marshall’s western property boundary. The property at 24 Cameo Drive is not charged a stockwater rate.
(d) Advises that there are no plans at present to extend race R3M1 to 24 Cameo Drive.

CARRIED

Are we doing enough to: Improve Urban Stormwater Discharges
20182028.14.8 in Submission 20182028.14 by Mrs Sarah Shore
20182028.17.7 in Submission 20182028.17 by Mr Daniel Thompson
20182028.24.7 in Submission 20182028.24 by Mrs Phillipa Rickerby
20182028.29.7 in Submission 20182028.29 by Mr Michael Bate
20182028.31.7 in Submission 20182028.31 by Ms Karen Lees
20182028.36.5 in Submission 20182028.36 by Miss Jennifer Jones
20182028.40.10 in Submission 20182028.40 by Mr Rhys and Ms Alice
20182028.41.7 in Submission 20182028.41 by Mr John Crawley
20182028.46.7 in Submission 20182028.46 by Mr Neil Wilkinson
20182028.47.7 in Submission 20182028.47 by Mr Chris Bacon
20182028.49.8 in Submission 20182028.49 by Mr Miles Dalton
20182028.52.9 in Submission 20182028.52 by Mr Ian Sissons
20182028.53.7 in Submission 20182028.53 by Mrs Kelly Bint
20182028.60.6 in Submission 20182028.60 by Mr Ali Azil
20182028.62.7 in Submission 20182028.62 by Ms Andrea Clinick
20182028.64.7 in Submission 20182028.64 by Mr Luke Saunders
20182028.65.7 in Submission 20182028.65 by Mr Joshua Lees
20182028.66.7 in Submission 20182028.66 by Mr Caleb Oliver
20182028.69.8 in Submission 20182028.69 by Mr Pete Johnson
20182028.79.8 in Submission 20182028.79 by Ms Kiri Cave
20182028.81.7 in Submission 20182028.81 by Mr Antony Oosthuysen
20182028.96.7 in Submission 20182028.96 by Mr Anonymous
20182028.99.7 in Submission 20182028.99 by Mrs Karen Johnson
20182028.117.7 in Submission 20182028.117 by Mr Gerard Power and Ms Olive Ualesi
20182028.118.7 in Submission 20182028.118 by Mrs Colleen McDonald
20182028.121.5 in Submission 20182028.121 by Woodend Combined Friendship Club
20182028.122.8 in Submission 20182028.122 by Mr Jeremy Richards
20182028.123.7 in Submission 20182028.123 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous
20182028.179.7 in Submission 20182028.179 by Mrs Anita Ward
20182028.207.7 in Submission 20182028.207 by Dr Rose Washbourne
20182028.209.7 in Submission 20182028.209 by Dr Clive Appleton
20182028.243.7 in Submission 20182028.243 by Mr John Watson
20182028.247.7 in Submission 20182028.247 by Mr Jeff Rogers
20182028.267.6 in Submission 20182028.267 by Mr John Richardson
20182028.269.7 in Submission 20182028.269 by Mr Allen Kene
20182028.275.8 in Submission 20182028.275 by Mr Steve Chandler
20182028.283.7 in Submission 20182028.283 by Canterbury District Health Board
20182028.285.7 in Submission 20182028.285 by Mrs Tascha Lawry
20182028.289.5 in Submission 20182028.289 by Mrs Esther Small
20182028.290.5 in Submission 20182028.290 by Mrs Desray Lithgow
20182028.291.7 in Submission 20182028.291 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous
20182028.295.7 in Submission 20182028.295 by Ms Emmy Saxton
20182028.297.7 in Submission 20182028.297 by Mr John and Carole and Mrs Houghton
20182028.298.7 in Submission 20182028.298 by Mr Paul Markholm
20182028.343.7 in Submission 20182028.343 by Ms Debbie Booth
20182028.345.7 in Submission 20182028.345 by Mr Kelvin Ashby
20182028.346.7 in Submission 20182028.346 by Mr Thomas Bedford
20182028.352.7 in Submission 20182028.352 by Mr Brian Heron
20182028.359.6 in Submission 20182028.359 by Mr Chris Lawry
20182028.381.7 in Submission 20182028.381 by Mr Bill Byers
20182028.383.7 in Submission 20182028.383 by Mr Lawrence Roberts
20182028.401.7 in Submission 20182028.401 by Mrs Julie McCartney
20182028.410.7 in Submission 20182028.410 by Ms Linda Pocock
20182028.411.7 in Submission 20182028.411 by Ms Jos Baker
20182028.416.7 in Submission 20182028.416 by Ms Prue Baines
20182028.417.7 in Submission 20182028.417 by Mr J & P and Mrs Hardy
20182028.461.7 in Submission 20182028.461 by Mr Beccy & Joe and Mrs Creswick
20182028.494.8 in Submission 20182028.494 by Mrs Elaine H B Cole
20182028.503.7 in Submission 20182028.503 by Mr Duncan Lees
20182028.528.7 in Submission 20182028.528 by Mr Garry Leech
20182028.535.7 in Submission 20182028.535 by Mr Chris Garrick
20182028.544.5 in Submission 20182028.544 by Mrs Wendy Howe
20182028.560.6 in Submission 20182028.560 by Ms Linda Stewart
20182028.563.7 in Submission 20182028.563 by Mrs Lesley Ottey
20182028.586.6 in Submission 20182028.586 by Mrs Madeleine Burdon
20182028.603.7 in Submission 20182028.603 by Ms Jo Kane
20182028.638.5 in Submission 20182028.638 by Waikuku Water
20182028.640.2 in Submission 20182028.640 by Edge Landscapes
20182028.641.7 in Submission 20182028.641 by Grey Power North Canterbury Association (Inc.)
20182028.644.6 in Submission 20182028.644 by Mr C Pocock
20182028.616.7 in Submission 20182028.616 by Mr Christopher Storm
20182028.662.5 in Submission 20182028.662 by Environment Canterbury
20182028.683.8 in Submission 20182028.683 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous
20182028.700.1 in Submission 20182028.700 by Mr Robert and Emmie and Mrs Johnston
20182028.730.7 in Submission 20182028.730 by Mrs Jennie Marsh
20182028.751.6 in Submission 20182028.751 by Mr Gavin and Mrs Dorothy McRae
20182028.784.7 in Submission 20182028.784 by Penrith Trust
20182028.839.6 in Submission 20182028.839 by Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga
20182028.847.7 in Submission 20182028.847 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous
20182028.861.7 in Submission 20182028.861 by Mr David Blackwell
20182028.867.7 in Submission 20182028.867 by Ms Bev Schleagel

Following a comment from Councillor Atkinson, referencing submitters 586 and 603, there is work in a specific area to be investigated and reported back to the Council accordingly.

Mayor Ayers, referenced submitters 640 comments and believed examples tried in the past are not necessarily that popular now, reflecting on what Christchurch City are doing now as maintenance can be seen as an issue and queried how do you achieve a balance. K Simpson explained responsibilities of receiving and reticulation systems into the waterway. Staff try to naturalise waterways to improve ecology and treat stormwater before it enters the waterway. Staff commented on the investment proposed in future years. Mayor Ayers commented on the Dudley Stream.

Councillor Doody queried permeable seal mentioned by submitter 563. G Cleary responded that in principal the Council were supportive of the process, however permeable seal is not used on road passageways. Permeable seal has limited use, however staff try to utilise it where practical, such as soak holes.

Councillor Atkinson stated that in Williams Street, through the shopping area, all the street pavers are permeable and run downhill into a soaker area that waters the plants.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Acknowledges the support for the proposed works to improved stormwater discharges as part of the network discharge consenting.
(d) Notes that networks discharge consent applications will be submitted to Environment Canterbury in 2018 for Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, Pegasus and Oxford.
(e) Notes that Stormwater Management Plans are required as part of the network discharge consents that address the potential downstream impact from a stormwater quality and quantity perspective.
(f) Notes that $20 million is included in the LTP for upgrades to improve the water quality of urban stormwater discharges.

CARRIED

William Raven Quay
20182028.411.10 in Submission 20182028.411 by Ms Jos Baker

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Advises drainage staff will investigate the condition and operation of the stormwater pipe non return valves in the vicinity of Williams Street Bridge. Valves will be replaced if found to be in poor state of repair.

CARRIED
Waikuku Beach Drainage Rate
20182028.638.6 in Submission 20182028.638 by Waikuku Water

THAT the Council:
  (a) Receives the submission.
  (b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
  (c) Advises drainage staff have met with representatives and concerned members of the community to get a better understanding of the drainage issues.
  (d) Notes that staff have started investigations and will report back to Council with recommendations.
  (e) Advises that remedial works will be carried out using existing maintenance budgets however some drainage works may require staff to request additional budget to complete the physical works.

CARRIED

Targeted Drainage Rate
20182028.838.1 in Submission 20182028.838 by Mr Owen Davies

THAT the Council:
  (a) Receives the submission.
  (b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
  (c) Advises staff have requested the Council approves new budgets in the LTP, for Ohoka Rural, Central Rural, Clarkville and Coastal Rural to build up a Maintenance Works Reserve Fund, over 10 years.

CARRIED

Kerbside Collection Services – please select the option you prefer and tell us why.
Submitters referenced in document 180517054365

THAT the Council:
  (a) Receives the submission.
  (b) Thanks the submitters for their submissions.
  (c) Approves inclusion of the "your choice" kerbside collection service in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan
  (d) Notes that 284 (76.5%) of the 371 submissions received are in favour of the "your choice" kerbside collection service
  (e) Approves increasing the level of education and community engagement around waste minimisation
  (f) Endorses the provision of support to and promotion of local waste minimisation initiatives that are led by businesses and community groups
  (g) Notes that there is sufficient budget in the LTP to fund an increase in community engagement and provide support to and promotion of local waste minimisation initiatives that are led by businesses and community groups
  (h) Notes that the Solid Waste Activity Management Plan and the Waste Management & Minimisation Plan will be amended to include the "your choice" collection service
  (i) Notes that the final version of the Waste Management & Minimisation Plan will be presented to Council for adoption in July 2018
  (j) Notes that there is no clear support from rural residents regarding Council extending kerbside collection services into rural areas

CARRIED
(k) **Endorses** staff continuing to work with rural residents and communities on a case-by-case basis to determine if the Council could provide appropriate and cost effective recycling services closer to those communities.

(l) **Requests** staff to investigate requiring better waste and litter management by developers and building companies through consenting processes in order to reduce the impact of earthworks and windblown construction materials on the surrounding environment.

**CARRIED**

**Rubbish Collection Zone**
20182028.171.1 in Submission 20182028.171 by Mrs Lika Rump
20182028.245.6 in Submission 20182028.245 by Ms Jenner Litchtwark

**THAT** the Council:
(a) **Receives** the submission.
(b) **Thanks** the submitters for their submissions.
(c) **Endorses** the current approach of considering the risks and costs of providing a kerbside collection to rural properties between and beyond kerbside collection areas on a case-by-case basis.
(d) **Notes** that property owners will have to approve the Council providing and rating for a kerbside collection to their property should any request for service be made by renters.
(e) **Notes** that a request for service in Oxford Rd close to Cust has already been considered by staff and the collection contractor.

**CARRIED**

**Enviroschools Programme**
20182028.284.1 in Submission 20182028.284 by Toimata Foundation

**THAT** the Council:
(a) **Receives** the submission.
(b) **Thanks** the submitter for their submission.
(c) **Thanks** the submitter for their acknowledgement of the Council's ongoing support of Enviroschools in the Waimakariri District.
(d) **Notes** that the draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan includes an Action to continue funding for Enviroschools.
(e) **Notes** that the Solid Waste Budgets allow to continue the same level of funding for Enviroschools over the next ten years.
(f) **Notes** that any expansion of the Enviroschools Programme would require an increase in funding above current levels.

**CARRIED**

**Illegal Rubbish Dumping**
20182028.670.7 in Submission 20182028.670 by Ms Evelyn Zuberbuhler

**THAT** the Council:
(a) **Receives** the submission.
(b) **Thanks** the submitter for their submission.
(c) **Instructs** staff to develop a campaign around correct disposal of recyclable and reusable materials, and the responsible disposal of rubbish, that can be run in local and social media.

**CARRIED**
Recycling Centre Expansion
20182028.863.5 in Submission 20182028.863 by Ms Shirley Cairns

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Notes that the Southbrook resource recovery park is an unsuitable location for composting operations for a number of reasons, including:
   ∑ Proximity to several composting operations results in competition for the feedstock and end markets
   ∑ The limited space available for compost maturation
   ∑ The sensitivity of the receiving environment to leachate and odour in particular
   ∑ Proximity to businesses that sell compost both in bulk and in bags
(d) Notes that once the reuse and recycling areas have been expanded there may be an opportunity to sell compost produced from our residents green waste but that the implications of this with regard to Council competing with local businesses would first have to be considered by the Council.

Footpath – between Stephen and Church Streets
20182028.7.1 in Submission 20182028.7 by Mr Wallace Smith

Staff noted that to construct a footpath in Blackett Street between Stephens Street and Church Street the cost is approximately $55,000.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Notes that included in the LTP is $100,000 per year over the next five years for new footpaths in the major towns.
(d) Notes that a programme will be presented to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board and a report taken to the Council to approve the next three year programme and this programme will includes the Blackett Street footpath.

Coldstream Road Footpath
20182028.11.1 in Submission 20182028.11 by Mr Paul Gread

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Agrees that priority should be given to improving walking and cycling provision along Coldstream Road to the sports facilities.
(d) Notes that the Council has approved the building of the Multi-Use Sports Facility, to meet our growing community’s needs. As such the project to upgrade Coldstream Road including the provision of safe pedestrian facilities is identified as a priority and will be considered as part of a wider consultation process with the community regarding the Multi-Use Sports Facility.
Crusher Dust Path for Sovereign Palms
20182028.12.1 in Submission 20182028.12 by Mr Derick & Lynn and Mrs Walls

Staff advised that the Greenspace unit has a budget in the LTP for the rehabilitation of the area in year 2023/24. A concept plan would be developed in 2022 and submitted to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board for consideration and approval.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Notes that funding is included in the LTP in 2023/24 for the development of this area.
(d) Notes that a concept plan will be developed during 2022 and taken to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board for consideration and approval.

Traffic Flow and Congestion
20182028.39.5 in Submission 20182028.39 by Ms Barb Warren

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Agrees projects should be included in the LTP for improving traffic flow and congestion and notes that these projects are already included so no additional project are necessary.

Old Waimakariri River Bridge
20182028.39.6 in Submission 20182028.39 by Ms Barb Warren

Councillor Atkinson commented that the bridge condition looks disgusting and suggested a maintenance budget could be used for replacing boards on the bridge and expressed noting in the budget for 10 years to repair. Councilor Atkinson believed the maintenance budget was not enough over the next 10 years. V Warmaar advised within 10 years Christchurch City had allocated funding for maintenance, but staff were unsure of which year it would occur. A replacement bridge is scheduled for 2045 year.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Declines the request to improve the Old Waimakariri River Bridge and the Ashley River Bridge on SH1.
(d) Notes that the Ashley River Bridge is part of the state highway network and is not the responsibility of the Waimakariri District Council.
(e) Notes that the Old Waimakariri River Bridge is jointly owned by the Waimakariri District Council and the Christchurch City Council and no maintenance works, apart from reactive maintenance, have been identified as being required over the next three years. Any amenity or appearance improvements would be beyond the current three year funding cycle and will be agreed and programmed in conjunction with the Christchurch City Council.
Barkers Road
20182028.61.6 in Submission 20182028.61 by Mr F B Walkyier

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Declines the request to seal the remaining length of Barkers Road in Loburn as sealing does meet Council Policy.
(d) Notes that the road quality will be investigated and the maintenance programme adjusted if necessary.

CARRIED

Poyntz and No.10 Roads - All Weather Crossing
20182028.79.5 in Submission 20182028.79 by Ms Kiri Cave

Staff commented that for an additional all weather crossing of the Eyre River between Poyntz Road and No 10 Road on the basis it would need to be a bridge and the cost would not attract NZTA funding. It would be considered expensive and not justified based on traffic volume and other priorities the Council currently has.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Declines the request at this time and notes that alternative routes are available when the Ford is closed.
(d) Notes staff will continue to monitor travel around the area.

CARRIED

Red Lion Site
20182028.97.9 in Submission 20182028.97 by Mr Alan & Joan and Mrs Orchard

Staff advised that a resource consent had recently been granted for businesses at the Ivory Street/High Street intersection on the old Red Lion Hotel site. As part of the consent process traffic impact was assessed. It was found the traffic impact can be managed. Improvements to Ivory Street between the Countdown supermarket and Alfred Street are included in the LTP in 2019/20. That will include strengthening the road.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Notes that the site in question is zoned for business activity in the District Plan and complying retail use is a permitted activity.
(d) Notes that matters occurring in conjunction with Rangiora-Ashley Community Board and the Rangiora Town Centre development.

CARRIED

Durham Street Pedestrian Crossing
20182028.97.10 in Submission 20182028.97 by Mr Alan & Joan and Mrs Orchard

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Notes that staff will meet with the submitters to discuss the concerns which have been raised.

CARRIED

Mandeville Cycle Lane
20182028.115.1 in Submission 20182028.115 by Ms Sarah Robotham

Councillor Barnett asked if there was any information on No.10 and Tram Roads in relation to accidents. G. Cleary advised staff were assessing safety of Tram Road, but not currently No.10 Road. It was advised staff reassess intersections after any serious accidents. History has shown that driver behaviour is a known contributor to intersection accidents.

Mayor Ayers reflected generally on Tram Road safety. Staff advised that in conjunction with NZTA, they were currently looking at the Giles to Heywards Road area.

Councillor Gordon suggested the matter is considered by the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Supports a cycle path along Tram Road between No 10 Road and McHughs Road being included in the cycleway programme that will be presented to Council for approval later this year.
(d) Notes that the LTP includes $500,000 per year for new cycle facilities. Paths around or servicing schools is considered a priority.

CARRIED

Downs Road - One-Lane Bridge
20182028.245.5 in Submission 20182028.245 by Ms Jenner Litchtwark

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Declines the request at this time and notes that two alternative routes are available when the Ford is closed.
(d) Notes staff will continue to monitor travel around the area.

CARRIED

Park and Ride
20182028.283.10 in Submission 20182028.283 by Canterbury District Health Board

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission and for their support for park and ride infrastructure to support public transport usage.
(c) Notes that the Council is a member of the Greater Christchurch Joint PT Committee and it is involved in the decision making relating to improved public transport infrastructure.

CARRIED
Condition of Waimakariri District Council Roads
20182028.298.10 in Submission 20182028.298 by Mr Paul Markholm
20182028.656.5 in Submission 20182028.656 by Mr Ken Turpin

Councillor Felstead reflected on submitter 656 and seal backs in Harris, Depot and Parish Roads. Y Warnaar advised that the Council do not currently have a seal back programme. Staff were however reviewing individual areas where it was deemed a safety issue.

G Cleary commented on a review of the roading staff structure that may assist with matters raised.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receive the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Notes the submitter’s comments about the districts roads condition and levels of service.
(d) Notes Council staff are reviewing the structure of the Roading Team to better address the ongoing condition of our roads and maintenance requirements.
(e) Notes that seal backs are generally carried out in conjunction with reseals on adjacent roads.
(f) Notes that Depot Road, Markerikeri Road and Parish Road will be added to the Deficiency Database and added to the future works programme.

CARRIED

Bike Path - Fernside to Rangiora
20182028.504.5 in Submission 20182028.504 by Ms Michelle Conchie Osborne

THAT the Council:
(a) Receive the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Supports a cycleway between Fernside and Rangiora being considered for funding from the walking and cycling budget over the next few years.
(d) Notes that a report will be presented to Council later this year outlining possible walking and cycling projects and their relative priority for Council consideration and approval of a programme and this report will include a Fernside to Rangiora Cycleway.

CARRIED

Carleton Road Upgrade
20182028.564.5 in Submission 20182028.564 by Mr A N Hudson
20182028.677.5 in Submission 20182028.677 by Mr A K Judson

THAT the Council:
(a) Receive the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitters for their submissions.
(c) Notes that these roads will be inspected and the maintenance programme adjusted to ensure they meet the agreed levels of service.

CARRIED
Street Lighting for Cust Village
20182028.636.1 in Submission 20182028.636 by Ms Rhonda Faulks
20182028.766.1 in Submission 20182028.766 by Ms Kathryn Taylor
20182028.617.4 in Submission 20182028.617 by Cust Community Network

THAT the Council:
   (a) Receives the submission.
   (b) Thanks the submitters for their submissions.
   (c) Declines the request street lighting at both ends of Cust noting that this is a 80km/h area and so a rural road and the Councils current level of service is not to provide lighting on rural road, except at major intersections.
   (d) Notes that if more development occurs in Cust and the speed limit changes then street lighting could be considered at that stage.

CARRIED

Walking and Cycling Strategy
20182028.637.7 in Submission 20182028.637 by Mr Martin Pinkham

THAT the Council:
   (a) Receives the submission.
   (b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
   (c) Notes that the Walking and Cycling Strategy was reviewed in 2017 and funding is included in the LTP for implementing the strategy and that the opportunity will exist to have input into what projects are included in the programme.
   (d) Notes that the LTP includes funding for the Kaiapoi to Belfast cycleway and that staff are currently working with NZTA staff to coordinate the cycleway construction with the Northern Corridor project.

CARRIED

Flaxton Road Improvements
20182028.705.1 in Submission 20182028.705 by Keep New Zealand Beautiful
20182028.419.5 in Submission 20182028.419 by Mrs Drucilla Kingi Patterson

O Davies commented on discussions with the landowner of the area raised by the submitters, and the expense involved.

Councillor Stewart commented on a resident planting oak trees, and suggested staff discuss removal of the willow trees with the adjoining neighbours. It was also recommended that staff involve the Green Space staff in the project.

THAT the Council:
   (a) Receives the submission.
   (b) Thanks the submitters for their submissions.
   (c) Notes that over the next two years the LTP includes the upgrade of Flaxton Road (between Kingsford Smith Drive and Lineside Road) which will include footpaths, street lighting and amenity improvements.
   (d) Notes that Council staff will consult with Keep New Zealand Beautiful and take back their feedback to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board and Drainage Advisory Board.

CARRIED

Bradleys Road to Whites Road - Extension of footpath/cycleway
20182028.756.4 in Submission 20182028.756 by Ohoka Residents Association
20182028.499.21 in Submission 20182028.499 by Oxford-Ohoka Community Board

THAT the Council:
   (a) Receives the submission.
   (b) Thanks the submitters for their submissions.
   (c) Notes that over the next two years the LTP includes the upgrade of Flaxton Road (between Kingsford Smith Drive and Lineside Road) which will include footpaths, street lighting and amenity improvements.
   (d) Notes that Council staff will consult with Keep New Zealand Beautiful and take back their feedback to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board and Drainage Advisory Board.

CARRIED
THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitters for their submissions.
(c) Supports the inclusion of a walkway/cycleway alongside Mill Road between Whites Road and Bradleys Road in the proposed Walking and Cycling programme.

CARRIED

Skewbridge Upgrade
20182028.756.6 in Submission 20182028.756 by Ohoka Residents Association
20182028.871.13 in Submission 20182028.871 by Pegasus Residents Group

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitters for their submissions.
(c) Notes that consideration will be given to the addition of a pedestrian/cycleway lane on the upgraded Skewbridge Road Bridge when detailed planning and design gets underway.
(d) Notes reference to report Trim 180510051603 (to Council 29 May 2018, Roading Activity).

CARRIED

Mobile Speed Detectors
20182028.756.7 in Submission 20182028.756 by Ohoka Residents Association
20182028.499.9 in Submission 20182028.499 by Oxford-Ohoka Community Board

Staff confirmed the Council operated three sets of speed indicator devices across the district.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitters for their submissions.
(c) Requests staff bring a report to Council outlying the issue and options for the speed management devices and recommending a strategy for the use and purchase before it makes a decision to purchase any more devices.

CARRIED

Road Seal - Pearson Park
20182028.778.1 in Submission 20182028.778 by Pearson Park Advisory Group
20182028.865.3 in Submission 20182028.865 by Oxford Promotions Action Committee

Following a question from Councillor Felstead, staff acknowledged that sealing the area would provide better accessibility and may increase the aesthetics of the area, however it was estimated to cost a minimum of $60,000.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitters for their submissions.
(c) Supports staff carrying out work to determine the cost of sealing the car park adjacent to the large tree in Oxford and reporting back to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board for further consideration and possible inclusion in a future LTP.

CARRIED
Footpath - Annabels Educare Pre-School
20182028.798.1 in Submission 20182028.798 by Mr Michael Hugh Henry

Staff advised a footpath has only been constructed along one side of the road as this is a local road and therefore footpaths on both sides are not a requirement of the District Plan. The request for the new footpath will be referred to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board for consideration.

Councillor Atkinson enquired why the footpath was not undertaken by the developer. Mayor Ayers responded. J Palmer clarified that the response will be changed and the matter referred to the Rangiora-Ashely Community Board.

Councillor Gordon sought clarity that the $6,000 is in the budget. Staff advised it was not currently included.

**THAT** the Council:
- (a) **Receives** the submission.
- (b) **Thanks** the submitter for their submission.
- (c) **Supports** this request being referred to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board for consideration and to determine priority and inclusion in the New Footpath Programme.

**CARRIED**

Parking - Rangiora
20182028.822.6 in Submission 20182028.822 by Ms Valarie McClatchy
20182028.498.11 in Submission 20182028.498 by Rangiora-Ashley Community Board

**THAT** the Council:
- (a) **Receives** the submission.
- (b) **Thanks** the submitter for their submission.
- (c) **Notes** that the LTP includes provision for parking.

**CARRIED**

Tuahiw Roading and Footpaths
20182028.839.5 in Submission 20182028.839 by Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga

**THAT** the Council:
- (a) **Receives** the submission.
- (b) **Thanks** the submitter for their submission.
- (c) **Notes** that there is currently no proposal to extend the Rangiora Woodend Cycle Path through Tuahiwi.
- (d) **Notes** that the Council could consider extending the path to Tuahiwi when it considers the programme for walking and cycling projects using the LTP provision of $500,000 per year.

**CARRIED**

Ivory/High Street Intersection
20182028.847.9 in Submission 20182028.847 by Mr Anonymous

Staff advised that a resource consent had recently been granted for businesses at the Ivory Street/High Street intersection on the old Red Lion Hotel site. As part of the consent process traffic impact were assessed. It was found the traffic impact can be managed. Improvements to Ivory Street between the Countdown supermarket and Alfred Street are included in the LTP in 2019/20.
That will include strengthening the road. When West Belt is extended to Townsend Road it is unlikely trucks will divert from Ivory Street to West Belt because of the extra distance involved.

Mayor Ayers enquired when the last section of Ivory Street was to be upgraded. Staff believed it was in 2019/20, however the kerb and channel work would occur first.

Councillor Barnett commented on the many ‘near miss’ accidents outside KFC and the vegetable shop asking staff to assess the situation. Staff commented on associated safety assessments.

Mayor Ayers suggested consideration of an additional left turning lane from Queen Street into Ivory Street (heading north) be also considered during the assessments.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Notes that resource consent has been approved of new businesses on the corner of Ivory Street and High Street and traffic impact were considered as part of the consent process.
(d) Notes that improvements to Ivory Street between the Countdown supermarket and Alfred Street are included in the LTP for 2019/20 and that will include strengthening the road.
(e) Notes that the new road connection to extend West Belt to Townsend Road is unlikely to divert trucks from Ivory Street due to the extra distance involved.

CARRIED

Oxford Car Park
20182028.499.7 in Submission 20182028.499 by Oxford-Ohoka Community Board

Councillor Felstead asked for the project to be costed and the information to go back to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board for future discussion. Councillor Felstead commented on the access to the reserve and farmers market area.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Supports staff undertaking an assessment to determine costings to seal the carpark area and to report back to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board for further consideration and possible inclusion in a future LTP.

CARRIED

Tree Root Damage - German and Browns Rock Roads
20182028.499.14 in Submission 20182028.499 by Oxford-Ohoka Community Board

Staff advised there is a plan in place to deal with the tree roots in German Road and Browns Rock Road and the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board has been advised of this plan. Work has started on German Road and is proceeding in sections with tree roots being cut along the road. German Road and Browns Rock Road will be repaired over the next three years when they are due for resealing. Staff believe this is the most cost effective way of dealing with this problem.

Councillor Felstead asked for a realistic year to be included in the response.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) That there is a plan in place to address the tree roots in German Road and Browns Rock Road. The plan is to cut the roots and carry out the repairs in conjunction with the programmed resealing of the roads and this will occur over the three years. Work is being undertaken in sections.

CARRIED

Mounseys Road, View Hill - Road Realignment
20182028.499.15 in Submission 20182028.499 by Oxford-Ohoka Community Board

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Notes the Roading Team will carry out a safety assessment of Mounseys Road to ensure it complies with safety standards for this type of road and will carry out improvements as required.
(d) Notes that if improvements are required then they will be prioritised for inclusion in the minor improvements programme.

CARRIED

Road Seal - Ashworth's Road
20182028.499.16 in Submission 20182028.499 by Oxford-Ohoka Community Board

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Declines the request to seal Ashworths Road on the basis it does not meet the Council Policy for seal extensions.
(d) Notes that a report is being presented to the Council on the sealing of unsealed roads and this will give the opportunity to consider changes to the policy.

CARRIED

Footpath - Oxford Urban Areas
20182028.499.17 in Submission 20182028.499 by Oxford-Ohoka Community Board

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Notes that included in the LTP is $100,000 per year over the next five years for new footpaths in the major towns including Oxford.
(d) Notes that a programme will be presented to the Community Boards and a report taken to the Council to approve the next three year programme and this programme includes a number of footpaths in Oxford.

CARRIED

Oxford Area School Pedestrian Safety
20182028.499.18 in Submission 20182028.499 by Oxford-Ohoka Community Board

Staff advised they had been working with the school on road safety and parking and will be seeking approval from the Community Board for a drop off zone outside the school. Staff are not aware of the school requesting a footpath on the west side of Bay Road, however staff will continue working
with the school to improve road safety where ever required. Staff advised an additional pedestrian crossing would remove car parking from outside of the school.

THAT the Council:
   (a) Receives the submission.
   (b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
   (c) Declines the request for kerb and channel, a footpath and a pedestrian crossing on the west side of Bay Road at the Oxford Area School.
   (d) Notes that staff work with the school on road safety improvements and will continue to do so.

CARRIED

Bus Shelter - Cust Village
20182028.617.6 in Submission 20182028.617 by Cust Community Network

Councillor Gordon suggested the matter be raised with the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board.

THAT the Council:
   (a) Receives the submission.
   (b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
   (c) Supports this request being referred to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board for consideration and to determine priority and possible inclusion in a future works programme.
   (d) Notes that there is $500,000 per year in the LTP for walking and cycling projects.

CARRIED

Footpath - Earlys Road
20182028.617.8 in Submission 20182028.617 by Cust Community Network

Councillor Gordon suggested the matter be referred to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board and staff undertake education with the Cust School.

THAT the Council:
   (a) Receives the submission.
   (b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
   (c) Notes that the road maintenance issues will be investigated to ensure the road meets the Council’s agreed levels of service.
   (d) Supports this request being referred to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board for consideration and to determine priority and possible inclusion in a future works programme.

CARRIED

Cycleway/walkway - Northern Arterial
20182028.496.9 in Submission 20182028.496 by Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board

THAT the Council:
   (a) Receives the submission.
   (b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) **Assures** the Board that the Belfast to Kaiapoi cycleway is fully committed and funded with the section from Belfast to the north side of the Waimakariri River included in the NZTA Northern Corridor Project and the section from the north side of the over to Kaiapoi included in the Council's LTP.

(d) **Notes** that staff are currently working with NZTA staff to coordinate the projects.

**CARRIED**

**Cycleway/Walkway - Kaiapoi to Rangiora**

20182028.496.10 in Submission 20182028.496 by Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** the submission.

(b) **Thanks** the submitter for their submission.

(c) **Agrees** that improving cycle networks within the towns including Kaiapoi is a priority for the $500,000 per year of funding in the LTP.

(d) **Notes** that staff will be consulting with the Community Boards when developing the programme for the walking and cycling funding.

**CARRIED**

**Traffic Management Plan for Tuahiwi Village**

20182028.496.13 in Submission 20182028.496 by Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board

Staff commented that they were not aware of issues in Tuahiwi which would require the development of a specific management plan for the area. Staff have a large number of roading projects to implement and are fully committed on these projects therefore external resource and additional funding would be required to develop a Local Area Traffic Management Plan for Tuahiwi.

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** the submission.

(b) **Thanks** the submitter for their submission.

(c) **Declines** the request to develop a Local Area Traffic Management Plan for Tuahiwi village at this point in time on the basis there is no evidence of a pressing issue or problem to justify this work ahead of other projects in the LTP.

(d) **Supports** staff holding a workshop with the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board to clarify the issues and concerns raised in the submission.

(e) **Notes** that staff will be fully committed to implementing the projects that are already in the LTP and if the Council agrees to developing a Local Area Traffic Management Plan for Tuahiwi village it would need to provide sufficient funding to engage external consultants to carry out the work and this is not recommended.

**CARRIED**

**Traffic Management Plan for Ohoka Road and Williams Street**

20182028.496.16 in Submission 20182028.496 by Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** the submission.

(b) **Thanks** the submitter for their submission.

(c) **Agrees** that staff will investigate the feasibility and need for right turn bays at Robert Coup Road and at the entrance to the school and they will be installed if they can be justified.

(d) **Agrees** that the cycle lanes on Ohoka Road will be reinstated.
(e) **Notes** that variable speed signs and pedestrian crossing points are already in place on Ohoka Road outside of the school.

(f) **Agrees** that considering the above the development of a comprehensive traffic management plan for Ohoka Road is not necessary.

(g) **Notes** that staff will work with the submitter to address the issues raised as part of this submission.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Blackie disagreed with the need for right turning bays into Robert Coup Road.

**Road Seal and Maintenance - Kaiapoi**

20182028.496.21 in Submission 20182028.496 by Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board

Councillor Atkinson spoke of school access and safety benefits to all, and would welcome further discussion, therefore he formally asked for an investigation into the matters raised and a report back to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board.

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** the submission.

(b) **Thanks** the submitter for their submission.

(c) **Notes** that maintenance work and capital roading work is already communicated to the Boards through a variety of means including 'start work' notices, the weekly Utilities & Roading update and targeted and specific updates on projects.

(d) **Invites** the Board to suggest how this could be improved and what type of additional information they require.

(e) **Notes** that Stirling Crescent, Jordan Street and Bayliss Drive will be inspected and assessed for inclusion in the footpath resurfacing programme.

(f) **Notes** that feedback at any time is welcomed through the service request system on footpath condition.

**CARRIED**

**Kerb and Channel - Kaiapoi**

20182028.496.22 in Submission 20182028.496 by Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board

Staff advised that this matter is being progressed in the work programme.

Councillor Atkinson asked for clarification of the year. Staff advised they were in the process of formulating the works programme.

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** the submission.

(b) **Thanks** the submitter for their submission.

(c) **Notes** that the kerb and channel programme is being developed at the present time and it is based on the comprehensive condition rating that was carried out last year and this programme will be presented to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board shortly.

(d) **Notes** that a section of kerb and channel renewal is proposed on Williams Street, south of Ohoka Road in 2018/19, subject to approval processes.

**CARRIED**
Paper Road Ponds
20182028.496.23 in Submission 20182028.496 by the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Notes that there is a proposal for and funding available for a walkway/cycleway along the unformed road reserve between Beach road and the Kaiapoi North School.
(d) Notes that the timing of the construction is dependent on the developer of the Beach grove development.

CARRIED

Roading - Rangiora
20182028.498.11 in Submission 20182028.498 by Rangiora-Ashley Community Board

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Notes that the LTP includes projects to improve Rangiora Woodend Road and to improve the roading connections to the state highway in conjunction with NZTA. NZTA also have funding to improve the highway through Woodend and staff are currently working with NZTA to develop a Detailed Business Case for the work.
(d) Notes that these projects will consider walking, cycling and public transport as is required by the Governments multi modal approach.
(e) Notes that the proposed new road to connect Lehmans Road to River Road is included in the LTP.
(f) Notes that the Council owns three sets of speed indicator devices and it is proposed to work with the Boards to develop a strategy of their use and that will include using them at entrances to towns.
(g) Notes that staff work with the trucking industry to manage engine braking and that the trucking industry does not support the use of engine braking in residential areas and that direct management of the issue by the industry is more effective than signage.
(h) Invites the Board to provide feedback to the Roading Team on where engine braking is a problem so this can be followed up with the trucking industry.
(i) Notes that consideration is being given to how the road surface in West Belt could be cost effectively improved. The rough condition has been caused by a number of water main and sewer main trenches.

CARRIED

Footpaths - Rangiora
20182028.498.12 in Submission 20182028.498 by Rangiora-Ashley Community Board

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Notes that included in the LTP is a project to improve Coldstream Road and in particular the provision of walking and cycling paths. This work will include working with the School to identify their needs and options to connect the school to Coldstream road.
(d) **Notes** that included in the LTP is funding for a footpath along Oxford Road on the north side to provide a continuous path to Lehmans Road. This work will include new kerb and channel and design work is currently underway.

**CARRIED**

**Rangiora Car Park Building**
20182028.498.13 in Submission 20182028.498 by Rangiora-Ashley Community Board

Councillor Gordon requested a briefing on the car park building proposal. J Palmer advised that the last of the property title adjustments and further costings were required first, and then staff would bring a report before the Council for consideration.

**THAT** the Council:
(a) **Receives** the submission.
(b) **Thanks** the submitter for their submission.
(c) **Advises** that Council staff will:
   ∑ Continue to monitor car park utilisation to determine emerging capacity constraints while the carpark building proposal is progressed.
   ∑ Advises that the 2010 Rangiora Town Centre is programmed to be reviewed.
   ∑ Advises that the existing LT provisions for Rangiora town centre parking will be considered in light of the progress that the joint venture partners make on the ‘North of High’ commercial development.

**CARRIED**

**Roading and Footpaths – Woodend / Sefton**
20182028.497.14 in Submission 20182028.497 by Woodend-Sefton Community Board

**THAT** the Council:
(a) **Receives** the submission.
(b) **Thanks** the submitter for their submission.
(c) **Notes** that the removal of the rumble strips in Pegasus is currently being managed within existing budgets and it is prioritised against other road maintenance work. Communication is ongoing with the Pegasus Residents Group on this programme. This approach is considered the most cost effective way of managing this issue as it is managed within the NZTA subsidised programme.
(d) **Notes** that if the Council wants to speed up the programme then additional funding would be required and this would not receive NZTA funding as the NZTA programme for the next three years has already been submitted and cannot be changed. Speeding up the programme is not recommended.
(e) **Notes** that included in the LTP is $100,000 per year over the next five years for new footpaths in the main towns including Woodend. The north end of Woodend now qualifies for this programme as NZTA recently shifted the 50km/h limit and hence the urban boundary further north. A report is being prepared to Council to approve the next three year programme for the new footpaths and Main North Road will be considered for that programme. Due to the high cost of a footpath on the west side due to the location of the drain it is unlikely this path will be in the next three years programme.
(f) **Notes** that Council staff will work with the developer to ensure the footpath connections between Woodend and Ravenswood are managed and coordinated in a timely way.

**CARRIED**
Public Transport
20182028.497.15 in Submission 20182028.497 by Woodend-Sefton Community Board
20182028.871.17 in Submission 20182028.871 by Pegasus Residents Group

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitters for their submissions.
(c) Notes that public transport (PT) in the Greater Christchurch area is managed by a Joint PT Committee and the Council is a member of that committee. So it is no longer Ecan's sole responsibility to manage public transport in the Greater Christchurch area. The Waimakariri District Council is 'in the tent' and is part of the decision making process.
(d) Notes that the Committee is currently reviewing the Public Transport Plan and this is a statutory document that must be reviewed every three years. The Committee is also working on a PT Futures Business Case. Both of these pieces of work will provide some direction on the future of PT in the Greater Christchurch area. It is also noted that the Government has announced increased funding for public transport so this might provide opportunities.
(e) Notes that once the Public Transport Plan is completed a review of services will get underway. That will be the time the Board can have some meaningful input. It is intended there will be more engagement with the Boards and community as part of this process and this will be managed by Council staff. In the past Ecan managed the reviews and they essentially put out a proposal for submissions. Early engagement will give the opportunity of input before a proposal is developed.

CARRIED

Bus Service in Kaiapoi
20182028.863.7 in Submission 20182028.863 by Ms Shirley Cairns

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Notes that the Council alone cannot change the bus routes in the district and so it cannot return the bus services in Kaiapoi to its original route.
(d) Notes that the next review of services in the district is likely to take place later this year or early next year and this will provide the opportunity for the community to have input into the services and routes in the district.

CARRIED

Proposed New Road for Kaiapoi
20182028.861.9 in Submission 20182028.861 by Mr David Blackwell

J Palmer provided an update on upcoming land proposals, particularly relating to West Kaiapoi and the Silverstream development area. Reports would be presented to the Council the following week.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Advises that there is already a proposal and funding in the LTP for a new road to connect Silverstream Boulevard to Adderley Terrace.

CARRIED
Infinity Drive
20182028.871.15 in Submission 20182028.871 by Pegasus Residents Group

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Notes that are no current plans to open Infinity Drive to through traffic to Gladstone Road.
(d) Notes that the Community Board and the Council have agreed to not form a permanent road connection from Pegasus to Gladstone Road until the Woodend bypass has been constructed and this is not expected to be within the next ten years.
(e) Notes that Infinity Drive remains an option for the permanent connection.

CARRIED

Butchers Road
20182028.353.5 in Submission 20182028.353 by Mrs Annette Williams
20182028.872.1 in Submission 20182028.872 by Mr G L McKenzie
20182028.873.1 in Submission 20182028.873 by Mrs Claire Spear
20182028.874.1 in Submission 20182028.874 by Mr A and Noni and Mrs Fuller

Staff advised the project control group for the project considered the appropriate surface for the New Arterial Road and concluded a two coat chip seal (grade 4/6), the same used in urban streets, was the most appropriate at this stage. Noise was considered and it was agreed this would be managed by using the small chipseal and a lower speed limit. It is also noted that the road was shown on the development plans and all property purchasers were made aware of the road. Cost was also a factor as the project budget did not allow for a quieter asphalt surface.

Staff acknowledged that as traffic volumes increase and in particular as more heavy vehicles use the route an asphalt surface will be required sometime in the future. NZTA have guidelines for assessing noise and when a low noise surfacing can be justified. Also, the Council policy is that all arterial and strategic urban roads in residential areas will be surfaced with an asphalt surface when they are next resurfaced. That means that when Butchers Road is due for a resurface it will be resurfaced with asphalt. Butchers Road adjacent to the houses is considered an urban road as the speed limit at 60km/h is less than the 70km/h required to define an urban road.

In the business as usual sense the trigger for resurfacing Butchers Road with an asphalt surface would be when it is next due for resurfacing. A two cost chip seal surface would be expected to last at least five years depending traffic volumes and heavy vehicle use. Meeting NZTA guidelines depends on traffic growth and it is estimated it would be at least three years before that would be met.

Staff also recommended that part of the budget which was previously allocated to the Waikuku to Pegasus Cycleway Upgrade be reallocated to this project so that surfacing of the northern section of Butchers Road can be carried out and that the southern portion of the road be programmed for three to five years and included in the next LTP and NZTA Funding Bid. The estimated cost of resurfacing Butchers Road adjacent to the existing houses is $250,000. The estimated cost of resurfacing the full length in the 60km/h area is $500,000.

It was noted that if only the Butchers Road section adjacent to the existing houses is resurfaced with asphalt the Council will come under pressure to resurface the remainder of the New Arterial Road adjacent to the new houses that will be built shortly.

Staff summarised the information advising the Butchers Road section of the New Arterial Road (from the 60/80 speed limit change to the Kaiapoi River Bridge) will be surfaced with asphalt in the next sealing season, and the southern section of the New Arterial Road (along the southern edge of the Silverstream Subdivision) will be resurfaced with asphalt in the next three to five years depending on traffic volumes and how the existing surfacing performs. It is noted that sealing of the northern portion along Butchers Road will unlikely qualify for NZTA funding.
THAT the Council:
   (a) **Receives** the submission.
   (b) **Thanks** the submitter for their submission.
   (c) **Approves** the resurfacing of the northern half of the New Arterial Road from the Kaiapoi River bridge north along Butchers Road to the 60/80km speed limit change at the northern end of the development with an asphalt surface at a cost for $250,000, and;
   (d) **Approves** the reallocation of $250,000 from the Waikuku to Pegasus Connection budget of $605,000 to allow for the funding of the asphalt surfacing.
   (e) **Approves** the resurfacing of the southern half of the New Arterial Road (from west of Island Rd to the Kaiapoi River bridge) with an asphalt surface in the next three to five years, with staff to submit a request for funding in the 2021-24 NZTA funding bid and 2021-31 LTP.
   (f) **Notes** that if Council does reallocating budget from the Waikuku to Pegasus Connection budget that it is not subsidised by NZTA.
   (g) **Notes** that this is unlikely to qualify for NZTA subsidy because it does not yet meet NZTA Guidelines or Council Policy requirements, and the final NZTA 'bid' for the 2018-21 period has already been submitted and assessed.
   (h) **Notes** that if Council decides to resurface Butchers Road adjacent the existing houses it will come under pressure to seal the remainder of the New Arterial Road in the 60km/h area when the new houses are built and occupied.

CARRIED

**Are we doing enough to: Manage Drinking Water Quality**
- 20182028.3.5 in Submission 20182028.3 by Mr Simon Green
- 20182028.6.1 in Submission 20182028.6 by Physicians and Scientists for Global Responsibility
- 20182028.14.6 in Submission 20182028.14 by Mrs Sarah Shore
- 20182028.15.6 in Submission 20182028.15 by Mr James Girvan
- 20182028.17.5 in Submission 20182028.17 by Mr Daniel Thompson
- 20182028.20.5 in Submission 20182028.20 by Mr Ross & Ellie and Mrs Williamson
- 20182028.21.5 in Submission 20182028.21 by Mr Dannie Mabey
- 20182028.24.5 in Submission 20182028.24 by Mrs Phillipa Rickerby
- 20182028.29.5 in Submission 20182028.29 by Mr Michael Bate
- 20182028.31.5 in Submission 20182028.31 by Ms Karen Lees
- 20182028.39.8 in Submission 20182028.39 by Ms Barb Warren
- 20182028.40.8 in Submission 20182028.40 by Mr Rhys and Ms Alice
- 20182028.41.5 in Submission 20182028.41 by Mr John Crawley
- 20182028.42.5 in Submission 20182028.42 by Mr Cathy and David and Mrs Price
- 20182028.46.5 in Submission 20182028.46 by Mr Neil Wilkinson
- 20182028.47.5 in Submission 20182028.47 by Mr Chris Bacon
- 20182028.49.6 in Submission 20182028.49 by Mr Miles Dalton
- 20182028.52.7 in Submission 20182028.52 by Mr Ian Sissons
- 20182028.53.5 in Submission 20182028.53 by Mrs Kelly Bint
- 20182028.54.5 in Submission 20182028.54 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous
- 20182028.56.5 in Submission 20182028.56 by Mr Alex Vermuelen
- 20182028.60.5 in Submission 20182028.60 by Mr Ali Azil
- 20182028.62.5 in Submission 20182028.62 by Ms Andrea Clinick
- 20182028.64.5 in Submission 20182028.64 by Mr Luke Saunders
- 20182028.65.5 in Submission 20182028.65 by Mr Joshua Lees
- 20182028.66.5 in Submission 20182028.66 by Mr Caleb Oliver
- 20182028.69.6 in Submission 20182028.69 by Mr Pete Johnson
- 20182028.78.5 in Submission 20182028.78 by Mrs Nicola Hunt
- 20182028.79.6 in Submission 20182028.79 by Ms Kiri Cave
- 20182028.81.5 in Submission 20182028.81 by Mr Liam O'Connell
- 20182028.86.5 in Submission 20182028.86 by Mr Antony Oosthuysen
- 20182028.88.5 in Submission 20182028.88 by Mr Ian MacDonald
- 20182028.94.5 in Submission 20182028.94 by Miss Tanya Whiteford
20182028.96.5 in Submission 20182028.96 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous
20182028.97.5 in Submission 20182028.97 by Mr Alan & Joan and Mrs Orchard
20182028.98.5 in Submission 20182028.98 by Mr A Warren
20182028.99.5 in Submission 20182028.99 by Mrs Karen Johnson
20182028.117.5 in Submission 20182028.117 by Mr Gerard Power and Ms Olive Ualesi
20182028.118.5 in Submission 20182028.118 by Mrs Colleen McDonald
20182028.120.5 in Submission 20182028.120 by Mrs Suzanne Thurlow
20182028.122.6 in Submission 20182028.122 by Mr Jeremy Richards
20182028.123.5 in Submission 20182028.123 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous
20182028.207.5 in Submission 20182028.207 by Dr Rose Washbourne
20182028.209.5 in Submission 20182028.209 by Dr Clive Appleton
20182028.213.6 in Submission 20182028.213 by Ms Cheryl York
20182028.243.5 in Submission 20182028.243 by Mr John Watson
20182028.247.5 in Submission 20182028.247 by Mr Alan & Joan and Mrs Orchard
20182028.253.5 in Submission 20182028.253 by Mr Ross Ditmer
20182028.267.5 in Submission 20182028.267 by Mr John Richardson
20182028.268.5 in Submission 20182028.268 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous
20182028.269.5 in Submission 20182028.269 by Mr Allen Kene
20182028.275.6 in Submission 20182028.275 by Mr Steve Chandler
20182028.283.6 in Submission 20182028.283 by Canterbury District Health Board
20182028.285.5 in Submission 20182028.285 by Mrs Tascha Lawry
20182028.290.6 in Submission 20182028.290 by Mrs Desray Lithgow
20182028.291.5 in Submission 20182028.291 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous
20182028.292.6 in Submission 20182028.292 by Mr Howard and Lynette and Mrs Fowler
20182028.295.5 in Submission 20182028.295 by Ms Emmy Saxon
20182028.297.5 in Submission 20182028.297 by Mr John and Carole and Mrs Houghton
20182028.298.5 in Submission 20182028.298 by Mr Paul Markholm
20182028.343.5 in Submission 20182028.343 by Ms Debbie Booth
20182028.345.5 in Submission 20182028.345 by Mr Kelvin Ashby
20182028.346.5 in Submission 20182028.346 by Mr Thomas Bedford
20182028.352.5 in Submission 20182028.352 by Mr Brian Heron
20182028.357.5 in Submission 20182028.357 by Mr Ray Freitag
20182028.358.5 in Submission 20182028.358 by Mr James A Ryan
20182028.381.5 in Submission 20182028.381 by Mr Bill Byers
20182028.383.5 in Submission 20182028.383 by Mr Lawrence Roberts
20182028.401.5 in Submission 20182028.401 by Mrs Julie McCartney
20182028.410.5 in Submission 20182028.410 by Ms Linda Pocock
20182028.411.5 in Submission 20182028.411 by Ms Jos Baker
20182028.416.5 in Submission 20182028.416 by Ms Prue Baines
20182028.417.5 in Submission 20182028.417 by Mr J & P and Mrs Hardy
20182028.461.5 in Submission 20182028.461 by Mr Beccy & Joe and Mrs Creswick
20182028.494.6 in Submission 20182028.494 by Mrs Elaine H B Cole
20182028.503.5 in Submission 20182028.503 by Mr Duncan Lees
20182028.510.7 in Submission 20182028.510 by Mrs Rochelle & Joe Faimalo
20182028.518.8 in Submission 20182028.518 by Ms Amanda Black
20182028.524.5 in Submission 20182028.524 by Mr Rodney Butt
20182028.528.5 in Submission 20182028.528 by Mr Garry Leech
20182028.535.5 in Submission 20182028.535 by Mr Chris Garrick
20182028.551.6 in Submission 20182028.551 by Mrs Norma McLaren
20182028.559.6 in Submission 20182028.559 by Ms Nancy Sutherland
20182028.560.5 in Submission 20182028.560 by Ms Linda Stewart
20182028.562.5 in Submission 20182028.562 by Miss Sherrianne Nation
20182028.563.5 in Submission 20182028.563 by Mrs Lesley Ottey
20182028.572.5 in Submission 20182028.572 by Mr Mike and Beng Choo and Mrs Battersby
20182028.586.5 in Submission 20182028.586 by Mrs Madeleine Burdon
20182028.602.5 in Submission 20182028.602 by Mr K J Claxton
20182028.605.5 in Submission 20182028.605 by Ms Janet Collier
20182028.632.5 in Submission 20182028.632 by Ms Dianna Slater
20182028.638.7 in Submission 20182028.638 by Waikuku Water
20182028.641.5 in Submission 20182028.641 by Grey Power North Canterbury Association (Inc.)
20182028.644.5 in Submission 20182028.644 by Mr C Pocock
20182028.660.5 in Submission 20182028.660 by Dr Kate Grundy
THAT the Council:

(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Acknowledges the support for managing drinking-water quality in the District.
(d) Notes that any decision to chlorinate or fluoridate the water will be considered following direction from the Government.
(e) Notes that budget provision has been made for ultra-violet (UV) treatment but this will not be implemented until direction from the Government is given on changes to the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand.
(f) Notes that Council has measures in place to protect water sources but is actively working with the regional council to improve the long term protection of water sources.

CARRIED

Are we doing enough to: Improve our Waterways

20182028.3.8 in Submission 20182028.3 by Mr Simon Green
20182028.14.10 in Submission 20182028.14 by Mrs Sarah Shore
20182028.17.9 in Submission 20182028.17 by Mr Daniel Thompson
20182028.24.9 in Submission 20182028.24 by Mrs Phillipa Rickerby
20182028.29.9 in Submission 20182028.29 by Mr Michael Bate
20182028.31.9 in Submission 20182028.31 by Ms Karen Lees
20182028.35.5 in Submission 20182028.35 by Mrs Karen Friedauer
20182028.39.9 in Submission 20182028.39 by Ms Barb Warren
20182028.40.12 in Submission 20182028.40 by Mr Rhys and Ms Alice
20182028.41.9 in Submission 20182028.41 by Mr John Crawley
20182028.42.8 in Submission 20182028.42 by Mr Cathy and David and Mrs Price
20182028.46.9 in Submission 20182028.46 by Mr Neil Wilkinson
20182028.47.9 in Submission 20182028.47 by Mr Chris Bacon
20182028.49.10 in Submission 20182028.49 by Mr Miles Dalton
20182028.51.5 in Submission 20182028.51 by Mrs Bella Whaley
20182028.52.11 in Submission 20182028.52 by Mr Ian Sissons
20182028.53.9 in Submission 20182028.53 by Mrs Kelly Bint
20182028.56.7 in Submission 20182028.56 by Mr Alex Vermuelen
20182028.62.9 in Submission 20182028.62 by Ms Andrea Clindick
20182028.64.9 in Submission 20182028.64 by Mr Luke Saunders
20182028.65.9 in Submission 20182028.65 by Mr Joshua Lees
20182028.66.9 in Submission 20182028.66 by Mr Caleb Oliver
20182028.67.6 in Submission 20182028.67 by Ms Holly Maxwell
20182028.69.10 in Submission 20182028.69 by Mr Pete Johnson
20182028.79.10 in Submission 20182028.79 by Ms Kiri Cave
20182028.81.9 in Submission 20182028.81 by Mr Liam O'Connell
20182028.86.7 in Submission 20182028.86 by Mr Antony Oosthuysen
20182028.88.8 in Submission 20182028.88 by Mr Ian MacDonald
20182028.94.8 in Submission 20182028.94 by Miss Tanya Whiteford
20182028.96.9 in Submission 20182028.96 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous
20182028.97.8 in Submission 20182028.97 by Mr Alan & Joan and Mrs Orchard
20182028.98.6 in Submission 20182028.98 by Mr A Warren
20182028.99.9 in Submission 20182028.99 by Mrs Karen Johnson
20182028.117.9 in Submission 20182028.117 by Mr Gerard Power and Ms Olive Ualesi
20182028.118.9 in Submission 20182028.118 by Mrs Colleen McDonald
20182028.120.7 in Submission 20182028.120 by Mrs Suzanne Thurlow
20182028.122.10 in Submission 20182028.122 by Mr Jeremy Richards
20182028.123.9 in Submission 20182028.123 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous
20182028.179.9 in Submission 20182028.179 by Mrs Anita Ward
20182028.207.9 in Submission 20182028.207 by Dr Rose Washbourne
20182028.209.8 in Submission 20182028.209 by Dr Clive Appleton
20182028.213.8 in Submission 20182028.213 by Ms Cheryl York
20182028.243.9 in Submission 20182028.243 by Mr John Watson
20182028.247.9 in Submission 20182028.247 by Mr Jeff Rogers
20182028.267.8 in Submission 20182028.267 by Mr John Richardson
20182028.269.9 in Submission 20182028.269 by Mr Allen Kene
20182028.275.10 in Submission 20182028.275 by Mr Steve Chandler
20182028.285.9 in Submission 20182028.285 by Mrs Tascha Lawry
20182028.291.9 in Submission 20182028.291 by Mr Anonymous Anonymous
20182028.295.9 in Submission 20182028.295 by Ms Emmy Saxton
20182028.297.9 in Submission 20182028.297 by Mr John and Carole and Mrs Houghton
20182028.298.9 in Submission 20182028.298 by Mr Paul Markholm
20182028.343.9 in Submission 20182028.343 by Mr Kelvin Ashby
20182028.345.9 in Submission 20182028.345 by Mr Kelvin Ashby
20182028.346.9 in Submission 20182028.346 by Mr Thomas Bedford
20182028.352.9 in Submission 20182028.352 by Mr Brian Heron
20182028.357.7 in Submission 20182028.357 by Mr Ray Freitag
20182028.358.8 in Submission 20182028.358 by Mr James A Ryan
20182028.359.8 in Submission 20182028.359 by Mr Chris Lawry
20182028.381.9 in Submission 20182028.381 by Mr Bill Byers
20182028.383.9 in Submission 20182028.383 by Mr Lawrence Roberts
20182028.401.9 in Submission 20182028.401 by Mrs Julie McCartney
20182028.410.9 in Submission 20182028.410 by Ms Linda Pocock
20182028.411.9 in Submission 20182028.411 by Ms Jos Baker
20182028.416.9 in Submission 20182028.416 by Ms Prue Baines
20182028.417.9 in Submission 20182028.417 by Mr J & P and Mrs Hardy
20182028.461.9 in Submission 20182028.461 by Mr Beccy & Joe and Mrs Creswick
20182028.494.10 in Submission 20182028.494 by Mrs Elaine H B Cole
20182028.503.9 in Submission 20182028.503 by Mr Duncan Lees
20182028.528.9 in Submission 20182028.528 by Mr Garry Leech
20182028.535.9 in Submission 20182028.535 by Mr Chris Garrick
20182028.559.8 in Submission 20182028.559 by Ms Nancy Sutherland
20182028.560.8 in Submission 20182028.560 by Ms Linda Stewart
20182028.562.8 in Submission 20182028.562 by Miss Sherrianne Nation
20182028.563.9 in Submission 20182028.563 by Mrs Lesley Ottey
20182028.586.8 in Submission 20182028.586 by Mrs Madeleine Burdon
20182028.605.7 in Submission 20182028.605 by Ms Janet Collier
20182028.632.7 in Submission 20182028.632 by Ms Dianna Slater
20182028.640.3 in Submission 20182028.640 by Edge Landscapes
20182028.644.8 in Submission 20182028.644 by Mr C Pocock
20182028.616.8 in Submission 20182028.616 by Mr Christopher Storm
20182028.660.7 in Submission 20182028.660 by Dr Kate Grundy
20182028.670.6 in Submission 20182028.670 by Ms Evelyn Zuberbuhler
20182028.692.7 in Submission 20182028.692 by Mr S H Jackson
20182028.730.9 in Submission 20182028.730 by Mrs Jennie Marsh
20182028.756.2 in Submission 20182028.756 by Ohoka Residents Association
20182028.761.2 in Submission 20182028.761 by Ohoka Rural Drainage Advisory Board
20182028.772.6 in Submission 20182028.772 by Ms Fiona P Roberts
20182028.784.9 in Submission 20182028.784 by Pennith Trust
20182028.822.5 in Submission 20182028.822 by Ms Valarie McClatchy
Councillors Gordon and Atkinson suggested further comment on glyphosate and the role of the Environmental Engineer.

Councillor Stewart drew attention to the new Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw. Councillor Stewart also suggested a communication flyer on the Bylaw and to include that flyer in the response letter.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Acknowledges the support for the current work to improve waterways and the need to do more in our District.
(d) Notes that Council is currently working with Environment Canterbury as part of the Waimakariri Water Zone and also the Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Working Group and Cam River Enhancement Subcommittee.
(e) Notes that Council has recently recruited a Water Environment Advisor to advise and assist Council on matters related to the natural water environment.
(f) Notes that Council has recently adopted the Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw. Information on the updated bylaw and responsibilities of landowners will be provided to the public through various forms of media.
(g) Notes that the use of glyphosate for Council operations is only used where deemed necessary and is carried out strictly in accordance with the manufacturer’s instructions. Other weed control options are used where more appropriate.
(h) Notes that an allowance of $200,000 has been included in the LTP for scoping of Zone Implementation Works following the development of the Waimakariri Sub-regional Chapter to the Land and Water Regional Plan.

Kaiapoi and Cam Rivers Enhancement
20182028.839.7 in Submission 20182028.839 by Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Advises that Waimakariri District Council is part of the Kaiapoi river rehabilitation working party that is also supported by Ngai Tuahuriri Rununga.
(d) The objectives of the working party include improving water quality and Mahinga Kai. The Council looks forward to continuing working with Ngai Tuahuriri Rununga and other parties to achieving these objectives.
(e) The Waimakariri District Council has included an annual $25,000 budget in the Long Term Plan to progress the work of the rehabilitation working party.

CARRIED
Use of Glyphosate
20182028.6.2 in Submission 20182028.6 by Physicians and Scientists for Global Responsibility
20182028.39.10 in Submission 20182028.39 by Ms Barb Warren
20182028.40.13 in Submission 20182028.40 by Mr Rhys and Ms Alice
20182028.554.5 in Submission 20182028.554 by Mrs Courtney Starbuck
20182028.756.1 in Submission 20182028.756 by Ohoka Residents Association

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Notes that maintenance staff will continue to use Glyphosate where necessary.
(d) Notes that Council staff will continue to explore and develop alternative methods of weed control where appropriate.

CARRIED

Water Management and Conservation
20182028.44.5 in Submission 20182028.44 by Mr Richard Connelly
20182028.57.6 in Submission 20182028.57 by Mrs Samantha Plows
20182028.408.5 in Submission 20182028.408 by Ms Sarah Hosking
20182028.561.5 in Submission 20182028.561 by Mr Lester Tidball
20182028.603.5 in Submission 20182028.603 by Ms Jo Kane
20182028.616.5 in Submission 20182028.616 by Mr Christopher Storm
20182028.667.6 in Submission 20182028.667 by Federated Farmers of New Zealand
20182028.731.5 in Submission 20182028.731 by Ms Tonya Bristow
20182028.755.10 in Submission 20182028.755 by Woodend Community Association
20182028.772.7 in Submission 20182028.772 by Ms Fiona P Roberts

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Acknowledges the submissions on water management.
(d) Notes that there is currently work underway on water education, protecting our water sources and reviewing the potential for water metering.

CARRIED

Ashley River Erosion
20182028.639.1 in Submission 20182028.639 by Ashley Gorge Farming Co Ltd

Councillor Gordon suggested a joint meeting of all the parties involved (ie elected members and Ecan).

Councillor Williams commented on Ecan information and the willows upstream, suggesting a report and general conversation on the matter.

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Decline the establishment of a WDC rate to address erosion, flooding, vegetation control, shingle management and river care on the Ashley River.

CARRIED

Land Improvement Agreement - Butchers Road
20182028.875.3 in Submission 20182028.875 by Mrs Heather Woods
THAT the Council:
  (a) Receives the submission.
  (b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
  (c) Decline as the purpose of a Land Improvement Agreement is not to supersede the requirement for an Esplanade Reserve.

CARRIED

Broadband
20182028.66.10 in Submission 20182028.66 by Mr Caleb Olliver

THAT the Council:
  (a) Receives the submission.
  (b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
  (c) Advises that Waimakariri District Council is aware that there is ongoing discussion between Enable Networks, Mainpower and the Northbrook Waters body corporate to allow fibre to be deployed within the Northbrook Waters development.
  (d) We understand all parties are committed to finding a solution. Waimakariri District Council encourages the rollout of fibre within the district. We encourage the Northbrook Waters to liaise directly with Enable networks to see if a solution can be found.

CARRIED

Passenger Rail
20182028.198.5 in Submission 20182028.198 by Mr Rodney Malin

THAT the Council:
  (a) Receives the submission.
  (b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
  (c) Declines the request of the Council to put in a passenger train line into Christchurch.
  (d) Notes that the Government has signalled increased funding for rapid transport in Christchurch and the Greater Christchurch Joint PT Committee is working on a PT Futures Programme Business Case and this work will help determine the future of public transport in greater Christchurch and whether it features rail as an option.

CARRIED

Woodend/Pegasus Waste and Water Supply
20182028.537.5 in Submission 20182028.537 by Mr Tim Paterson

THAT the Council:
  (a) Receives the submission.
  (b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
  (c) Notes that Council will consider water and wastewater servicing of the existing properties in Waikuku village as part of any development in the area.

CARRIED

Speed Limits - Signage
20182028.499.20 in Submission 20182028.499 by Oxford-Ohoka Community Board
 THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Notes that '40km/h when children are present' signs have been approved by NZTA for rural schools in high speed environments. Oxford Area School is an urban school.
(d) Notes that staff will meet with the school to better understand the problem and to develop options once the problem is better understood. This can include speed surveys on the road if necessary.

CARRIED

Speed Limits - Cust Village
20182028.617.2 in Submission 20182028.617 by Cust Community Network

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Notes the Council is developing a speed management strategy based on the new speed management guidelines and so it is recommended the speed limit in Cust is considered once the strategy has been approved.

CARRIED

Speed Limits - Cust School
20182028.617.3 in Submission 20182028.617 by Cust Community Network

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Notes that Council staff will discuss the problem with the Cust School and the Police and look at options to manage the problem.
(d) Notes that the Council is developing a speed management strategy and it will be appropriate to consider the speed limits in Cust once this strategy is completed.

CARRIED

Speed Limits - Main Road, Oxford
20182028.501.1 in Submission 20182028.501 by Ms Fiona Hogan
20182028.666.1 in Submission 20182028.666 by Mrs Shirley Farrell
20182028.499.10 in Submission 20182028.499 by Oxford-Ohoka Community Board
20182028.856.1 in Submission 20182028.856 by Mr Oliver Crook

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives the submission.
(b) Thanks the submitter for their submission.
(c) Declines to review the speed limit on Main Street in Oxford at this point is time.
(d) Notes that the Council is developing a speed management strategy and it could consider the use of 40km/h speed limits as part of that strategy.
(e) Notes that speed surveys show the existing mean speed of traffic through Oxford is lower than 50km/h and changing the speed limit may not change driver behaviour and that there are no speed related crashes or incidents having been reported in Main Street in Oxford.

CARRIED
**Speed Limits - Pegasus Roundabout**
20182028.871.14 in Submission 20182028.871 by Pegasus Residents Group

**THAT** the Council:
(a) **Receives** the submission.
(b) **Thanks** the submitter for their submission.
(c) **Notes** that the responsibility of setting speed limits on the State Highway and at the Pegasus Roundabout is NZTA and they are currently accessing this route from a safety point of view and have been engaging with the community and so it is suggested the submitter raises their suggestion with NZTA.
(d) **Notes** that the Council is developing a speed management strategy and it is recommended this strategy is completed before decisions are made on reviewing the speed limit on Pegasus Boulevard.

**CARRIED**

Moved: Mayor Ayers  
Seconded: Councillor Atkinson

**THAT** the Council
(a) **Confirms** the public submissions and recommendations formally be adopted, that were taken as proforma at the beginning of the meeting.

**CARRIED**

8. **QUESTIONS**

Nil.

9. **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS**

Nil.

10. **NEXT MEETING**

The Council will meet at 3.15pm on Tuesday 19 June to adopt the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

Mayor Ayers commented on the process, noting that rates are under pressure and decisions had not been easy to balance. Mayor Ayers thanked the Councillors and staff for their contributions.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 10.45AM ON WEDNESDAY 31 MAY 2018.

CONFIRMED

________________
Chairperson

________________
Date
MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD IN THE
COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA, ON TUESDAY 3 JULY 2018,
COMMENCING AT 1PM.

PRESENT:
Mayor D Ayers (Chair), Deputy Mayor K Felstead, Councillors K Barnett, A Blackie, W Doody,
R Brine, D Gordon, J Meyer, S Stewart and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE:
J Millward (Acting Chief Executive), C Sargison (Manager Community & Recreation), S Markham
(Engagement & Strategy Manager), C Brown (Community & Green Space Manager), K Simpson
(3Waters Manager), S Hart (Business and Centres Manager), A Willis (Contract Planner),
M O’Connell (Senior Policy Analyst), S Collin (Infrastructure Strategy Manager), K Waghorn (Solid
Waste Asset Manager), C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager), and S Nichols (Governance
Manager).

The meeting adjourned at 3.05pm and recommenced at 3.17pm.

1. APOLOGIES

Moved: Mayor Ayers Seconded: Councillor Williams

An apology was received and sustained from Councillor N Atkinson for absence.

CARRIED

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Nil.

3. REGISTER OF INTERESTS

No changes were made to the register.

4. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Nil.

5. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

5.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 5 June 2018

Moved: Councillor Gordon 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 5 June 2018.

CARRIED

Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 19 June 2018

Moved: Councillor Gordon Seconded: Councillor Meyer

THAT the Council:
(b) Confirms as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the
Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 19 June 2018.

CARRIED
Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 5 June 2018

Matters were dealt with in the public excluded section of the meeting.

MATTERS ARISING

Nil.

6. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

Nil.

7. ADJOURNED BUSINESS

Nil.

8. REGENERATION REPORTS

8.1. Oxford Museum and Jaycee Room Strengthening – C Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)

C Sargison spoke to the report advising of alterations and proposed work. He commented on the proposal for a new entranceway to the Museum, which has an agricultural machinery focus and how users access the building.

Mayor Ayers sought clarification on the separation of the Jaycee area from the Museum area. C Sargison commented that the Jaycee area would be rated at 66% of building code.

Mayor Ayers queried potential damage to exhibitions during the alteration work. C Sargison commented on the display areas and how the display cases would be potentially difficult and risky to move, outlining the logistics involved with upgrading the museum area.

Councillor Felstead queried the brickwork on the building. C Sargison advised the Jaycee room and kitchen is due for a repainting once the brickwork is repaired and sealed.

Councillor Gordon queried the painting of the roof to the same colour as the building. C Sargison advised the roof painting would be covered by another project. In a supplementary question Councillor Gordon queried the red pointing on the blocks. C Sargison commented on the logistics and risk of damaging the blocks further.

Councillor Doody commented on the kitchen, specifically the stove area and people movement, suggesting the walkway being wider. Staff advised the safety aspect is not an issue.

Mayor Ayers questioned staff about camp ground buildings in relation to earthquake ratings. J Millward advised a report, as part of the Section 17A review, was scheduled to come before the Council in the future.

Councillor Gordon queried the timing of the camp ground information. J Millward advised that would follow after the community housing report that would be discussed next week.

Moved: Councillor Felstead Seconded: Councillor Doody

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180510051351.

(b) Notes that the strengthening of all of the community buildings is now complete with the exception of the Oxford Museum/Jaycee building.
(c) **Approves** the Oxford Museum/Jaycee building not being strengthened to 67% NBS and retaining a seismic strength of 34-66% NBS.

(d) **Approves** staff proceeding with the new entranceway and toilets for the building up to a total cost of $125,500.

(e) **Notes** that the Oxford Museum will contribute $15,000 towards the cost of the new entranceway to the Museum.

(f) **Circulates** this report to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Felstead commented that if the government changed the Building Act this project will not be affected. He stated the toilet improvements and improved entranceway would be a positive improvement overall.

Councillor Doody concurred that it is important the Museum has its own entranceway and recently attended an informative meeting with the group discussing how the fixtures are being secured.

Councillor Gordon reflected on his involvement with the Oxford Museum and the proactive group of people involved with the facility and project. He acknowledged the entrance required better signage and was looking forward to the improvements.

Councillor Meyer reflected on a recent meeting with members of the Museum and was looking forward to the improvements.

8.2 **Public Consultation of the Reviewed Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan – S Hart (Business and Centres Manager)**

S Hart outlined the main aspects of the report and referred to the timeline table contained in the report. He noted that hearings are not proposed, based on discussions with the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board and the Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group. The project was still tracking slightly over budget by approximately $30,000 and S Hart explained the reasons why, with the shortfall to come from the Kaiapoi Town Centre budget.

Councillor Barnett stated she noticed a focus of consultation is on Kaiapoi and asked how staff were going to involve people that live in areas such as Clarkville and Tuahiwi that use Kaiapoi as a hub. S Hart outlined social media, the Youth Council and other means of advising of the consultation.

Councillor Barnett asked if staff had considered an information session at Kaiapoi High School. Staff advised that had not been considered but it could be noted. In a supplementary question Councillor Barnett queried if consideration of staff attending the Kaiapoi market to capture people on the weekend at the market. Staff advised of other conversations to be held before finalising the consultation programme.

Councillor Barnett asked the Mayor at what point the Council would decide if it wanted a hearing to occur. Mayor Ayers advised procedurally now would be appropriate to include in the motion.

Councillor Barnett indicated an amendment to include a provision of a hearing panel.

Moved: Councillor Brine Seconded: Councillor Williams

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No.180621069246.
(b) Approve public consultation of the Draft Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan – 2028 and Beyond and related Consultation Plan.

(c) Notes that the consultation process allows for a four (4) week period of engagement activities and receipt of submissions.

Councillor Brine commented that he was open to consideration of a hearing panel in the future.

AMENDMENT

Moved: Councillor Barnett Seconder: Councillor Gordon

The staff recommendation with an additional clause:

(d) Agrees to have the submissions heard by a hearing panel.

CARRIED

Councillor Barnett outlined her reasoning for the amendment stating it makes it easier for consultation documentation and planning. Councillor Barnett remarked she was a strong supporter of community involvement and a hearing is a transparent process to hear from the people that are part of the development.

Councillor Felstead enquired if it was appropriate that member(s) of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board should be included on the hearing panel. S Hart advised that the Council would need to consider the potential conflict of interest if the Community Board lodge a submission. The hearing panel would make recommendations to the Council for a final decision.

Councillor Stewart enquired, as a member involved with the earlier enquiry by design process, whether that is considered a conflict. Mayor Ayers advised it is not considered a conflict as the hearing process is conducted under the Local Government Act and not the Resource Management Act. He explained hearings are a way of getting more information to assist with decision making. S Markham commented on views of the matter and for members to consider if it was appropriate to sit on the hearing panel.

Councillor Gordon stated he was supportive of the amendment and it was an important opportunity for people to be heard and supported the principal of having an open process. He thanked staff involved in the process to date.

A brief discussion occurred relating to potential members of the hearing panel.

Moved: Councillor Barnett Seconded: Councillor Gordon

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No.180621069246.

(b) Approve public consultation of the Draft Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan – 2028 and Beyond and related Consultation Plan.

(c) Notes that the consultation process allows for a four (4) week period of engagement activities and receipt of submissions.

(d) Agrees to have the submissions heard by a hearing panel.

(e) Agrees that the Hearing Panel consists of Councillors Barnett, Blackie and Meyer.

CARRIED

9. REPORTS
9.1 Multi-Use Sports Facility Project Management and Structure – C Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)

C Sargison spoke to the report outlining the process, which includes the Council directly engaging the quantity surveyor, whilst the design team are engaged directly by Warren and Mahoney for the contract of all other design team members. C Sargison explained the co-ordination flow and how the various stages and areas link together. The purpose of establishing a project steering group was outlined which includes a member of the North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust (NCSRT). The steering group will report back to the Council. C Sargison outlined key aspects of the design team working with users of the facility.

Councillor Felstead sought clarification on the project meetings being open to the public. Staff confirmed that the project meetings would be open to the public, unless a matter related to commercial sensitivity and the process would be similar to the Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group.

Councillor Felstead enquired if advisers can come to the meeting when required for discussions as it may assist with the process. C Sargison confirmed that option is not precluded and reflected on the process for the Dudley Pool, envisaging a similar collaborative approach.

Councillor Doody sought clarification, that if the Chair of NCSRT was not available, then would a substituted person attend. C Sargison advised a meeting had occurred with the Chair of NCSRT and the Sports Trust would be represented at each meeting. Following a query from Mayor Ayers, staff confirmed the Mayor was a member of the steering group, ex officio.

Councillor Williams queried not receiving tenders from the company who was going to design the facility. C Sargison explained that it was the concept design that had been tendered and that in such instances it is automatic that the designer is also engaged for the detailed design level. C Sargison advised that three companies were considered for the concept design with only one company placing a tender.

Councillor Williams queried the water and sewage upgrades and why this aspect is separate to the building costs. C Sargison explained that these budgetary elements are known and factored into the overall budgets, explaining development contributions.

Moved: Councillor Gordon Seconded: Councillor Doody

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180613065468

(b) Approves the multi-use indoor sports facility being delivered on the traditional methodology with separate design, procurement and construction phases.

(c) Approves the project structure for the multi-use indoor sports facility development as set out in Trim document 180618067298.

(d) Approves the Project Steering Group Terms of Reference and membership as set out in Trim document 180618067303, and noting the Mayor is included, being ex-officio to all Council Committees and Steering Groups.

(e) Delegates to the Chief Executive and Manager Community and Recreation the authority:

(i) to engage Warren and Mahoney for architectural and lead design services.

(ii) to engage AECOM for Quantity Surveying Services for the project.
(iii) to approve Warren and Mahoney’s engagement of the necessary engineering disciplines.

(f) **Delegates** to the Manager Community and Recreation the authority to engage Richard Lindsay for peer review services on the design.

(g) **Notes** that the Minutes of each Project Steering Group (PSG) meeting will be circulated to Councillors.

(h) **Notes** that the PSG will provide a recommendation to Council for contractor procurement.

(i) **Notes** that there will be a separate report to Council on the proposed Heads of Agreement and Operating Agreement with the North Canterbury Sports Trust.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Stewart Abstained

Councillor Gordon commented positively on the NCSRT chair being a representative on the steering group, the model of the process and the opportunity to involve other groups or information sources.

Councillor Doody thanked C Sargison for the work to date and looked forward to the project moving forward.

**Canterbury Water Management Strategy Annual Report 2017 – G Meadows (Policy Manager)**

(The Waimakariri Water Zone Committee (WWZC) Chairperson David Ashby was present during consideration of this report.)

M O’Connell briefly introduced the report before handing over to David Ashby (WWZC Chairperson) and Andrew Arps (ECan Zone Manager). The Annual Report was taken as read.

D Ashby outlined the role of the Committee which has no statutory powers but a responsibility to make recommendations on the Zone Implementation Plan Agendum (ZIPA) which will go forward to the Sub-Regional Plan. He commented on the number of hours involved in discussions and the major issues being dealt with, reflecting on the large number of community meetings. D Ashby outlined the key issues facing the Committee over the next two months with complex issues to consider and make recommendations on that will affect many farming practices. He also reflected on the linkage with various groups as part of the information exchange and the subsequent community meetings that would follow. The seriousness of the process going forward and implications to future farming practices were being considered very carefully and with appropriate timeframes.

A Arps commented on 11 programmes linked with good farming management practices that the Committee was factoring into its recommendation processes and also linked with the Annual Report information. Some of these programmes start contributing to improved water quality upon implementation and he provided several examples of this occurring.

Councillor Doody queried changes to farming practices and the timeframes involved. D Ashby commented that due to the complexity of the matter, it was one of the main reasons for the time extension of the Committee timeframes. D Ashby referenced a nitrate report, advising that it will be aggressive and challenging as the Committee have a responsibility to the Runanga and the community for setting frameworks for levels of nitrate reduction with a modelled approach. Responsibilities to, and liaison with, the community and the Runanga was briefly outlined. It was advised that through July there will be more community and farm meetings.
Councillor Doody queried an enhancement group project in Amuri. A Arps advised that he was now liaising with three zones and sharing information, of which the Amuri project information would contribute to that knowledge base.

Councillor Felstead queried the Annual Report, particularly in relation to regional and national economies, asking if there is going to be another report on what effect proposed limits will have on the economies, particularly locally. D Ashby reflected on the Waiora Zone Committee and acknowledged the Committee was between a rock and a hard place. Committee members were well aware of the investment of agriculture, the inter-connections, the impacts on farming and the need to balance it between levels of productions, economics and the environment. D Ashby spoke of the benefits of projects involving riparian planting, guidance from the Dr Henry Hudson report and working towards a quality water supply.

Mayor Ayers enquired if there is more that we, as a District Council, can do to assist the Committee and the rural community with the economic issues. D Ashby responded that it was a difficult time while the Committee were working through the issues, followed by consultation. He suggested that, at a later date, there will be a need for conversations with the Regional Council, Runanga and Waimakariri District Council. He commented on the Silverstream catchment that is acknowledged as a priority, noting the lag phase which would still occur if all other farming practices ceased. He commented on the infiltration trial and the guidance needed as the Committee move forward. D Ashby commented on technological advances, particularly in relation to improving water quality.

Mayor Ayers referred to a chart in the Annual Report, with many of the descriptors directed at ECan which is a planning and regulatory organisation. Mayor Ayers enquired if there was a danger of over regulation and not achieving what is actually needed to be achieved and furthermore, that there may be other approaches that could be considered better. D Ashby reflected on issues with Plan Change 5, and the default rules of the land and water plan. D Ashby believes this is a journey commenting on the importance of the direction of travel, the buy-in from land owners and non-statutory options to be considered as it often attracts more positive buy-in and more benefits.

Councillor Barnett asked whether, because of the scale of the issue, this matter should be driven at a national level rather than a regional level. D Ashby acknowledged the point raised, and indicated the difficulties of working with different zones in respect of their inter-linking with neighbouring zones. In a supplementary question Councillor Barnett enquired if we go too far in one direction is there a possibility of bankrupting a region. D Ashby acknowledged the risks and challenges ahead, what the understandings are and what information is yet to be worked through. D Ashby acknowledged that the face of agriculture will be different from what we see now and the committee needs to find an appropriate and realistic timeline to enable farmers to change farming practices, mitigating issues whilst meeting community and cultural aspirations, for the longer term benefit of the environment.

Councillor Barnett enquired if, by releasing the report in the proposed way, it may not highlight what the farming community is already doing to try to reduce nitrate levels, bearing in mind we need to much more. D Ashby reiterated earlier comments about the direction of travel on this journey, the need to challenge the farming community and to have clear goals. This is about the concentration of nitrates in waterways and working towards significant reductions.

Councillor Doody asked if the committee had a plan in place for the health and wellbeing of the farmers and contractors and the ability for farmers to talk to appropriate counsellors and access wellbeing services. D Ashby advised the committee is acutely aware of the pressures on farmers. A Arps outlined ECan staff awareness training, acknowledging some of this stemmed from M.Bovis matters. Staff have a heightened awareness, knowledge of how to assist and ongoing encouragement for farmers to talk.
Councillor Gordon enquired if ECAn were partnering with the Rural Support Trust and would the various support agencies be available when the proposals are released. D Ashby spoke on the information available and acknowledged the committee was aware of farmers’ wellbeing and the need to allow for health aspects and adjustments in the timeframes. He reiterated staff and the Committee were mindful of the impacts that the information and subsequent actions will have on the community.

Moved: Mayor Ayers  Seconded: Councillor Blackie

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report no. 180531060559.
(b) Receives the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee Annual Report 2017 (TRIM 180531060476).
(c) Approves the distribution of the Annual Report to Community Boards and Drainage and Water Supply Advisory Groups for their information.

CARRIED

Mayor Ayers thanked the Water Zone for the work that it is doing, acknowledging it is not an easy task. He commented on reasons for asking about a regulatory approach, open fires and the impacts on clean air policies in relation to regulation. Mayor Ayers reflected on his family farming connection in Harewood in the 1930’s and the impacts of farming and economics. Mayor Ayers stated he has confidence in the ability of the farming community to adapt and rise above the current issues.

9.2 Sustainability Strategy – Scoping Report – M O’Connell (Senior Policy Analyst)

M O’Connell outlined the key elements of the report and reflected on the meaning of sustainability, how this work dovetails into other government programmes and the action that this Council can undertake.

There were no questions from members.

Moved: Councillor Gordon  Seconded: Councillor Barnett

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180611064136.
(b) Approves the preparation of a corporate Sustainability Strategy for the Council.
(c) Recommends the appointment of Mayor David Ayers to be Project Champion for the promulgation of the Sustainability Strategy.

CARRIED


K Waghorn provided a brief overview of the working party discussions and recommendations to date.

There were no questions from members.

Moved: Councillor Brine  Seconded: Councillor Doody

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180620068478.
(b) Approves contracting out the operations and maintenance of Southbrook Resource Recovery Park and Oxford Transfer Station to a private waste business with the option of the main contractor engaging, managing and supporting a community group to undertake resource recovery activities.

(c) Approves staff undertaking a registration of interest process to identify potential suppliers from the community in addition to the private sector.

(d) Approves this departure from the Council’s standard procurement process to enable social procurement objectives to be achieved.

(e) Approves the term of the solid waste contracts for kerbside collection and transfer station operations being 7 years plus three one-year rights of renewal (7+1+1+1).

(f) Approves the procurement strategy appended as Attachment iii.

(g) Notes that the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party has approved the consultation materials and the Communications Action Plan.

(h) Notes that letters, feedback cards and Q&A sheets will be posted to ratepayers during the first week of July 2018.

CARRIED

Councillor Brine stated good discussions had been held at the working party and the information was documented.

Councillor Doody concurred with her colleague’s comments.

9.4. Request for Additional Funding for Kaiapoi Well Head Security Improvements – C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager) and M Andrews (Civil Engineer)

C Roxburgh spoke to the report, highlighting key aspects of the report, explaining the reasoning for the budget shortfall and the contractor engagement.

Councillor Barnett asked why it costs $40,000 to work on two wells above ground when one well underground is cheaper. C Roxburgh advised that not all the higher cost wells have been programmed as the underground wells are usually more expensive, explaining the varying ground conditions.

Councillor Gordon queried the contractor’s experience. C Roxburgh explained a recent assessment of suitably qualified contractors. Underground wells require more skill sets to undertake the work, particularly underground chambers. He explained the risks and cost factors involved by not engaging suitably qualified contractors.

J Millward commented on a recently activated Management Steering Group and explained the purpose of the work involving capital work. The staff will assess if any savings could be made, then the capacity information goes to the steering group, who will look at the capacity of the works and be reported back to the Council. The reason is to restrict project creep and contain budgets within the LTP frameworks. The group will also assess the capital works programme.

Moved: Councillor Williams  Seconded: Councillor Blackie

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180621068890.

(b) Approves an increase to the Kaiapoi Well Head Improvement capital budget from $100,000 to $180,000 in the 2018/19 financial year to allow for the full required scope to be completed.

(c) Approves staff to engage G&T Construction to undertake well head security works at Darnley Square and Rugby Park to the value of $62,728.
(d) **Notes** that the reason for not publicly tendering the works is due to the specialised nature of the works, the expertise and availability of the contractor, the competitive price received and the criticality of the works given the likely consequences if security is not maintained for the scheme.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Williams stated that this work has to be done and believed this is the best and most appropriate option for the circumstances and he believed staff had recommended appropriately.

Councillor Blackie remarked on the need to do this work.

Mayor Ayers commented that the wells will be more secure as a result of the work.

Councillor Gordon was supportive of the steering group initiative as it offers assurance that the Council is getting the best option for the most appropriate situation. J Millward confirmed this funding information will be included in future Council reports. Because of the large volume and cost of capital works scheduled over the next three years staff have investigated in a procurement system to ensure best practice. There will be a further report to the upcoming Audit and Risk Committee. This will assist management in making improvements financially.

**Mainpower Trust’s Ownership Review and Capital Distribution – J Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)**

J Millward spoke to the report advising this was a modified proposal, explaining the changes from previous proposals and why the recommendation is being supported which is a variation from the views of the Council in previous years.

There were no questions from members.

Moved: Mayor Ayers Seconded: Councillor Gordon

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180621069047.

(b) **Resolves** to submit to the MainPower Trust in support of the Trustees’ proposal to retain 100% of the Distributable Capital with the MainPower Trust.

(c) **Authorises** the Chief Executive Officer to sign and submit the submission.

**CARRIED**

9.5 **Final Greenspace Activity Management Plan 2018 – C Brown (Community and Green Space Manager) and R O’Loughlin (Community Green Space Asset Information Officer)**

C Brown spoke to the report and provided background information on the work undertaken, advising that the plans had been peer reviewed and indicated the steps going forward.

Councillor Barnett queried monitoring levels of service in the audit reports and if it would be appropriate to include more commentary. C Brown explained the performance measures, targets and options available and what is being done to address any issues identified. In a supplementary question Councillor Barnett queried perceptions of the public at viewing the declining performance levels. Staff acknowledged further commentary could be included.
Councillor Brine queried how changes can be made to the documents. C Brown explained that they are living documents and can be amended at any time.

Moved: Councillor Brine  Seconded: Councillor Barnett

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180614066068.
(b) **Adopts** the final 2018 Activity Management Plan for Greenspace.
(c) **Notes** that reports will be presented to the Community and Recreation Committee on the implementation of the Asset Management Improvement Plan.
(d) **Circulates** this report to all Community Boards for their information.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Brine commented positively on the work of staff.

Councillor Barnett remarked the plans were good documents and provided a good level of read.

Mayor Ayers commented that the documents are necessary for planning and linking in with other strategic documents but believed they held limited public interest.

### 9.6 Environment Canterbury Representation Review – S Nichols (Governance Manager)

S Nichols spoke briefly to the report.

Moved: Mayor Ayers  Seconded: Councillor Felstead

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180624069683.
(b) **Notes** the Canterbury Regional Council proposal is for two members to represent the North Canterbury constituency that would come into existence for the 2019 Local Body Elections.
(c) **Submits** in support of the representation arrangements proposed by the Canterbury Regional Council (ECan) for implementation for the 2019 Local Body Elections, with the submission to be approved by the Mayor.
(d) **Notes** a copy of the final submission will be circulated to all Councillors and Community Boards.

**CARRIED**

Mayor Ayers commented that ECan representation is very difficult within the electoral legislation, as the greatest ratepayer population falls within the Christchurch area, yet the rural areas involve much of the ECan related work. He stated he could understand if the rural population felt they are under-represented at the ECan table.

### 10. HEALTH AND SAFETY

#### 10.1 Health and Safety Reports for May and June 2018 – J Palmer (Chief Executive)

J Millward spoke to the report, commenting on the in-depth monitoring undertaken by staff.

Moved: Councillor Williams  Seconded: Councillor Doody
(a) Receives report Nos. 180524057333 and 180618067368.

CARRIED

11. REPORT FOR INFORMATION FROM THE REGENERATION STEERING GROUP MEETING OF 11 JUNE 2018

Proposed Permanent Rowing Base in Murphy Park, Kaiapoi – M Flanagan, Landscape Planner – District Regeneration and C Batchelor, Communications Advisor – District Regeneration

Moved: Councillor Blackie Seconded: Councillor Meyer

That the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180521055764.

CARRIED

Councillor Blackie commented on the wide consultation with stakeholders, feedback and discussions.

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

12.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee held on 22 May 2018
12.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri Youth Council held on 29 May 2018
12.3 Minutes of a meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group held on 11 June 2018

Moved: Councillor Gordon Seconded: Councillor Felstead

THAT the information in items 12.1-12.3 be received.

CARRIED

13. COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

13.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board held on 14 May 2018
13.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board held on 7 June 2018
13.3 Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board held on 11 June 2018
13.4 Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board held on 13 June 2018
13.5 Minutes of a meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board held on 18 June 2018

Moved: Councillor Felstead Seconded: Councillor Gordon

THAT the information in items 13.1 to 13.5 be received.

CARRIED

Councillor Felstead noted a change of a meeting date in October to enable the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board to hold a meeting at Mandeville. He also commented on the independent hearing commissioners’ decision to decline, to Canterbury Landscapes, for two ECan consents, noting that the WDC consent was still being considered by the same commissioners.
14. **CORRESPONDENCE**

Nil.

15. **MAYOR’S DIARY**

15.1. **Mayor’s Diary 30 May – 24 June 2018**

Moved: Councillor Barnett Seconded: Councillor Felstead

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report no. 180619067641.

**CARRIED**

Mayor Ayers advised he intended to present, at the August Council meeting, an update on the recent visit to Enshi and Wuhan, China.

The meeting adjourned at 3.05pm and reconvened at 3.17pm.

16. **COUNCIL PORTFOLIO UPDATES**

16.1. **Iwi Relationships**

Mayor Ayers advised there were no matters to update.

16.2. **Canterbury Water Management Strategy**

Councillor Stewart provided background information on the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee. This is one of ten zone committees which are non-statutory. It has a budget of $100,000 which is granted through the Immediate Steps Programme to fund biodiversity projects. The committee has a consensus process, suggesting it operates differently from standing committees. The committee has been having a regular series of workshops over the last year to meet strategic goals of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy.

A most recent formal meeting of the committee was held on 11 June, where three applications for Immediate Steps funding were considered, including an application from Easterbrook Road Community Planting, for $49,000, which was granted to a group of 12 landowners for riparian planting through their properties. This is from the springhead near No 4 Drain through to Fernside Road. The total cost of this project is $200,000, and the remainder of this money will be coming from the landowners.

Three public consultation meetings are coming up in the district to discuss the nitrate levels in water and the requirements that are going to be put in place. Councillor Stewart spoke on the problems with the nitrate levels in Silverstream, noting that if the levels increase as predicted, no fish life will be able to survive in this water, which will mean the Salmon Farm would not be able to operate.

The levels of reduction of nitrate levels to be recommended by the Water Zone committee are a combination of what the law requires as a base line, which uses Good Management Practice levels. These reduction levels have been driven by the committee members, proposing a 25 – 30% reduction in nitrate levels, staged over the coming years. Members of the committee are proposing a complete change in farming practices.

The quality of water in Silverstream and Kaiapoi River will need extra work done to achieve this, with higher reductions required.

The message from the Runanga is that they will not accept waiting for 80 years for change and will want this to be a generational change, occurring in the next 10 years.
period. The Runanga are in discussions with Ngai Tahu and ECAn on this matter directly.

Councillor Stewart also mentioned the intensive farming in Waimakariri which is impacting on the pristine water supply of Christchurch City. If this continues the nitrate levels of the water, that is supplied to most of Christchurch, will be raised and the water polluted.

Three public meetings are scheduled to be held in July on the nitrate levels, 18 July in Kaiapoi, 19 July in Oxford and the following week on 25 July at Rossburn Reception, Rangiora. These meetings are the first time this information is going to be made available to the general public.

Councillor Barnett asked what is being done on a national level regarding these serious water issues. Councillor Stewart responded that the CWMS has a plan, but does not have the money for any solutions. Councillor Stewart believes that, due to the geography of this area, it has the most challenging issues.

16.3. **International Relationships**

Deputy Mayor Felstead spoke on the cultural exchange occurring between Kaiapoi High School and four schools from Wuhan. This is the first of such exchanges with further discussion between the schools.

There was a successful launch of the Migrants’ Night movie; with migrants in the district telling stories of their life here.

16.4. **Regeneration (Kaiapoi)**

Councillor Blackie noted that the Riverbank project had issues in the past week. There have been time constraints and the dredging of the river from the bank cannot occur. The current contractor has demands to finish his land based work and the dredge and pontoon project has been reprogrammed for December, as no dredge work can occur during whitebait season.

17. **QUESTIONS**

Nil.

18. **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS**

Nil.

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

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

Moved: 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>19.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of Council meeting of 5 June 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>Item No</td>
<td>Reason for protection of interests</td>
<td>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 19.1 – 19.5 | Protection of privacy of natural persons  
To carry out commercial activities without prejudice | A2(a)  
A2(b)ii |

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:

**CLOSED MEETING**

The public excluded portion of the meeting occurred from 3.52pm until 4.13pm.

20. **NEXT MEETING**

The next scheduled meeting of the Council is on Tuesday 7 August 2018 commencing at 1pm.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 4.14PM.

CONFIRMED

______________________________  
Chairperson

______________________________  
Date
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1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to provide an update on progress of delivering the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme for the roading, water, wastewater and drainage works.

1.2. The final estimate for the capital component of the recovery works is $38,219,000 which is less than the approved budget of $38,645,000.

1.3. Since last reporting, four projects have been completed and a further two have been progressed to within a few months of completion.

1.4. A total of 47 of the 51 projects have been completed and three are under construction.

1.5. The budget spent on the projects completed to date is $27.7M. The total spent on the recovery capital programme at the end of June 2018 was $32.2M (projects completed plus projects underway) and this represents 84% of the revised total programme estimate.

1.6. All water and wastewater projects have been completed.

1.7. The key remaining stormwater projects are Beswick Stormwater Management Area (SMA) and Feldwick SMA plus associated reticulation. These are integral to the development of the Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area.

1.8. The design of the Beswick SMA is complete and the construction will be delivered under Contract 18/34: Kaiapoi East Enabling Works and Beswick SMA, due for completion in March 2019.

1.9. The Feldwick SMA is linked to the Feldwick/Macintosh drainage strategy currently in development. Budget is allocated for construction in 2019/20.

1.10. The majority of the road projects have been completed, the remainder are:

∑ Project 43: Kaiapoi East Services Re-Routing (roads) – This is under construction and due to be completed in September 2018.

∑ Project 45: Kaiapoi East Access Road (the new Feldwick Drive) – This is partially open to traffic and due to be completed in mid-August 2018.

∑ Project 48 Regeneration Area Infrastructure Decommissioning (roads) – This is due to be completed by March 2019 as part of Contract 18/34, along with the Beswick SMA, as noted above.
Jones Street reconstruction – Concept design is underway and is planned for construction this financial year.

1.11. All roading projects in the Earthquake Recovery Programme will be completed by the end of this financial year.

1.12. The completion of the Kaiapoi East Access Road will be a significant milestone for the recovery effort and will provide a vastly improved level of service to residents in the Kaiapoi East area. An official opening is scheduled for Saturday 18th August.

1.13. All of the key remaining projects are within and integrally related to the Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area.

1.14. There are other roading projects within the Regeneration Area, such as the Charles Street rebuild east of Jones Street and the boat ramp access road. These projects are included within the district regeneration programme as opposed to the earthquake recovery programme, and will consequently be delivered by the District Regeneration Project Control Group.

1.15. The Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Steering Group (EIRSG) will continue to meet over the next few months as some key projects are completed. After around October 2018, it is proposed that the EIRSG be disbanded and the remaining projects completed under the direction of the District Regeneration Project Control Group (DRPCG). Key members of the EIRSG (Roading Manager and 3 Waters Manager) are represented on the DRPCG, so the transition is expected to be relatively seamless.

Attachments - Project Status Table, including Proposed Revised Construction Dates

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180723081893

(b) Notes the recovery works construction programme as presented in Attachment 1 of this report.

(c) Notes that 48 of the 52 projects on the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme have been completed, one will be completed in August 2018 and another in September 2018. The remainder are integral with the Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area.

(d) Notes that the current estimate for the capital component of the recovery works is $38,219,000, which is approximately $400K less than is budgeted.

(e) Notes that a proposal is being considered to convert the redundant Charles St wastewater pump station into a public viewing platform adjacent to the Kaiapoi River, rather than demolish the structure.

(f) Authorises staff to utilise the remaining budget of $100K allocated for demolishing the Charles St wastewater pump station for investigating and establishing the public viewing platform, if it is found to be feasible and safe to do so.

(g) Forwards this report to the Utilities and Roading Committee and Regeneration Steering Group for their information.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1. The Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme delivers repairs to Council’s horizontal infrastructure that was damaged in the 2010-2011 Canterbury earthquakes, principally in areas of Kaiapoi, The Pines Beach and Kairaki. The initial repair programme, instigated immediately after the September 2010 earthquake, stalled when the Government introduced the Residential Red Zones. The current infrastructure recovery programme was subsequently developed in 2012 to reinstate the remaining damaged infrastructure and accommodate the impacts of the Red Zones.
3.2. The programme is managed by the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Steering Group. The EIRSG is comprised of:

- Gary Boot (WDC Senior Engineering Advisor) – Chair
- Kalley Simpson (WDC 3 Waters Manager)
- Joanne McBride (WDC Roading Manager), previously Ken Stevenson
- Gavin Lake (Lake Civil) – Programme Manager / Roading Discipline Lead
- Paul Reed (Beca) – Water and Wastewater Discipline Lead
- Bevan Pratt (previously E2 Environmental) – Stormwater Discipline Lead

3.3. In addition, key members of the District Regeneration PCG meet with the EIRSG to ensure close coordination between the two programmes.

3.4. As at August 2016, the programme comprised 50 individual projects with a total budget of $41M, and 44 of the projects had been completed. The remaining projects, representing around half of the total budget, were affected by uncertainties around the future of the Residential Red Zones and could not be progressed at that time.

3.5. The Residential Red Zones Recovery Plan was approved in December 2016, providing the framework for the future of the Residential Red Zones and identifying the proposed long-term land uses in the corresponding Regeneration Areas. This enabled the remaining infrastructure works to be progressed.

3.6. As at the end of June 2018, the programme comprised 52 individually scoped projects plus budget provisions for loosely scoped works required to restore infrastructure in the Regeneration Areas. The combined forecast cost of these works is $38,219,000.


3.8. This report provides a final update on budget and programme.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

   **Recovery Programme Summary**

4.1. Since the last update, the focus for the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Steering Group has been:

- Completion of 3-waters replacement on the periphery of the Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area and in the Kaiapoi South Regeneration Area.
- Decommissioning water and wastewater infrastructure in the Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area and provisions for long-term servicing of houses within this area.
- Reconstruction of roads in the Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area and in the Kaiapoi South Regeneration Area.

4.2. The group has been working in tandem with the Regeneration Project Control Group that is tasked with implementing the Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan.

4.3. There are currently 52 individual infrastructure recovery projects on the programme and of those:

- 48 projects have been completed
- 2 are on programme (roading for Projects 43 and 48)
- 1 is behind programme (Project 45)
- 1 is programmed not to start yet (Project 39)

4.4. Since the last update four projects have been completed, which concludes all the water and wastewater projects:
4.5. There are three projects currently under construction:

- **Project 43**: Kaiapoi East Services Re-routing (road). This is damaged kerb and channel replacement in Bracebridge Street, Blackwell Crescent and Moore Street which commenced in July 2018. It is being delivered as a variation to Contract 17/45 Kaiapoi East Access Road and will be completed in September 2018.

- **Project 45**: Kaiapoi East Access Road. This was due for completion in June 2018 but prolonged wet weather in May and June, coupled with a lack of drying conditions, saturated the ground and impeded progress. Drainage and earthworks activities were continually inundated with unusually high groundwater levels. The road partially opened to traffic mid-July and will be completed mid-August 2018.

- **Project 48**: Regeneration Area Infrastructure Decommissioning (road) - water and wastewater works were completed in June 2018. The roads in Reay Place, The Oaks, Blackwell Crescent and Ilex Place have been decommissioned. The remaining roads for decommissioning, all in Kaiapoi East, will be removed under Contract 18/34: Kaiapoi East Enabling Works and Beswick SMA, which is due to go out to tender imminently.

4.6. The remaining projects funded from the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme will be delivered under the direction of the District Regeneration Project Control Group. These are integral to the development of the Regeneration Areas and discussed below.

4.7. Jones Street reconstruction was originally intended to be delivered as part of Project 45 but is influenced by the mixed-use business Regeneration Area either side. It includes some works to the west in Charles Street and Beswick Street and is currently in the concept design phase. Budget is allocated for construction this year. A report of the options will be presented to the Utilities and Roading Committee meeting on 28 August 2018.

4.8. There are other roading projects within the Regeneration Area, such as the Charles Street rebuild east of Jones Street and the boat ramp access road. These projects are included within the district regeneration programme as opposed to the earthquake recovery programme, and will consequently be delivered by the District Regeneration Project Control Group.

4.9. The remaining stormwater projects are Beswick SMA and Feldwick SMA in Kaiapoi East plus associated reticulation and the Town Centre / Raven Quay East pipework in Kaiapoi South.

4.10. Tender documents for Contract 18/34: Kaiapoi East Enabling Works and Beswick SMA are being finalised. Construction is planned to start in September 2018 with completion in March 2019.

4.11. The Feldwick SMA is linked to the Feldwick/Macintosh drainage strategy currently in development. Budget is allocated for design this year and construction in 2019/20. This will also incorporate Project 39: Feldwick Drain Stormwater Pump Station.

4.12. Table 1 below provides a summary of the programme status since November 2012, as compared with the programme at the time.
### Table 1: Summary of Project Status since November 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>Nov '12</th>
<th>Jul '13</th>
<th>Nov '14</th>
<th>Jul '15</th>
<th>Nov '16</th>
<th>Jun '17</th>
<th>Nov '17</th>
<th>Nov '18</th>
<th>Jul '18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahead of Programme</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Programme</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behind Programme</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Projects</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* projects on hold

Note: There are 52 projects in the programme but the individual project numbers extend up to 57 as some project numbers have been omitted due to projects being combined as the programme has progressed, and some projects have been split in two.

### Charles Street Wastewater Pump Station Decommissioning

4.13. The old Charles Street wastewater pump station is located adjacent to the Kaiapoi River stopbank within Charles St Reserve. The pump station was damaged in the earthquake and is no longer needed in its current form, partly due to the loss of houses within the Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area.


![Figure 1: Disused Charles St Wastewater Pump Station](image)

4.15. A new Charles St wastewater pump station has been constructed on the east side of the New World Supermarket car park. The other pump stations in Kaiapoi that used to discharge into the old Charles St pump station, now pump directly to the wastewater treatment plant through a shared rising main.

4.16. The old Charles St pump station has been decommissioned and was intended for demolition. Despite the pump station being abandoned, the physical structure is in relatively good condition and has some semi-historical significance in that it was part of the original wastewater treatment scheme for Kaiapoi. A review of the Kaiapoi Borough...
archives indicates it was to some degree managed by Norman Kirk during his time as mayor of Kaiapoi.

4.17. Given the favourable location and condition of the pump station structure, staff considered using it to form a viewing platform over the Kaiapoi River. This option was subsequently supported by the Regeneration Steering Group following a workshop outlining the proposal at the 5th March 2018 meeting.

4.18. There is still some residual work needed to confirm that the structure can be made safe and that it would represent a genuine asset for the community. The principal risk relates to the depth of the structure below ground. It is believed this risk could be mitigated relatively easily by filling the structure with compacted hard-fill to ground level, but this would need to be weighed against potential benefits of leaving the structure empty.

4.19. If the structure is to be maintained and converted to a viewing platform, then the work would generally comprise the following:

a. Potentially filling the structure to ground level with compacted hard-fill.

b. Earthworks and planting around the building to reduce its visible height and to better integrate it into the surrounding landscape.

c. Earthworks and construction of a pathway to enable pedestrian access from the adjacent stopbank onto the roof of the building.

d. Repair and strengthen the roof as required to create a public viewing platform. This includes removal of existing penetrations, possible resurfacing and installation of a perimeter barrier.

e. Potential for interpretation signage on the viewing platform.

f. Engineering assessment and design to enable the above works.

4.20. The pump station has been decommissioned, stripped of all equipment, and sealed to make safe. Given it has not been necessary to demolish and fill the pump station structure, there is a budget remaining of approximately $100,000. The estimated cost of the works is $80,000.

4.21. Council approval is sought to utilise the remaining earthquake recovery budget of $100,000 to construct the viewing platform. Subject to Council approval, the work will be completed this financial year.

4.22. The budget for demolishing the old Charles St pump station was provided from the insurance payout and attracts no contribution from the Crown. There would be no impact on rates, and there in no impediment to using the budget for the construction of the viewing platform, provided the Council agrees.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

Groups and Organisations

5.1. The works have been planned in consultation with members of the District Regeneration PCG.

Wider Community

5.2. The infrastructure recovery programme was presented to the community following its release in May 2012. Drawings showing the programme were published on the Council website and updated periodically, the latest being April 2017. These have now been removed and the information conveyed on the pages about the Regeneration Projects.

5.3. Prior to the works starting on each site, leaflets have been delivered to residents to advise them of the works and any significant delays or changes are similarly communicated.
5.4. Extensive community engagement was undertaken by Council through the development of the Draft Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial Implications

6.1. The current estimate for the entire programme is $38.2M. This is approximately $400K less than the $38.6M estimate that the 2019-29 LTP budget was based on.

6.2. The current estimate for 3 Waters (excludes Roading) of $27.8M is approximately $3.0M less than estimate of $30.8M that the Crown Cost Share Agreement was based on.

6.3. The programme estimate has been regularly updated and reported to Council. Figure 2 below presents the programme estimates and expenditure as the works have progressed.

![Graph showing Earthquake Recovery Programme Cost Estimates & Expenditure](image)

Figure 2: History of Earthquake Recovery Programme Cost Estimates & Expenditure

6.4. Figure 2 shows the challenging period that the EIRSG went through in the first six months as the team worked to define the scope of works and grappled with a challenging construction market, prior to locking in the costs through the Cost Share Agreement (CSA).

6.5. Figure 2 also highlight the period of around 18 months while there was minimal progress while the future use of the residential red zones was resolved.

6.6. A key success factor to managing to programme within the agreed budgets was application of the confidence based contingency that was implemented just prior to the CSA. Other than that, the flexibility provided by the Procurement Strategy, careful project management by the EIRSG, and a softening of the construction market are all factors that has assisted with the financial success of the programme.

Community Implications

6.7. The community implications associated with these projects are affordable, improved and more resilient 3-waters and road infrastructure.
Risk Management

6.8. The total spent on the recovery programme at the end of June 2018 was $32.2M (projects completed plus those underway) and this represents 84% of the total programme estimate noted above. As the sum spent approaches 100% of the budget, the opportunity for cost overruns decreases. Having said that, approximately $3.2M of the remaining budget is associated with Stormwater Management Areas, for which the Council does not have comparable rates. Therefore, there is a risk that the tender prices might be higher than budgeted. This will be quantified in the next two months, when tenders for the Beswick SMA will be received.

6.9. The Infrastructure Recovery Steering Group meets monthly along with representatives from the District Regeneration PCG and discusses risks associated with the projects. The group periodically reviews the Risk Register, with the last full review being undertaken in November 2017. Measures are put in place to mitigate the risks.

6.10. The Risk Register has one remaining risk categorised as “major” - exposure to contaminated ground. This is a legacy from previous land use and demolition works within the Regeneration Areas. Tonkin and Taylor is developing a Site Management Plan to inform those carrying out works of appropriate precautions. The Plan has been commissioned by the District Regeneration PCG and is expected to be available in August 2018. Indications are that the risks to health of workers and the public from contaminated ground for the remaining road recommissioning and stormwater management projects in Kaiapoi East are low; and this risk would be downgraded accordingly.

6.11. However, asbestos contamination remains a significant risk for works in parts of the Kaiapoi South Regeneration Area. Infrastructure repairs have been completed in the worst affected area at significant additional cost to the programme.

6.12. The creation of this Site Management Plan and distribution to affected parties is a regulatory requirement imposed on Council as landowner of the Regeneration Areas.

6.13. Other remaining risks are typical of “business as usual” and the risk register provides a plan to mitigate them. These risks will be managed by the District Regeneration PCG in delivering the remaining works.

Health and Safety

6.14. All works have been managed in accordance with the U&R Department’s H&S practices relating to safety in design, engaging contractors, and overseeing construction works.

7. CONTEXT

Policy

7.1. The Council is authorised to consider matters relating to programming and budgeting of earthquake recovery works.

Legislation

7.2. The Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act, Land Transport Management Act, Local Government Act are all relevant in this matter.

Community Outcomes

7.3. The following community outcomes are relevant in this matter:

∑ There is a safe environment for all.
∑ Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable, affordable and sustainable.
∑ There is sufficient clean water to meet the needs of communities and ecosystems.
∑ Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable, and affordable manner.

Gary Boot
Senior Engineering Advisor
## Attachment 1:

**Project Status Table, including Proposed Revised Construction Dates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Expected build start</th>
<th>Expected build finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Kaiapoi Town Centre Earthquake Repairs &amp; Bridge Improvements</td>
<td>COMPLETED Mar ‘14</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Kaikanui Sewer Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Feb ‘14</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Chapman PI Sewer Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Sep ‘13</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Otaki St Sewer Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Apr ‘14</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Sneyd St Sewer Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Jun’16</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Peraki St Sewage Pumping Main Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Nov ‘13</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: Courtenay Downs Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED May’18</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10: Kaiapoi Service Centre Sewer Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Nov ‘13</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12: Kaiapoi Sewer Earthquake Relining</td>
<td>COMPLETED Oct ‘13</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16: Moore St Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Jul ‘15</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17: Holland Dr Sewer Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Nov ‘13</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18: Sewell St Sewer Earthquake Recovery Works</td>
<td>COMPLETED Jun ‘15</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19: Charles St Sewer Pump Station Earthquake Recovery Works</td>
<td>COMPLETED Aug’16</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20: Pines Beach Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Aug ‘15</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21: Sewer Pump Station Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Jul ‘15</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22: Moorcroft Sewer Pump Station Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Feb ‘14</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23: Rangiora Sewer Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Jun ‘14</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24: Woodend Beach Sewer Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Dec ‘14</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25: Adderley Tce Water Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Feb ‘13</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26: Cust Water Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Nov ‘15</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27: Gray / Feldwick / Moore St North Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Oct ‘12</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Expected build start</td>
<td>Expected build finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28: Beach Rd West / Reid Memorial Ave East Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Sep ’12</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29: Dunns Ave North Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Sep ’12</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30: Adderley Tce / Fuller St Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Jun ’13</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31: Meadow St Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Mar ’14</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32: Kaiapoi West Earthquake Infrastructure Rebuild</td>
<td>COMPLETED Dec’15</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33: Various Sewer Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED May’16</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34: Kairaki Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Sept’14</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35: Courtenay Downs Sw Basins Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Apr ’13</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36: 202 Ferry Rd Stormwater Culvert Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Apr ’13</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37: Bull Farm Stormwater Pipe Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Dec ’12</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38: Kaiapoi Cemetery SW Pipe Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Aug ’13</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39: Feldwick Drain Stormwater Pump Station Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>Not started. Will be progressed by District Regeneration PCG as part of the Feldwick Stormwater Management Area</td>
<td>2019/20</td>
<td>2019/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40: Cridland St SW Pump Station Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Nov ’13</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41: Dudley Drain Stormwater Pump Station Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Jun ’14</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42: Bowler St Stormwater Pump Station Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Jun ’14</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43: Kaiapoi East Services Re-Routing Earthquake Recovery Works</td>
<td>COMPLETED Mar ’18</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44: Pines Beach Water Source Earthquake Recovery Works</td>
<td>COMPLETED Sep ’15</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45: Kaiapoi East Access Road Earthquake Recovery Works</td>
<td>2 months behind. Construction by Texco Excavating impeded by wet weather &amp; high groundwater</td>
<td>Feb’18</td>
<td>Aug’18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46: Old Waimakariri Bridge Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Jul ’13</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47: Kaiapoi Lakes Sewer Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Jun ’15</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Expected build start</td>
<td>Expected build finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48: Regeneration Area Infrastructure Decommissioning</td>
<td>In progress. Decommissioning of redundant water &amp; wastewater assets completed in Jun’18. Road decommissioning completed in Kaiapoi South &amp; underway in Kaiapoi East. Remainder will be carried out in Contract 18/34: Kaiapoi East Enabling Works</td>
<td>Jan’14</td>
<td>Mar’19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49: Doubledays Rd Culvert Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED May ’13</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50: Ocean Outfall Trunk Main Valve Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Dec ‘13</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51: Fuller St Stormwater Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Sep ‘14</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52: Well Redevelopments</td>
<td>COMPLETED Jun ‘15</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53: Hugh St Sewer Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Nov ‘13</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54: Waikuku Beach Stormwater Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED Jul ‘14</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55: Stone St Sewer Earthquake Repairs</td>
<td>COMPLETED May ’14</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56: Dudley Drain Earthquake Regeneration</td>
<td>COMPLETED Jun’18</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57: Servicing Houses in the Regeneration Area</td>
<td>COMPLETED Jun’18</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SUBJECT: Building (Earthquake Prone Buildings) Amendment Act 2016
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1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report recommends that Council approves consultation with the community regarding the identification of ‘priority’ buildings.

1.2 The Building (Earthquake Prone Buildings) Amendment Act 2016 (the Act) makes it Council’s role to identify all potentially earthquake-prone buildings within set time-frames, assign an earthquake rating if applicable, and put the information into a national register.

1.3 The Act also introduces the concept of ‘priority buildings’ and requires Council to undertake community consultation (through the Local Government Act 2002, S83 Special Consultative Procedure) to identify priority buildings and roads/footpaths that could be impacted by having an unreinforced masonry building (URB) located in close proximity to them, whereby there is the potential for an unreinforced masonry part to fall onto the identified thoroughfare.

1.4 Public consultation is required to identify priority routes/buildings that could impact on public thoroughfares. All Boards have been consulted on this matter and at this stage in this District, three roads fit into this category:

- Williams Street, Kaiapoi (Old BNZ building)
- Walker Street, Kaiapoi (Kaiapoi Mill)
- High Street, Rangiora (approximately nine buildings)

1.5 The public consultation submission period is proposed from 20 August to 20 September with a Hearing to consider all submissions programmed for Thursday 11 October. To facilitate the process this report also seeks the Council to appoint three Councillors to the Hearing panel. The Hearing panel would then make recommendations to the Council.

Attachments:

i) Statement of Proposal, Earthquake-prone buildings legislation (Trim 180619068194)
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council

(a) **Receives** report No: 180710076763

(b) **Approves** the Statement of Proposal for public consultation in accordance with Section 83 of the *Local Government Act 2002*, and *Building (Earthquake prone buildings) Amendment Act 2016*, Subpart 6A – *Special provisions for earthquake-prone buildings*.

(c) **Notes** that the period of public consultation will be from 20 August to 20 September 2018, following which a hearing is proposed for later in October.

(d) **Notes** consultation with affected property owners is being undertaken.

(e) **Appoints** Councillor….. and Councillor….. and Councillor….. to the Hearing Panel.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 The *Building (Earthquake Prone Buildings) Amendment Act 2016* came into force on 1 July 2017. The Act introduced a new system to ensure the way buildings are managed for future earthquakes is consistent across the country, and provides more information for people using buildings.

3.2 The new system prioritises identification and remediation of earthquake-prone buildings (EPB) that either pose a high risk to life or are critical to recovery in an emergency. Certain hospital, emergency and education buildings that are earthquake-prone will be ‘priority buildings’. Other EPB may be priority buildings due to their location and the potential impact of their failure in an earthquake on people. These buildings must be identified with community input.

3.3 Priority buildings must be identified and remediated in half the usual time, to reduce the risks to life safety more promptly.

3.1. The significant amount of earthquake strengthening of buildings undertaken since the Canterbury earthquakes in 2010/11 means there are very few URM buildings in this District that meet the criteria of the Act. Even so, public consultation must be undertaken to ensure all priority buildings are identified and the danger mitigated in accordance with the requirements of the Act. Public consultation through the special consultative procedure is formal with a 20 day period for submissions to be made, the matters to be heard by a Hearing panel which then makes a recommendation back to the Council. The Hearing is programmed for Thursday 11 October and Deliberations by the panel set for Tuesday 23 October.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The Waimakariri District is in a high seismic risk area which means Council must identify potentially earthquake-prone priority buildings by 1 January 2020 and owners of these buildings must carry out seismic working within 7.5 years (time from the issue of EPB notice).

4.2. To determine which buildings in the District should be identified as ‘priority buildings’ Council must identify (1) which thoroughfares have sufficient vehicle or pedestrian traffic to warrant prioritisation if part of an unreinforced masonry (URM) building were to fall onto them in an earthquake; and (2) which transport routes of strategic importance would be impeded if buildings collapsed onto them in an earthquake.

4.3. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.
5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations
Building owners will be advised of the implications of the Act on their building(s) through face-to-face meetings and followed up with written communication.

5.2. Wider Community
Wider public consultation will be undertaken using the special consultative procedure in the Local Government Act 2012 S83. It is proposed public consultation will open on 20 August and close on 20 September 2018.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications
This consultation will be undertaken using current staff resources and within current budgets.

6.2. Community Implications
On completion of this consultation, priority buildings and strategic routes will be identified and danger to life mitigated in accordance with the provisions of the Act.

6.3. Risk Management
Building owners will be aware of their responsibilities under the Act and monitoring by Council staff will ensure compliance. Public consultation will provide the widest possible identification of unreinforced masonry buildings and strategic paths/roads to ensure the risk to the public is minimised.

If there is a major earthquake in the next 7.5 years, before building owners have time to complete strengthening work, there is a risk to the public. The URM buildings register ensures the public has knowledge of the buildings that are potentially unsafe.

6.4. Health and Safety
URM buildings will be identified as part of the public consultation, the register of these buildings will be available to the public. The Act provides that these buildings must be strengthened within 7.5 years to ensure that “people who use buildings can do so safely and without endangering their health” (Building Act 2004). Unreinforced masonry facades, parapets etc pose a risk to pedestrians/vehicles passing by as demonstrated through the Canterbury earthquakes.

7. CONTEXT

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

7.2. Legislation
Building (Earthquake prone buildings) Amendment Act 2016, Subpart 6A – Special provisions for earthquake-prone buildings
Local Government Act 2002, S83 Special consultative procedure

7.3. Community Outcomes
There is a safe environment for all
- Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised.
- Our district has the capacity and resilience to quickly recover from natural disasters and adapt to the effects of climate change.
Earthquake-Prone Buildings Legislation
Statement of Proposal
1 Introduction

The system for identifying and managing earthquake-prone buildings changed on 1 July 2017, when the Building (Earthquake-prone Buildings) Amendment Act 2016 came into effect. The new system ensures the way buildings are managed for future earthquakes is consistent across the country, and provides more information for people using buildings. There are new requirements, powers and time frames to address earthquake-prone buildings.

More information about the new system can be found at: https://www.building.govt.nz/managing-buildings/managing-earthquake-prone-buildings

2 Managing earthquake-prone buildings

2.1 Earthquake-prone priority buildings

The new system prioritises identification and remediation of earthquake-prone buildings that either pose a high risk to life safety, or are critical to recovery in an emergency. Certain hospital, emergency, and education buildings that are earthquake-prone will be priority buildings. Other earthquake-prone buildings may be identified as priority buildings because of their location, and the potential impact on people if they fail in an earthquake and block access routes important to the community. These buildings must be identified with community input.

Priority buildings must be identified and remediated in half the usual time to reduce the risks to life safety more promptly. This means the Council must identify potentially earthquake-prone priority buildings in this district within 2.5 years, and building owners must strengthen or demolish earthquake-prone priority buildings within 7.5 years.1

Waimakariri District Council must identify, with community assistance:
(1) which thoroughfares in the District have sufficient vehicle or pedestrian traffic to warrant prioritisation, if part of an Unreinforced Masonry (URM) building2 were to fall onto them in an earthquake; and
(2) which transport routes of strategic importance would be impeded if buildings collapsed onto them in an earthquake.

3 Why are we consulting?

Your input is sought to identify whether there are any buildings that may need to be classified as priority buildings.

1 From the date the earthquake-prone building notice is issued
2 An unreinforced masonry (URM) building has masonry walls that do not contain steel, timber or fibre reinforcement. URM buildings are older buildings that often have parapets, as well as verandas, balconies, decorative ornaments, chimneys and signs attached to their facades (front walls that face onto a street or open space).
To determine which other buildings may be priority buildings, Waimakariri District Council must identify thoroughfares that have both URM buildings and sufficient vehicle or pedestrian use.

Your views will assist to inform the Council’s decision on which thoroughfares (if any) to prioritise.

This consultation is in accordance with section 133AF(2)(a) of the Building Act 2004, which requires Council to use the special consultative procedure in section 83 of the Local Government Act 2002 to identify these priority buildings.

4 Proposals

4.1 Vehicle and pedestrian roads and accessways with sufficient traffic to warrant prioritisation

Waimakariri District Council has applied the following criteria to identify roads, footpaths or other thoroughfares to be prioritised:

1. **High pedestrian areas (people not in vehicles)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of use</th>
<th>Description of area</th>
<th>Example of application to Waimakariri District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Areas relating to social or utility activities</td>
<td>Areas where shops or other services are located</td>
<td>Town and suburban areas with shops, cafes, restaurants, bars and lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas relating to work</td>
<td>Areas where concentrations of people work and move around</td>
<td>Areas around office buildings or other places of work where there is a concentration of workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas relating to transport</td>
<td>Areas where concentrations of people access transport</td>
<td>Areas around bus stops and car parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key walking routes</td>
<td>Key walking routes that link areas where people are concentrated</td>
<td>Routes from bus stops and car parks to areas where there are shops, other services or work locations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Areas with high vehicle traffic (people in motor vehicles/on bikes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of use</th>
<th>Description of area</th>
<th>Example of application to Waimakariri District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key traffic routes</td>
<td>Key traffic routes regularly used by vehicles including public transport</td>
<td>Central business district streets, arterial routes, bus routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas with concentrations of vehicles</td>
<td>Areas where high concentrations of vehicles build up</td>
<td>Busy intersections, areas where traffic builds up at peak hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and

3. Potential for part of an unreinforced masonry building to fall onto the identified thoroughfare

Waimakariri District Council seeks your views on whether the following roads, footpaths and other thoroughfares have sufficient traffic to warrant prioritisation. It also seeks your views on whether there are any other thoroughfares that should be included.

Based on their being sufficient traffic and the potential for part of an unreinforced masonry building to fall, Waimakariri District Council proposes the following thoroughfares to be prioritised:

- **Rangiora CBD** – the boundary is outlined in red on the map in Appendix 1, High Street from Percival Street to East Belt.
- **Kaiapoi CBD** – the boundary is outlined in red on the map in Appendix 2, Williams Street and Charles Street in the vicinity of the Bank of New Zealand building.
- **Kaiapoi, Ranfurly Street** – the boundary is outlined in red on the map in Appendix 3, Ranfurly Street from Smith Street past the old mill building.

Questions

1. Do you agree with the routes identified for prioritisation?
2. If not, which routes do you disagree with and why?
3. Are there any other routes that meet the criteria but are not listed?
4.2 Buildings on a transport route of strategic importance

Buildings impeding a strategic transport route in an earthquake could inhibit an emergency response to the detriment of the community, i.e. loss of life, if access to emergency care is not possible.

Waimakariri District Council has applied the following criteria to identify buildings on transport routes of strategic importance in an emergency for prioritisation:

1. **Emergency routes**
   Routes likely to be used by emergency services in:
   (a) transiting from their bases to areas of need in a major emergency, or
   (b) transiting to central services such as hospitals, where there are no alternative routes available.

2. At least one building located on them that, if it collapsed, would impede the route.

Waimakariri District Council has not identified any emergency route that should be prioritised.

We seek your views on whether there are any routes that you think should be included, based on the likelihood of use by emergency services in an emergency and the potential for at least one building to impede the route if it collapsed.

**Questions**

1. Are there any other routes that meet the criteria but are not listed?
5 Have your say

Submissions

Anyone can make a submission on this Statement of Proposal. The Waimakariri District Council wishes to hear from any person, group or business that would like to make a submission on proposed thoroughfares for prioritisation.

This consultation is open from 20 August 2018 to 20 September 2018 and all relevant information is available on the Council’s website www.waimakariri.co.nz. Hard copies are available from the Council’s libraries and service centres.

6 What happens next

Once consultation closes on 20 September, Council will consider and hear submissions on Thursday 11 October. A proposal will be determined in November.

Once priority thoroughfares have been finalized, Council will look at buildings on those thoroughfares to determine whether they are potentially earthquake-prone in accordance with the Earthquake-prone Building methodology. Affected building owners will be notified. Owners of potentially earthquake-prone buildings, whether a priority building or not, have 12 months to provide an engineering assessment. Council will then determine whether the building is earthquake-prone, and notify the building owner of remediation requirements.

3 The EPB methodology is a regulatory tool that sets out the types of buildings that [Council] must identify as potentially earthquake-prone.
1. SUMMARY

1.1. This report seeks Council's approval to consult on the proposed speed limit change as shown on Figure 1, and summarised in Table 1:

![Figure 1 Map of Proposed Speed Limit Changes](image-url)
Table 1 Summary of Proposed Speed Limit Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Woodend Road from end of existing 80km/h east of Smarts Road to proposed Ravenswood roundabout</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Woodend Road from proposed Ravenswood roundabout to start of 50km/h north of School Road</td>
<td>70km/h</td>
<td>60km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gressons Road</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys Road from Rangiora Woodend Road to existing 50km/h at railway line</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbrook Road from Boys Road to existing 50km/h east of Goodwin Street</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2. Community Boards normally approve requests to consult on speed limit changes. However, in this instance, the speed limits being reviewed fall within the Rangiora Ashley, Woodend Sefton, and Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board areas. It was therefore considered more appropriate to seek Council approval on behalf of all three affected Boards. Each of the affected Boards will receive a copy of this report.

1.3. The safe and appropriate speeds for these roads have been assessed using NZTA’s Speed Management Guide (2016)

1.4. The road environment on the section of Rangiora Woodend Road through, and immediately north west of Woodend is likely to be affected by both the Ravenswood development, and any measures implemented by NZTA as part of their project to improve access onto and across State Highway 1 through Woodend.

1.5. Construction of stage 1B of the residential portion of the Ravenswood development is expected to start in October 2018. This stage will include a new roundabout north west of Chinnerys Road, and residential development fronting onto Rangiora Woodend Road between the roundabout and Chinnerys Road. It is considered desirable to have a new speed limit in place prior to completion of these works.

1.6. The 60km/h speed limit proposed for the urban section of Rangiora Woodend Road is higher than the assessed safe and appropriate speed. This is because physical measures to reduce the operating speeds are likely to be necessary. Implementation of these measures is not considered justified until there is more clarity about the impacts of NZTA’s possible proposals for SH1 on Rangiora Woodend Road.

1.7. Feedback has been sought from the community on the question of whether the speed limits on these roads should be reduced (without suggesting a proposed new limit). Printed survey forms were distributed to adjacent property owners, and to pupils of Woodend School. An online survey was also carried out using Survey Monkey.

1.8. A summary of feedback responses, excluding the Woodend School responses, is shown in Table 2. A more detailed breakdown of responses is shown in Table 9.

Table 2 Summary of Feedback Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Woodend Road - Rural</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Woodend Road - Urban</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gressons Road</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys Road</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 180706075194.

(b) Approves consultation being carried out on the proposed speed limit changes summarised below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Woodend Road from end of existing 80km/h east of Smarts Road to proposed Ravenswood roundabout</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Woodend Road from proposed Ravenswood roundabout to start of 50km/h north of School Road</td>
<td>70km/h</td>
<td>60km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gressons Road</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys Road from Rangiora Woodend Road to existing 50km/h at railway line</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbrook Road from Boys Road to existing 50km/h east of Goodwin Street</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Notes the consultation on this proposal will be carried out between 13 August and 9 September 2018.

(d) Notes the Community Boards will be updated at the end of the consultation process.

(e) Notes that any submissions on the proposal will be taken into account before the speed limit change is presented to the Council on 2 October 2018 for approval.

(f) Circulates this report to the Community Boards.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1. The review of speed limits on Rangiora-Woodend Road has been prompted by the addition of the cycleway along this road, and the increase of traffic flows associated with changing land uses in the District. In particular, the Ravenswood development is likely to have a significant impact on the environment adjacent to the Rangiora Woodend Road, and on traffic flows and make up.

3.2. The other roads included in this review have been included because it was considered valuable to maintain a consistency of approach to speed limits in the area.

3.3. This speed limit review has been based on the 2017 Speed Limit Setting rule, and the 2016 Speed Management Guide.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. Each of the specific sections of road are discussed in the sections below
RANGIORA WOODEND ROAD

4.2. Rangiora-Woodend Road is an Arterial road between Smarts Road and Chinnerys Road and a Primary collector between Chinnerys Road and School Road. The road consists of an undivided sealed carriageway with narrow shoulders with numerous roadside hazards such as power poles, ditches and vehicle entrances along its length.

4.3. The existing speed limits on Rangiora Woodend Road are:
   - 80km/h to the west of Smarts Road (outside area under review)
   - 100 km/h from Smarts Road to Chinnerys Road
   - 70km/h from Chinnerys Road to School Road
   - 50km/h from School Road to SH1 (outside area under review)

4.4. Current land use on both sides of Rangiora Woodend Road is rural between Smarts Road and Chinnerys Road. Beyond Chinnerys Road the land uses are residential on the north eastern side of the road, and rural on the south western side.

Ravenswood Development

4.5. The Ravenswood development is expected to have significant impacts on the section of Rangiora Woodend Road to the north west of Chinnerys Road.

4.6. Stage 1A of the residential portion of Ravenswood is currently under construction. It includes properties fronting onto Chinnerys Road, and new internal roading connecting onto Chinnerys Road. It does not include properties or roading with access onto Rangiora Woodend Road.

4.7. Construction of Ravenswood Stage 1B is scheduled to run from October 2018 to May 2019. This stage will include properties with access onto Rangiora Woodend Road, and a roundabout at the intersection of Rangiora Woodend Road and the new Bob Robertson Drive. Bob Robertson Drive will eventually link Rangiora Woodend Road with the commercial section of the Ravenswood development and the roundabout on State Highway 1 at Pegasus Boulevard.

4.8. The speed limit assessment has therefore assumed that the land uses adjacent to the section of Rangiora Woodend Road between Chinnerys Road and the new Ravenswood roundabout will be similar to those adjacent to the section between Chinnerys Road and School Road.

4.9. Table 3 shows the recorded Average Daily Traffic (ADT) volumes on Rangiora Woodend Road:

Table 3 Rangiora Woodend Road Traffic Counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>ADT (vpd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/05/2018</td>
<td>South of Woodend Rd</td>
<td>3,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/09/2017</td>
<td>100m south of Chinnerys Rd</td>
<td>5,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/05/2018</td>
<td>140m east of Boys Road</td>
<td>10,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/05/2018</td>
<td>350m west of Boys Rd</td>
<td>6,680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NZTA projects

4.10. NZTA has a project underway to provide safer access across and onto State Highway 1 in Woodend. This project is likely to result in improved access onto SH1 in a limited number of locations. This may result in some routes accessing SH1 becoming more attractive than others, thereby contributing to changed traffic patterns on Rangiora Woodend Road. This may prompt changes to intersection, or other, layouts along Rangiora Woodend Road.

4.11. The nature and timing of any changes associated with improving access to SH1 are currently unknown. The speed limit assessment has therefore assumed no changes associated with these measures.

Assessment – Smarts Road to Proposed Ravenswood Roundabout

4.12. Full speed limit assessments are included in Attachment 1. The assessment for Rangiora Woodend Road – Smarts Road to proposed Ravenswood roundabout is summarised in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Speed Limit</th>
<th>100km/h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of feedback respondents supporting a lower speed limit (See section 5)</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Function</td>
<td>Class 2 (Arterial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Risk</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Risk</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Risk Rating</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Safe and Appropriate Speed</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Mean Speed</td>
<td>85.3km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Speed Limit</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Options - Smarts Road to Proposed Ravenswood Roundabout

4.13. The assessed safe and appropriate speed is 80km/h. In addition, the Speed Limit Setting Rule recommends that mean operating speeds are no more than 10% above the posted speed limit. The current recorded mean speed (85km/h) meets this recommendation with a posted speed limit of 80km/h. It is therefore recommended that consultation be carried out on reducing the speed limit to 80km/h on Rangiora Woodend Road between Smarts Road to the Proposed Ravenswood roundabout. Other options considered include:

1. **Leave Speed Limit at 100km/h.**

4.14. This option is not recommended because the roadside features, including power poles, roadside drains, intersections, property accesses, and the cycleway pose significant hazards. The speed survey suggests that this section of road is currently operating as an 80km/h road rather than a 100km/h road.

2. **Consult on reducing the speed limit lower than 80km/h.**

4.15. 70km/h speed limits are not supported by the current Speed Limit Setting rule. A dispensation would be required by NZTA to set a new 70km/h speed limit. An application
for a dispensation would need to show how the 70km/h limit would be phased out. It is considered unlikely that NZTA would approve a 70km/h limit.

4.16. A 60km/h limit is considered too slow for this environment. The roadside environment and road alignment do not suggest a 60km/h speed environment to drivers. This is reflected in the current mean speed. Compliance with a 60km/h limit in this environment is likely to be poor without significant changes to the roadside and road environment.

4.17. This option is therefore not recommended.

Assessment – Proposed Ravenswood Roundabout to School Road

4.18. Full speed limit assessments are included in Attachment 1. The assessment for Rangiora Woodend Road – Smarts Road to proposed Ravenswood roundabout is summarised in Table 5

| Table 5 Speed Limit Assessment Rangiora Woodend Road - Ravenswood Roundabout to School Road |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Current Speed Limit | 70 km/h and 100km/h |
| Percentage of feedback respondents supporting a lower speed limit (See section 5) | 52% |
| Road Function | Class 3 (Primary Collector) |
| Collective Risk | Low |
| Personal Risk | Low |
| Infrastructure Risk Rating | Low-Medium |
| Assessed Safe and Appropriate Speed | 50km/h |
| Recorded Mean Speed | 62.6km/h |
| Recommended Speed Limit | 60km/h |

Options – Proposed Ravenswood Roundabout to School Road

4.19. It is recommended that consultation be carried out on reducing the speed limit to 60km/h on Rangiora Woodend Road between the proposed Ravenswood roundabout and the existing 50km/h speed limit west of School Road for the following reasons:

1. Although the safe and appropriate speed is assessed at 50km/h, the recorded mean speed suggests that significant engineering works would be required reduce the operating speed to within 10% of 50km/h. Such works are not recommended prior to confirmation of SH1 access works being proposed by NZTA.
2. The current mean speed is less than 10% higher than the recommended speed limit;
3. Residential development is expected to extend to the section of road between the proposed roundabout and the current urban edge of Woodend at Chinnerys Road by mid 2019.

4.20. Other options considered include:

1. Leave Speed Limits at 100 and 70km/h.

4.21. This option is not recommended because the roadside features, including, existing and proposed urban development, intersections, and property accesses make a lower speed limit appropriate for this section of road. The speed survey suggests that this section of road is currently operating as a 60km/h road rather than a 70 or 100km/h road.
2. Consult on Lowering the Rural Section (proposed roundabout to Chinnerys Road) to 80km/h.

4.22. The proposed roundabout will perform a significant “gateway” function for Woodend, traffic approaching the town.

4.23. The proposed residential development on this section of Rangiora Woodend Road will give the north eastern side of this section of road a much more urban feel than it currently has.

4.24. A detailed construction programme for the roundabout and other construction works on Rangiora Woodend Road, including services installation and road and footpath construction, will not be available until a contractor is appointed for the construction of Ravenswood Stage 1B. However, the developer’s programme is for construction to start in October 2018, and continue until May 2019. It is likely that this section of Rangiora Woodend Road will be under some form of temporary traffic management for much of this period.

4.25. There is a small risk that stage 1B of the Ravenswood development does not proceed within the proposed timeframe. However, it is considered unlikely that the roundabout and development on this section of Rangiora Woodend Road will not proceed at some stage. It is considered appropriate to consult on speed limits to suit a likely well defined development.

4.26. This option is therefore not recommended

3. Delay Consultation until Future NZTA Projects are confirmed

4.27. NZTA’s projects to improve access across and to SH1 may have an effect on the layout and nature of Rangiora Woodend Road, and other roads in Woodend. It may also affect the location and nature of the future extension of the cycleway into the Woodend urban area.

4.28. Both of these factors are likely to influence the safe and appropriate speeds on Rangiora Woodend Road within Woodend. It is therefore possible that a further review of speed limits on this section of Rangiora Woodend Road may be required once there is clarity about the nature and timing of NZTA’s proposals for access to SH1, including pedestrian and cycle connections to and across the highway. Delaying consultation, and any subsequent speed limit changes, minimises the likelihood of needing to review the speed limits again. However, it does not address the likely changes to the road environment associated with the Ravenswood stage 1B development.

4.29. Not adjusting the speed limit to suit these developments has some potentially significant safety effects. This option is therefore not recommended

4.30. A variation of this option is to extend the 70km/h limit to include the section between Chinnerys Road and the proposed Ravenswood roundabout, and delay consultation on the extended 70km/h section until there is clarity around the nature and timing of NZTA’s proposals.

4.31. An extension of the 70km/h limit will require a special dispensation from NZTA. An argument could be made that the 70km/h limit would be reviewed once there was clarity about the wider Woodend access proposals, and that it was therefore comparatively short term. This is considered a reasonably strong argument, but there is still some uncertainty over how NZTA would view it.
4.32. This option has some advantages over the preferred option, but its inability to address the speed on the existing urban section of Rangiora Woodend Road and the uncertainty over NZTA’s response mean that it is not the preferred option. It should be noted that this is a subjective assessment, and it is not unequivocal.

4. Consult on Reducing the Speed Limit to 50km/h

4.33. The safe and appropriate speed for this section of road is assessed at 50km/h. However, it is considered that the combination of long sections of very wide road and a rural environment on one side is likely to result in poor compliance with a 50kmh speed limit.

4.34. The recorded mean speed is 63km/h. A reduction in mean speed of 8km/h is required to meet the target that mean operating speed not exceed the posted speed limit by more than 10%. This is unlikely to be met by merely reducing the speed limit and enforcement. Further engineering measures are likely to be required.

4.35. Measures to make the road “feel” more like a 50km/h road, and thereby reduce the operating speed, include provision cycle lanes, lane narrowing, and road narrowing. These measures are not recommended prior to confirmation of measures that NZTA might be implementing on the State Highway.

4.36. This option also has some advantages over the preferred option, but the need to implement physical measures to achieve compliance mean that it is not the preferred option. This is also a subjective assessment, and is not unequivocal.

GRESSONS ROAD

4.37. Gressons Road is primary collector linking Rangiora-Woodend Road with SH1. The road is an undivided sealed carriageway with multiple hazards such as power poles, ditches and Vehicle entrances along its length with a speed limit of 100 km/hr. The Average Daily Traffic (ADT) is 2,313 Vehicles per day.

4.38. Current land use on both sides of Gressons Road is rural.

Assessment – Gressons Road

4.39. Full speed limit assessments are included in Attachment 1. The assessment for Gressons Road is summarised in Table 6.

Table 6 Speed Limit Assessment Gressons Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Speed Limit</th>
<th>100km/h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of feedback respondents supporting change (See section 5)</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Function</td>
<td>Class 2 (Arterial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Risk</td>
<td>Medium High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Risk</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Risk Rating</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Safe and Appropriate Speed</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Mean Speed</td>
<td>93.0km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Speed Limit</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Options – Gressons Road

4.40. The assessed safe and appropriate speed is 80km/h. In addition, the Speed Limit Setting Rule recommends that mean operating speeds are no more than 10% above the posted speed limit. The current recorded mean speed (93km/h) does not meet this recommendation with a posted speed limit of 80km/h. A mean speed reduction of 5km/h is required to meet this target. A reduction of this magnitude is considered to be a stretch, but achievable with a speed limit change and enforcement.

4.41. It is therefore recommended that consultation be carried out on reducing the speed limit to 80km/h on Rangiora Woodend Road between Smarts Road to the Proposed Ravenswood roundabout. Other options considered include:

1. Leave Speed Limit at 100km/h.

4.42. The roadside features, including power poles, roadside drains, intersections, property accesses, and the cycleway pose significant hazards on this road.

4.43. The speed limit on SH1 at the intersection with Gressons Road is 80km/h. If the limit on Rangiora Woodend Road reduces to 80km/h and Gressons Road stays at 100km/h then Gressons Road would be inconsistent with both the adjacent roads.

4.44. This option is therefore not recommended.

BOYS ROAD – Rangiora Woodend Road to 50km/h Limit East of Railway Line

4.45. Boys Road is a primary collector linking Rangiora-Woodend Road with the urban area of Rangiora at South Belt. The road is an undivided sealed carriageway with multiple hazards such as power poles, ditches and Vehicle entrances along its length with a speed limit of 100 km/hr. The Average Daily Traffic (ADT) is 1,638 Vehicles per day.

4.46. Current land use on both sides of Boys Road is rural.

Assessment – Boys Road

4.47. Full speed limit assessments are included in Attachment 1. The assessment for Boys Road is summarised in Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7 Speed Limit Assessment Boys Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Speed Limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of feedback respondents supporting change (See section 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Risk Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Safe and Appropriate Speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Mean Speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Speed Limit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Options – Boys Road

4.48. The assessed safe and appropriate speed is 80km/h. In addition, the Speed Limit Setting Rule recommends that mean operating speeds are no more than 10% above the posted speed limit. The current recorded mean speed (89km/h) is extremely close to meeting this recommendation with a posted speed limit of 80km/h. A reduction in mean speed of 1km/h is required to meet this target. A reduction of this magnitude is considered to be readily achievable with a speed limit change and enforcement.

4.49. It is therefore recommended that consultation be carried out on reducing the speed limit to 80km/h on Boys Road. Other options considered include:

1. Leave Speed Limit at 100km/h.

4.50. The roadside features, including power poles, roadside drains, intersections, property accesses, and the cycleway pose significant hazards. The speed survey suggests that this section of road is currently operating more as an 80km/h road rather than a 100km/h road.

4.51. If the limit on Rangiora Woodend Road reduces to 80km/h and Boys Road stays at 100km/h then Boys Road would be inconsistent with adjacent roads.

4.52. This option is therefore not recommended.

NORTHBROOK ROAD – Boys Road to 50km/h Limit East of Goodwin Street

4.53. Northbrook Road is primary collector to the south-west of Rangiora-Woodend Road. It connects Boys Road to the eastern part of the Rangiora urban area. The road is a narrow, undivided sealed carriageway with multiple hazards such as power poles, ditches and Vehicle entrances along its length with a speed limit of 100 km/hr. The Average Daily Traffic (ADT) is 4,795 Vehicles per day.

4.54. Land uses on the section of Northbrook Road being reviewed are rural.

Assessment – Northbrook Road

4.55. Full speed limit assessments are included in Attachment 1. The assessment for Northbrook Road is summarised in Table 8.

Table 8 Speed Limit Assessment Boys Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Speed Limit</th>
<th>100km/h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of feedback respondents supporting change (See section 5)</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Function</td>
<td>Class 3 (Primary Collector)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Risk</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Risk</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Risk Rating</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Safe and Appropriate Speed</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Mean Speed</td>
<td>82.6km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Speed Limit</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Options – Northbrook Road**

4.56. The assessed safe and appropriate speed is 80km/h. In addition, the Speed Limit Setting Rule recommends that mean operating speeds are no more than 10% above the posted speed limit. The current recorded mean speed (83km/h) meets this target with a posted speed limit of 80km/h.

4.57. It is therefore recommended that consultation be carried out on reducing the speed limit to 80km/h on Boys Road. Other options considered include:

1. **Leave Speed Limit at 100km/h.**

4.58. The roadside features, including power poles, roadside drains, intersections, property accesses, and the cycleway pose significant hazards. The speed survey suggests that this section of road is currently operating more as an 80km/h road rather than a 100km/h road.

4.59. If the limit on Rangiora Woodend and Boys Roads reduce to 80km/h and Boys Road stays at 100km/h then Boys Road would be inconsistent with adjacent roads.

4.60. This option is therefore not recommended.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations** During the proposed consultation process the views of the following key stakeholder groups will be sought:

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

5.2. **Wider Community** Feedback has been sought from the wider community regarding the wider question of whether speed limits on these roads should be lowered. The feedback process did not propose any specific speed limits. Full details of the feedback received are included in Attachment iii, and summarised in Table 9.

5.3. Printed feedback forms were made distributed to adjacent property owners and made available through Council service centres and libraries. Returns from these forms are referred to as “Returned Survey Form Results” in the table. Survey forms were distributed to pupils of Woodend School by the school. Returns from the school pupils are referred to as “Woodend School Results”. An online option was also available. This option used Survey Monkey to process the responses. This is referred to as “Survey Monkey Results”.

5.4. There is much stronger support for reducing the speed limit amongst the responses using the survey forms than amongst those using the online survey. This may reflect the demographic of respondents who do not have ready access to the internet or are uncomfortable using it. It may also reflect a bias towards those who live adjacent to the affected roads and received the hard copy questionnaire.

5.5. The Survey Monkey results may be more reflective of those who travel these roads.
### Table 9 Feedback Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Description</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Returned Survey Forms Results</th>
<th>Woodend School Results</th>
<th>Survey Monkey Results</th>
<th>Total Survey Results</th>
<th>Total Survey Results Excl Woodend School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Woodend Road between existing 80 km/h sign east of Smarts Road to the 70 km/h sign at Chinnerys Road - current speed limit 100 km/h</td>
<td>Yes, I think this road should have a lower speed limit</td>
<td>62 19</td>
<td>75% 23%</td>
<td>24 9</td>
<td>174 89</td>
<td>150 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No, I think this road should stay the same</td>
<td>50 30</td>
<td>60% 36%</td>
<td>14 19</td>
<td>134 128</td>
<td>120 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Woodend Road from Chinnerys Road to School Road - current speed limit 70 km/h</td>
<td>Yes, I think the speed limit should have a lower speed limit</td>
<td>51 29</td>
<td>61% 35%</td>
<td>18 15</td>
<td>139 124</td>
<td>121 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No, I think the speed limit should stay the same</td>
<td>56 25</td>
<td>67% 30%</td>
<td>22 11</td>
<td>146 117</td>
<td>124 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gresson Road - Current speed limit 100 km/h</td>
<td>Yes, I think this road should have a lower speed limit</td>
<td>62 19</td>
<td>75% 23%</td>
<td>No, I think this road should have a lower speed limit</td>
<td>161 102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys Road from the railway line to Rangiora Woodend Road - current speed limit 100 km/h</td>
<td>No, I think the speed limit should stay the same</td>
<td>66% 34%</td>
<td>51% 48%</td>
<td>52% 47%</td>
<td>55% 44%</td>
<td>61% 38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbrook road east of Goodwin Street to Boys Road - current speed limit 100 km/h</td>
<td>Yes, I think this road should have a lower speed limit</td>
<td>34% 47%</td>
<td>34% 47%</td>
<td>34% 47%</td>
<td>34% 47%</td>
<td>34% 47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications There are no financial implications in consulting on this.

6.2. Community Implications The views of the community are being sought.

6.3. Risk Management

6.4. 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.

7.2. Legislation

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

The Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits Rule (2017) requires that permanent speed limits be set by bylaw.

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

7.3. Community Outcomes

Governance

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. 1,3
- The Council takes account of the views across the community including mana whenua. 1,3
- The Council makes known its views on significant proposals by others affecting the District’s wellbeing. 3
- Opportunities for collaboration and partnerships are actively pursued. 1,2,3,4

7.4. Delegations

The Speed Limits Bylaw 2009 enables the Council to set speed limits by Council resolution.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL
MEMO

FILE NO: RDG-31/180706075236

DATE: 27 July 2018

MEMO TO: Bill Rice – Senior Transport Engineer

FROM: Nick Rochford – Graduate Engineer

SUBJECT: Rangiora-Woodend Road, Gressons Road, Boys Road and Northbrook Road

1.0 Background

The purpose of this memo is to report on the findings of a speed limit review undertaken on Rangiora-Woodend Road as well as the surrounding roads of Gressons Road, Boys Road and Northbrook Road.

Rangiora-Woodend Road is an Arterial road between Smarts Road and the proposed Ravenswood Roundabout and a Primary collector between the proposed Ravenswood Roundabout and School Road between Rangiora and Woodend. The road is an undivided sealed carriageway with narrow shoulders with roadside hazards along its length such as power poles, ditches and vehicle entrances. The road itself has multiple speed limits of 80 km/hr, 100 km/hr, 70 km/hr and 50 km/hr between Golf Links road and Schools Road. The Average Daily Traffic (ADT) is 10,195 vehicles per day.

Gressons Road is a primary collector to the north-east of Rangiora-Woodend road. The road is an undivided sealed carriageway with multiple hazards such as power poles, ditches and vehicle entrances along its length with a speed limit of 100 km/hr. The Average Daily Traffic (ADT) is 2,313 Vehicles per day.

Northbrook Road is primary collector to the south-west of Rangiora-Woodend road towards Rangiora. The road is an undivided sealed carriageway with multiple hazards such as power poles, ditches and vehicle entrances along its length with a speed limit of 100 km/hr. The Average Daily Traffic (ADT) is 4,795 Vehicles per day.

Boys Road is primary collector to the south-west of Rangiora-Woodend road. The road is an undivided sealed carriageway with multiple hazards such as power poles, ditches and vehicle entrances along its length with a speed limit of 100 km/hr. The Average Daily Traffic (ADT) is 1,638 Vehicles per day.

The reasons for reviewing the speed limit on Rangiora-Woodend Road and its surrounding roads is due to the increase of traffic flows and new addition of the cycleway along Rangiora-Woodend road. As well as the eventual development of Ravenswood increasing the population in the area and therefore the traffic flows. A roundabout is slated to be added to Rangiora-Woodend Road outside the Ravenswood development in time to the north of the Rangiora-Woodend and Proposed Ravenswood Roundabout intersection connecting to the Pegasus roundabout.
Figure 1.3 Roadside Hazards – Gressons Road

Figure 1.4 Road Environment - Northbrook Road
2.0 Analysis and Results

NZTA has recently reviewed the way speed limits are managed nationally and in 2016 the new NZ Speed Management Guide was published. The NZ Speed Management Guide sets out a framework to assess safe and appropriate speeds for different road environments. The recommended safe and appropriate speed ranges for different Road Classes are outlined in Table 2.1 below.

Table 2.1 Recommended safe and appropriate speed ranges for Road Classes (Figure 2.3 from NZ Speed Management Guide)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Straight open road / urban motorway</th>
<th>Curved open road</th>
<th>Winding open road</th>
<th>Urban (not motorway)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class 1 High volume national</td>
<td>100-110km/h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2 National, Regional, Arterial</td>
<td>80-100km/h</td>
<td>60-80km/h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 3 Primary and secondary collector</td>
<td>60-80km/h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 4 Access and low-volume access All winding/tortuous</td>
<td>60-80km/h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the Guide considers new 70km/h and 90km/h speed limits to be interim speeds rather than permanent speed limits, and requires written approval from NZTA prior to implementing.

3.0 Function / Feature

The majority of land adjacent to Rangiora-Woodend road is zoned ‘Rural’, with the exception of the Eastern end which consists of the new Ravenswood development and the surrounding urban areas entering woodend. For the purpose of this investigation Rangiora-Woodend road up to the new Ravenswood development, Gressons Road, Boys Road and Northbrook Road are considered to be rural, with Rangiora-Woodend Road from Proposed Ravenswood Roundabout to School Road considered to be a combination of rural and urban.

According to the ONRC and the Waimakariri District Council road hierarchy the roads under consideration can be seen below with their classifications in Table 3.1.
Table 3.1 ONRC and WDC Road Hierarchy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>ONRC</th>
<th>WDC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Woodend Road (Rangiora to Proposed Ravenswood Roundabout)</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora-Woodend Road (Ravenswood Roundabout to School Road)</td>
<td>Primary Collector</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbrook Road</td>
<td>Primary Collector</td>
<td>Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gressons Road</td>
<td>Primary Collector</td>
<td>Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys Road</td>
<td>Primary Collector</td>
<td>Collector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of vehicles using all of these roads are motorcycles, cars, trucks and vans. There is minimal cyclist and pedestrian activity on Gressons, Northbrook and Boys Road. The addition of the cycleway along Rangiora-Woodend Road means that cyclist and pedestrian traffic has been removed from the road edge. However total numbers are likely to increase. There are reasonable sized grass verges on both sides of all roads in areas but in some sections these grass verges are minimised due to road sized ditches and trees.

4.0 Road Safety Metric

The Road Safety Metric includes two different measures of risk: Collective Risk (Crash density) and Personal Risk (Crash rate). Collective and Personal Risks are formulated using crash data over a length of road and then categorised into a respective Risk Rating band, as shown in Table 4.1 below.

Table 4.1 Risk Ratings Associated with Collective and Personal Risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RISK RATING</th>
<th>COLLECTIVE RISK</th>
<th>PERSONAL RISK</th>
<th>COLOUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average annual fatal and serious injury crashes per km</td>
<td>Average annual fatal and serious injury crashes per 100 million vehicle-km</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>≤ 0.039</td>
<td>&lt; 4</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-medium</td>
<td>0.04 ≤ 0.089</td>
<td>4 ≤ 4.9</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0.09 ≤ 0.14</td>
<td>5 ≤ 5.9</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-high</td>
<td>0.11 ≤ 0.189</td>
<td>7 ≤ 7.9</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>0.19+</td>
<td>9+</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 4.2 – 4.6 show the number of fatal and serious crashes recorded of each section of road in the last 5 years. By using formulas (1) and (2) given in the KiwiRAP Road Assessment Programme for collective and personal risk, calculations were made to determine the risk levels of each section of road. Once calculated and referencing Table 4.1 the risk levels of each section of road was determined for the analysis of the sections. The risk levels can be seen in Table 4.7.

Collective Risk = \[
\frac{(\text{Fatal Crashes} + \text{Serious Injury Crashes})}{\text{Number of Years of Data} \times \text{Length of Road Section (Excl Urban Sections)}}
\]  

Personal Risk = \[
\frac{(\text{Fatal Crashes} + \text{Serious Injury Crashes}) \times 100 \times 10^6}{\text{Distance Travelled} \times \text{ADT} \times \text{Number of Years} \times 365}
\]
### Table 4.2 Rangiora-Woodend Road (Smarts to Ravenswood Roundabout) Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Collective Risk (or Crash Density)</th>
<th>Personal Risk (or Crash Rate)</th>
<th>Calculations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora-Woodend Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smarts to Ravenswood Roundabout (100 km/hr)</td>
<td>Fatal Crashes 0</td>
<td>Serious injury Crashes 2</td>
<td>Medium 0.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number of years of data 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>length of road section, Excl urban sections (km) 4.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calculations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.648</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.3 Rangiora-Woodend Road (Ravenswood Roundabout to School Road) Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Collective Risk (or Crash Density)</th>
<th>Personal Risk (or Crash Rate)</th>
<th>Calculations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora-Woodend Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenswood Roundabout to School Road (70 km/hr)</td>
<td>Fatal Crashes 0</td>
<td>Serious injury Crashes 0</td>
<td>Low 0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number of years of data 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>length of road section, Excl urban sections (km) 0.876</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calculations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.4 Gressons Road Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collective Risk (or Crash Density)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal Crashes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury Crashes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of years of data</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>length of road section, Excl urban sections (km)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculations</td>
<td><strong>Medium-High</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Personal Risk (or Crash Rate)

| Fatal Crashes | 2 |
| Serious injury Crashes | 1 |
| number of years of data | 5 |
| Period (days) | 1825 |
| ADT         | 2313 |
| Distance Travelled (km) | 4.5 |
| Calculations | **High** | **15.793** |

### Table 4.5 Boys Road Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collective Risk (or Crash Density)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal Crashes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury Crashes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of years of data</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>length of road section, Excl urban sections (km)</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculations</td>
<td><strong>Medium-High</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Personal Risk (or Crash Rate)

| Fatal Crashes | 1 |
| Serious injury Crashes | 1 |
| number of years of data | 5 |
| Period (days) | 1825 |
| ADT         | 2099 |
| Distance Travelled (km) | 3.17 |
| Calculations | **High** | **16.470** |
Table 4.6 Northbrook Road Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northbrook Road</th>
<th>Collective Risk (or Crash Density)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fatal Crashes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serious injury Crashes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of years of data</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>length of road section, Excl urban sections (km)</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculations</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Risk (or Crash Rate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal Crashes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury Crashes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of years of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period (days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Travelled (km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 Personal and Collective Risk levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Collective Risk</th>
<th>Personal Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora-Woodend Road (Rangiora to Proposed Ravenswood Roundabout)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora-Woodend Road (Ravenswood Roundabout to School Road)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbrook Road</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gressons Road</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys Road</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.0 Infrastructure Risk Rating

The Infrastructure Risk Rating (IRR) is a predictive model used to assess the road safety risk. Eight key features are used to determine the road safety risk along a section of road. These are road stereotype, alignment, carriageway width, roadside hazards, land use, intersection density, access density and traffic volume. The model then assigns an IRR score which is allocated within a rural or urban risk band, as shown in Table 4 below.
Tables 5.2 - 5.6 below summarise the key features and risk ratings determined along Rangiora-Woodend road (both sections), Gressons Road, Boys Road and Northbrook Road. A summary of the risk ratings is shown in Table 5.7.

**Table 5.2. Key features of Infrastructure Risk Rating for Rangiora-Woodend Road (Smarts to Proposed Ravenswood Roundabout)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Stereotype Risk Score</td>
<td>Two lane undivided</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment Risk Score</td>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriageway Risk Score</td>
<td>3.0 m &lt; road &lt; 3.5 m</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 m &lt; shoulder &lt; 0.5 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left side Roadside Hazard Risk</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right side Roadside Hazard Risk</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Risk Score</td>
<td>Rural residential</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Density Risk Score</td>
<td>1 &lt; 2 intersections / km</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Density Risk Score</td>
<td>5 to 10 accesses / km</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Volume Risk Score</td>
<td>6,000 &lt; 12,000 veh/day</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calculation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1.58</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.1 IRR Score and Risk Band**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRR Score</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 &lt; 0.8</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8 &lt; 1.2</td>
<td>Low-Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 &lt; 1.6</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 &lt; 2.0</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Low-Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 &lt; 2.4</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 &lt; 2.8</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8+</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5.3. Key features of Infrastructure Risk Rating for Rangiora-Woodend Road (Ravenswood Roundabout to School Road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Stereotype Risk Score</td>
<td>Two lane undivided</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment Risk Score</td>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriageway Risk Score</td>
<td>3.5 m &lt; road</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0 m &lt; shoulder &lt; 2.0 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left side Roadside Hazard Risk Score</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right side Roadside Hazard Risk Score</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Risk Score</td>
<td>Rural Town / Rural Residential</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Density Risk Score</td>
<td>3 &lt; 5 intersections / km</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Density Risk Score</td>
<td>20 + accesses / km</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Volume Risk Score</td>
<td>6,000 -&lt; 12,000 veh/day</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation**

1.66

### Table 5.4. Key features of Infrastructure Risk Rating for Boys Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Stereotype Risk Score</td>
<td>Two lane undivided</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment Risk Score</td>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriageway Risk Score</td>
<td>3.0 m &lt; road &lt; 3.5 m</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 m &lt; shoulder &lt; 0.5 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left side Roadside Hazard Risk Score</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right side Roadside Hazard Risk Score</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Risk Score</td>
<td>Rural residential</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Density Risk Score</td>
<td>1 &lt; 2 intersections / km</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Density Risk Score</td>
<td>2 to 5 accesses / km</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Volume Risk Score</td>
<td>1,000 -&lt; 6,000 veh/day</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculation**

1.37
### Table 5.5. Key features of Infrastructure Risk Rating for Northbrook Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northbrook Road</td>
<td>Road Stereotype Risk Score</td>
<td>Two lane undivided</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alignment Risk Score</td>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carriageway Risk Score</td>
<td>3.0 m &lt; road &lt; 3.5 m</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 m &lt; shoulder &lt; 0.5 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Left side Roadside Hazard Risk Score</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right side Roadside Hazard Risk Score</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use Risk Score</td>
<td>Rural residential</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intersection Density Risk Score</td>
<td>&lt; 1 Intersection / km</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access Density Risk Score</td>
<td>2 to 5 accesses / km</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic Volume Risk Score</td>
<td>1,000 &lt; 6,000 veh/day</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calculation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.6. Key features of Infrastructure Risk Rating for Gressons Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gressons Road</td>
<td>Road Stereotype Risk Score</td>
<td>Two lane undivided</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alignment Risk Score</td>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carriageway Risk Score</td>
<td>3.0 m &lt; road &lt; 3.5 m</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 m &lt; shoulder &lt; 0.5 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Left side Roadside Hazard Risk Score</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right side Roadside Hazard Risk Score</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use Risk Score</td>
<td>Remote rural</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intersection Density Risk Score</td>
<td>&lt; 1 Intersection / km</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access Density Risk Score</td>
<td>5 to 10 accesses / km</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic Volume Risk Score</td>
<td>1,000 &lt; 6,000 veh/day</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calculation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.7 Personal and Collective Risk levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora-Woodend Road (Rangiora to Proposed Ravenswood Roundabout)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora-Woodend Road (Ravenswood Roundabout to School Road)</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbrook Road</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gressons Road</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys Road</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.0 Discussion and Recommendation

Table 6.2 and 6.3 below were taken from the NZTA speed management guide and used to determine the recommended speeds for each road section. A summary of all the findings and recommended speeds can be seen in Table 6.4. The resulting classifications indicate that a speed limit of 80 km/hr for Rangiora-Woodend Road (Smarts to Proposed Ravenswood Roundabout) and Northbrook Road. A speed of “less than 80 km/h” is a safe and appropriate speed along Boys Road and Gressons Road. A proposed speed change to 60 km/h on Rangiora-Woodend Road (Ravenswood Roundabout to School Road).

The urban area around the southern end Woodened-Rangiora Road is considered to be urban through to the proposed extent of the new Ravenswood development. This will be defined by a roundabout that is due to be added at the end of the year once stage two of the development is started. The roundabout will make a suitable break point to transition between the two speed limits when entering Woodend from the north along Rangiora-Woodend Road.

Special speed testing sites were used to determine the current operating speeds along all five sections of analysed road. The mean speed and 85th percentile speeds were utilised to confirm the reports finding on the proposed speed limits. The Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2017 requires an RCA to aim to achieve a mean speed no more than 10% over the set speed. Table 6.1 displays each test site, mean speed, 85th percentile and proposed new speed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section of Road</th>
<th>Test site</th>
<th>Mean Speed (km/hr)</th>
<th>85th percentile (km/hr)</th>
<th>Proposed new Speed (km/hr)</th>
<th>Within 10% of Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Woodend Road</td>
<td>400m north of Chinnerys</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Woodend Road</td>
<td>South of Woodend Road</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys Road</td>
<td>400m west of Northbrook</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>&lt;80</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbrook Road</td>
<td>600 m West of Boys Road</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gressons Road</td>
<td>North of Rangiora Woodened Road</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>102.3</td>
<td>&lt;80</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 6.1 it can be stated that Rangiora-Woodend Road (Between Smarts Road and Ravenswood), Boys Road and Northbrook Road all are suited to have their speed limits lowered to the proposed new limits of 80 km/hr for each section. Rangiora-Woodend Road (Ravenswood to School Road) is also within the 10% threshold for the proposed new speed of 60 km/hr. Gressons Road is outside the 10% threshold required by The Land Transport rules. This section will either require special approval to be lowered to the proposed limits of 80 km/hr or engineered to change the road environment to match the calculations.

Both Boys Road and Gressons Road were assessed to be < 80 km/hr by using Table 6.3. Combining this assessment with the observed speed data on both sections of road it is more feasible to lower limits to 80 km/hr rather than the next limit of 60 km/hr.
Table 6.2 Proposed Safe and Appropriate Speed Classification Method – Urban Roads (Figure 2.2 from NZ Speed Management Guide)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function / Feature</th>
<th>Road safety metric</th>
<th>Infrastructure Risk Rating</th>
<th>Safe and Appropriate Speed (km/h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• ONRC is Class 1 or 2</td>
<td>• Personal Risk ≤ Low-Medium</td>
<td>• 'Low' or 'Low-Medium'</td>
<td>• 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identified as a Freight Priority Route in a Network Operating Framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limited Access Road controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Median Divided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ONRC is Class 1 or 2</td>
<td>• Personal Risk ≤ Medium</td>
<td>• 'Low' or 'Low-Medium'</td>
<td>• 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Non-commercial adjacent land use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ONRC is Class 1 or 2</td>
<td>No road safety metric used in the assessment</td>
<td>• Any IRR</td>
<td>• 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Non-commercial adjacent land use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ONRC is Primary Collector</td>
<td>• Personal Risk ≤ Medium-High</td>
<td>• Low to Medium</td>
<td>• 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residential adjacent land use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Any ONRC</td>
<td>• Personal Risk ≤ Medium-High</td>
<td>• 'Low' to 'Medium'</td>
<td>• 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Non-commercial and non-residential adjacent land use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Any ONRC</td>
<td>No road safety metric used in the assessment</td>
<td>• 'Low' to 'Medium-High'</td>
<td>• 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CBD/town centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residential neighbourhoods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Any ONRC</td>
<td>No road safety metric used in the assessment</td>
<td>• 'High'</td>
<td>• 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CBDs or town centres with high place function and concentration of active road users</td>
<td>No road safety metric used in the assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parks</td>
<td>No road safety metric used in the assessment</td>
<td>• Any rating</td>
<td>• 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shared spaces with high place function and concentration of active road users</td>
<td>No road safety metric used in the assessment</td>
<td>• Any rating</td>
<td>• 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Car parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 2: Commercial land use excludes industrial land use activities.
Note 3: No road safety metrics are used in the assessment of roads with a safe and appropriate speed of 40km/h or less, but the corridor’s look and feel should be conducive to achieving the safe and appropriate speeds.
Table 6.3 Proposed Safe and Appropriate Speed Classification Method – Rural Roads (Figure 2.2 from NZ Speed Management Guide)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function / Feature</th>
<th>Road Safety Metric</th>
<th>Infrastructure Risk Rating</th>
<th>Safe and Appropriate Speed (km/h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>ONRC</strong> is Class 1</td>
<td>• Personal Risk ≤ Low-Medium;</td>
<td>• ‘Low’</td>
<td>• 110²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Median Divided and at least 2 lanes in each direction</td>
<td>• Collective Risk ≤ Medium-High;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No direct property access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Grade separated intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>ONRC</strong> is Class 1 – 3</td>
<td>• Personal Risk ≤ Medium;</td>
<td>• ‘Low’ or ‘Low-Medium’</td>
<td>• 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sealed road</td>
<td>• Collective Risk ≤ Medium-High;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Any <strong>ONRC</strong></td>
<td>• Personal Risk ≤ Medium-High;</td>
<td>• ‘Low’ to ‘Medium’</td>
<td>• 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not in a rural town³</td>
<td>No road safety metric used in the assessment</td>
<td>• ‘Low’ to ‘High’</td>
<td>• &lt;80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sealed road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Any <strong>ONRC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ‘Low’ to ‘High’</td>
<td>• &lt;80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not in a rural town³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Unsealed road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>ONRC</strong> is Class 1 – 2</td>
<td>• Personal Risk ≤ Low-Medium</td>
<td>• ‘Low’ or ‘Low-Medium’</td>
<td>• 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rural town²</td>
<td>• Collective Risk ≤ Medium-High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>ONRC</strong> is Class 1 – 2</td>
<td>• Personal Risk ≤ Medium</td>
<td>• ‘Low’ to ‘Medium’</td>
<td>• 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rural town²</td>
<td>• Collective Risk ≤ Medium-High</td>
<td>• ‘Low’ to ‘Medium’</td>
<td>• 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rural town²</td>
<td></td>
<td>• ‘Low’ to ‘Medium-High’</td>
<td>• &lt;50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High place function and concentration of active road users</td>
<td></td>
<td>• ‘High’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 2: Not classified as Urban according to Statistics New Zealand definition.
### Table 6.4 Summary of Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section of Road</th>
<th>Current Speed limit</th>
<th>Function/Feature</th>
<th>Personal Risk</th>
<th>Collective Risk</th>
<th>Infrastructure Risk Rating</th>
<th>Table used</th>
<th>Change Required</th>
<th>Proposed Speed limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Woodend Road (Smarts Road to Ravenswood Roundabout)</td>
<td>80 km/hr and 100 km/hr</td>
<td>Class 2 (Arterial)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2.2 (Rural Roads)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>80 km/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Woodend Road (Ravenswood Roundabout Road to School Road)</td>
<td>70 km/hr</td>
<td>Class 2 (Arterial)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2.1 (Urban Roads)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60 km/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys Road</td>
<td>100 km/hr</td>
<td>Class 3 (Primary Collector)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2.2 (Rural Roads)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>&lt; 80 km/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbrook Road</td>
<td>100 km/hr</td>
<td>Class 3 (Secondary Collector)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2.2 (Rural Roads)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>80 km/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gressons Road</td>
<td>100 km/hr</td>
<td>Class 3 (Primary Collector)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2.2 (Rural Roads)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>&lt; 80 km/hr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.0 Next Steps

The setting of speed limits rule requires formal consultation on the proposed changes. The next step will be formally requesting the Board to approve a proposal and timeframe for consultation.

Nick Rochford
Graduate Engineer
Waimakariri District Council Metrocount Report
Speed Statistics by Hour

Datasets:
Site: [0545E] RANGIORA WOODEND RD 400m north of Chinnerys Rd <100> @ 1.844
Attribute: [-43.315467 +172.652360]
Direction: 7 - North bound A>B, South bound B>A. Lane: 1
Survey Duration: 10:55 Thursday, 10 August 2017 => 10:46 Tuesday, 22 August 2017,
Zone:
File: 0545E 0 2017-08-22 1046.EC1 (Plus )
Identifier: CE95B6T3 MC56-L5 [MC55] (c)Microcom 19Oct04
Algorithm: Factory default axle (v4.08)
Data type: Axle sensors - Paired (Class/Speed/Count)

Profile:
Filter time: 10:56 Thursday, 10 August 2017 => 10:46 Tuesday, 22 August 2017 (11.9935)
Included classes: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13
Speed range: 10 - 160 km/h.
Direction: North, East, South, West (bound), P = North, Lane = 0-16
Separation: Headway > 0 sec, Span 0 - 100 metre
Name: Default Profile
Scheme: Vehicle classification (NZTA2011)
Units: Metric (metre, kilometre, m/s, km/h, kg, tonne)
In profile: Vehicles = 78148 / 78177 (99.96%)
### Speed Statistics by Hour

**Site:** 0545E.1.2NS  
**Description:** RANGIORA WOODEND RD 400m north of Chinnerys Rd <100> @ 1.844  
**Filter time:** 10:56 Thursday, 10 August 2017 => 10:46 Tuesday, 22 August 2017  
**Scheme:** Vehicle classification (NZTA2011)  
**Filter:** Cls(1-13) Dir(NESW) Sp(10,160) Headway(>0) Span(0 - 100) Lane(0-16)

Vehicles = 78148  
Posted speed limit = 100 km/h, Exceeding = 4382 (5.61%), Mean Exceeding = 104.52 km/h  
Maximum = 145.4 km/h, Minimum = 17.6 km/h, Mean = 85.3 km/h  
85% Speed = 94.98 km/h, 95% Speed = 100.36 km/h, Median = 85.23 km/h  
20 km/h Pace = 76 - 96, Number in Pace = 55998 (71.66%)  
Variance = 95.32, Standard Deviation = 9.76 km/h

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>85%</th>
<th>95%</th>
<th>&gt;PSL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0000</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>135.8</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>101.7</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>128.5</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0200</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>130.7</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>105.9</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0300</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>132.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>104.6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0400</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>121.8</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0500</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>124.5</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>101.9</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0600</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>139.7</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0700</td>
<td>3213</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>126.1</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0800</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>135.6</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900</td>
<td>4983</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>124.9</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>5261</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>142.0</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>5697</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>135.1</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>5889</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>128.6</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>5597</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>145.4</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>6433</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>140.6</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>7302</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>122.1</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>7286</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>134.9</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>6768</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>127.9</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>4490</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>136.4</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>2764</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>140.3</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>145.2</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>133.8</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>137.0</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>130.2</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Vehicles = 78148 100.0% | 17.6 | 145.4 | 85.3 | 85.2 | 95.0 | 100.4 | 4382 | 5.6%
Waimakariri District Council Metrocount Report
Speed Statistics by Hour

Datasets:
Site: [0545B SP] RANGIORA WOODEND RD South of Woodend Rd <70> OS#82 @ 0.906
Attribute: [-43.321848 +172.659913]
Direction: 7 - North bound A>B, South bound B>A. Lane: 1
Survey Duration: 14:54 Tuesday, 8 May 2018 => 14:41 Friday, 18 May 2018,
Zone:
File: 0545B SP 0 2018-05-18 1442.EC1 (Plus )
Identifier: E953RFNH MC56-6 [MC55] (c)Microcom 02/03/01
Algorithm: Factory default axle (v4.08)
Data type: Axle sensors - Paired (Class/Speed/Count)

Profile:
Filter time: 14:55 Tuesday, 8 May 2018 => 14:41 Friday, 18 May 2018 (9.99093)
Included classes: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13
Speed range: 10 - 160 km/h.
Direction: North, East, South, West (bound), P = North, Lane = 0-16
Separation: Headway > 0 sec, Span 0 - 100 metre
Name: Default Profile
Scheme: Vehicle classification (NZTA2011)
Units: Metric (metre, kilometre, m/s, km/h, kg, tonne)
In profile: Vehicles = 36911 / 36917 (99.98%)
Speed Statistics by Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>85%</th>
<th>95%</th>
<th>&gt;PSL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0000</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>148.4</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0200</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>109.9</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0300</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>101.7</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0400</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>116.0</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0500</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>106.6</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0600</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>116.0</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0700</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>102.6</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0800</td>
<td>2797</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900</td>
<td>2164</td>
<td>119.1</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2223</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>2256</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>2484</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>2301</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>2650</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>3626</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>3728</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>3729</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>100.2</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>2328</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>110.0</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>114.3</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>101.9</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

36911 100.0% | 148.4 | 62.6 | 69.3 | 73.7 | 4975 13.5%
Datasets:
Site: [0280C SP] GRESSONS RD North of Rangiora Woodend Road <100> @ 1.767
Attribute: [-43.297300 +172.651732]
Direction: 7 - North bound A>B, South bound B>A. Lane: 1
Survey Duration: 15:13 Tuesday, 8 May 2018 => 13:05 Friday, 18 May 2018,
Zone: 
File: 0280C SP 0 2018-05-18 1306.EC1 (Plus )
Identifier: BH00810Q MC56-L5 [MC55] (c)Microcom 19Oct04
Algorithm: Factory default axle (v4.08)
Data type: Axle sensors - Paired (Class/Speed/Count)
Profile:
Filter time: 15:14 Tuesday, 8 May 2018 => 13:05 Friday, 18 May 2018 (9.911)
Included classes: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13
Speed range: 10 - 160 km/h.
Direction: North, East, South, West (bound), P = North, Lane = 0-16
Separation: Headway > 0 sec, Span 0 - 100 metre
Name: Default Profile
Scheme: Vehicle classification (NZTA2011)
Units: Metric (metre, kilometre, m/s, km/h, kg, tonne)
In profile: Vehicles = 19689 / 19702 (99.93%)
## Speed Statistics by Hour

**Site:** 0280C SP.1.2NS  
**Description:** GRESSONS RD North of Rangiora Woodend Road <100> @ 1.767

**Filter time:** 15:14 Tuesday, 8 May 2018 => 13:05 Friday, 18 May 2018

**Scheme:** Vehicle classification (NZTA2011)

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

Vehicles = 19689  
Posted speed limit = 100 km/h, Exceeding = 4336 (22.02%), Mean Exceeding = 105.99 km/h  
Maximum = 102.3 km/h, Minimum = 20.2 km/h, Mean = 93.0 km/h  
85% Speed = 102.33 km/h, 95% Speed = 108.63 km/h, Median = 92.88 km/h  
20 km/h Pace = 83 - 103, Number in Pace = 14237 (72.31%)  
Variance = 102.88, Standard Deviation = 10.14 km/h

### Hour Bins (Partial days)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>85%</th>
<th>95%</th>
<th>&gt;PSL 100 km/h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>125.2</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>107.2</td>
<td>123.3</td>
<td>7 29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>112.1</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>112.1</td>
<td>4 23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0200</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>117.7</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>108.4</td>
<td>117.7</td>
<td>6 33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0300</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>121.2</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>5 10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0400</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>128.7</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>104.7</td>
<td>117.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0500</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>125.0</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>103.4</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>38 24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0600</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>140.5</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>111.3</td>
<td>128 26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0700</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>136.5</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>102.2</td>
<td>108.5</td>
<td>227 21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0800</td>
<td>1426</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>135.2</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>101.9</td>
<td>107.8</td>
<td>288 20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900</td>
<td>1373</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>157.2</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>101.3</td>
<td>106.6</td>
<td>253 18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1362</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>131.4</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>100.9</td>
<td>107.3</td>
<td>248 18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1429</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>133.2</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>101.4</td>
<td>107.7</td>
<td>280 19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>143.1</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>101.9</td>
<td>107.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1416</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>144.9</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>102.1</td>
<td>109.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>134.4</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>102.6</td>
<td>108.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1706</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>145.5</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>107.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>142.7</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>102.6</td>
<td>108.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1724</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>154.7</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>102.6</td>
<td>109.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1036</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>149.9</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>102.1</td>
<td>109.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>144.9</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>103.3</td>
<td>108.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>150.1</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>111.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>142.7</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>104.7</td>
<td>113.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>143.6</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>106.2</td>
<td>115.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>124.6</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>108.5</td>
<td>118.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

----  | 19689| 100.0%| 20.2 | 157.2| 93.0 | 92.9 | 102.3| 108.6 | 4336 22.0%
Waimakariri District Council Metrocount Report

Speed Statistics by Hour

Datasets:
[0475A] NORTHBROOK RD 600m west of Boys Rd <100> @ 0.460
Attribute: [-43.310565 +172.620638]
Direction: 7 - North bound A>B, South bound B>A, Lane: 1
Survey Duration: 11:59 Monday, 4 September 2017 => 10:31 Monday, 18 September 2017,
Zone: File: 0475A 0 2017-09-18 1031.EC1 (Plus B)
Identifier: EP220HAH MC56-L5 [MC55] (c)Microcom 19Oct04
Algorithm: Factory default axle (v4.08)
Data type: Axle sensors - Paired (Class/Speed/Count)
Profile:
Filter time: 12:00 Monday, 4 September 2017 => 10:31 Monday, 18 September 2017
(13.9386)
Included classes: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13
Speed range: 10 - 160 km/h.
Direction: North, East, South, West (bound), P = North, Lane = 0-16
Separation: Headway > 0 sec, Span 0 - 100 metre
Name: Default Profile
Scheme: Vehicle classification (NZTA2011)
Units: Metric (metre, kilometre, m/s, km/h, kg, tonne)
In profile: Vehicles = 15565 / 15574 (99.94%)
**Speed Statistics by Hour**

**Site:** 0475A.1.2NS  
**Description:** NORTHBROOK RD 600m west of Boys Rd <100> @ 0.460  
**Filter time:** 12:00 Monday, 4 September 2017 => 10:31 Monday, 18 September 2017  
**Scheme:** Vehicle classification (NZTA2011)  
**Filter:** Cls(1-13) Dir(NESW) Sp(10,160) Headway(>0) Span(0 - 100) Lane(0-16)

Vehicles = 15565  
Posted speed limit = 100 km/h, Exceeding = 1084 (6.96%), Mean Exceeding = 107.36 km/h  
Maximum = 154.5 km/h, Minimum = 10.6 km/h, Mean = 82.6 km/h  
85% Speed = 94.16 km/h, 95% Speed = 102.19 km/h, Median = 82.26 km/h  
20 km/h Pace = 72 - 92, Number in Pace = 9821 (63.10%)  
Variance = 155.70, Standard Deviation = 12.48 km/h

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>85%</th>
<th>95%</th>
<th>&gt;PSL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>103.0</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0200</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0300</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>102.8</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>102.8</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0400</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>106.7</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0500</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>107.4</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>103.6</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0600</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>150.9</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0700</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>133.0</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0800</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>150.9</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>137.5</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>101.0</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>135.9</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>101.3</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>131.2</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>100.6</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>152.2</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>143.1</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>100.4</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>148.7</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>101.2</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>137.5</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>101.1</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1484</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>133.4</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>103.3</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1479</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>144.3</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>104.0</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>153.4</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>103.8</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>154.5</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>127.3</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>107.1</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>120.7</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>106.8</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>117.0</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>106.1</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>120.3</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>107.9</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Vehicles** = 15565  
**Posted speed limit** = 100 km/h, Exceeding = 1084 (6.96%), Mean Exceeding = 107.36 km/h  
**Maximum** = 154.5 km/h, **Minimum** = 10.6 km/h, **Mean** = 82.6 km/h  
**85% Speed** = 94.16 km/h, **95% Speed** = 102.19 km/h, **Median** = 82.26 km/h  
**20 km/h Pace** = 72 - 92, **Number in Pace** = 9821 (63.10%)  
**Variance** = 155.70, **Standard Deviation** = 12.48 km/h
Waimakariri District Council Metrocount Report

Speed Statistics by Hour

Datasets:
- Site: [0073B] BOYS RD 400m west of Northbrook Rd <100> @ 1.376
- Attribute: [-43.314263 +172.620470]
- Direction: 7 - North bound A>B, South bound B>A, Lane: 1
- Survey Duration: 12:12 Monday, 4 September 2017 => 10:23 Monday, 18 September 2017,
- Zone: File: 0073B 0 2017-09-18 1023.EC1 (Plus B)
- Identifier: EP02G536 MC56-L5 [MC55] (c)Microcom 19Oct04
- Algorithm: Factory default axle (v4.08)
- Data type: Axle sensors - Paired (Class/Speed/Count)

Profile:
- Filter time: 12:13 Monday, 4 September 2017 => 10:23 Monday, 18 September 2017
- Included classes: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13
- Speed range: 10 - 160 km/h.
- Direction: North, East, South, West (bound), P = North, Lane = 0-16
- Separation: Headway > 0 sec, Span 0 - 100 metre
- Name: Default Profile
- Scheme: Vehicle classification (NZTA2011)
- Units: Metric (metre, kilometre, m/s, km/h, kg, tonne)
- In profile: Vehicles = 23754 / 23762 (99.97%)
### Speed Statistics by Hour

**Site:** 0073B.1.2NS  
**Description:** BOYS RD 400m west of Northbrook Rd <100> @ 1.376  
**Filter time:** 12:13 Monday, 4 September 2017 => 10:23 Monday, 18 September 2017  
**Scheme:** Vehicle classification (NZTA2011)  
**Filter:** Cls(1-13) Dir(NESW) Sp(10,160) Headway(>0) Span(0 - 100) Lane(0-16)

Vehicles = 23754  
**Posted speed limit** = 100 km/h, **Exceeding** = 3514 (14.79%), **Mean Exceeding** = 105.91 km/h  
**Maximum** = 158.4 km/h, **Minimum** = 14.1 km/h, **Mean** = 88.5 km/h  
**85% Speed** = 99.86 km/h, **95% Speed** = 105.89 km/h, **Median** = 89.19 km/h  
**20 km/h Pace** = 80 - 100, **Number in Pace** = 15331 (64.54%)  
**Variance** = 156.72, **Standard Deviation** = 12.52 km/h

### Hour Bins (Partial days)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Bin</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>85%</th>
<th>95%</th>
<th>&gt;PSL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0000</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>121.3</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>113.3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>115.7</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>102.5</td>
<td>114.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0200</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>117.1</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>104.7</td>
<td>112.4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0300</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>133.0</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>122.1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0400</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>121.2</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>101.0</td>
<td>107.1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0500</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>131.0</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>106.3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0600</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>136.5</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>113.6</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0700</td>
<td>1394</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>135.2</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>101.7</td>
<td>107.7</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0800</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>142.4</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>133.6</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>103.6</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>140.3</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>104.0</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>131.2</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>103.3</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>131.0</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>104.9</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1790</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>154.2</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>104.7</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>158.4</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>2070</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>140.4</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>2032</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>141.8</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>152.8</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>101.1</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>146.3</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>101.1</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>150.9</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>102.1</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>155.8</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>103.7</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>148.5</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>102.9</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>124.3</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>103.2</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>117.3</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>103.4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>23754</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>158.4</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>105.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>Yes, I think this road should have a lower speed limit</td>
<td>No, I think the speed limit should stay the same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Woodend Road</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between the existing 80 km/h sign east of Smarts Road to the 70 km/h sign at Chinnerys Road - current speed limit 100 km/h</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gresson Road - Current speed limit 100 km/h</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I think this road should have a lower speed limit</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I think the speed limit should stay the same</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys Road from the railway line to Rangiora Woodend Road - current speed limit 100 km/h</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I think this road should have a lower speed limit</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I think the speed limit should stay the same</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbrook road east of Goodwin Street to Boys Road - current speed limit 100 km/h</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I think this road should have a lower speed limit</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I think the speed limit should stay the same</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Returned Survey Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (Yes/No)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage (Yes/No)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woodend School Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (Yes/No)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage (Yes/No)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Monkey Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (Yes/No)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage (Yes/No)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Survey Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (Yes/No)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage (Yes/No)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Survey Results Excl Woodend School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (Yes/No)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage (Yes/No)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to request additional budget of $200,000 for the Oxford Rural No.1 source upgrade project.

1.2. This is required to provide sufficient allowance for professional fees and project contingency for the completion of the project.

1.3. When staff last reported to Council in April it was expected that the current budget allowance would be sufficient for the completion of the project. There was however expenditure in the order of $120,000 associated with gaining the resource consent for the well that were not anticipated at that time. The additional budget is to compensate for this previously forecast expenditure, as well as to allow contingency for issues that may arise during construction.

1.4. The resource consent to take water from the well has now been granted by Environment Canterbury, and there were no appeals against this decision (refer attached consent decision documents).

Appendices:

i Resource consent decision documents (180724082264).

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180724082339.

(b) Notes that the consent to take water from the new well has been granted by Environment Canterbury and that there were no appeals against this decision.

(c) Approves an additional capital budget of $200,000 for the Oxford Rural No.1 Source Upgrade budget for the 2018/19 financial year ($130,000 level of service budget, $70,000 renewal budget) to make a total combined capital budget of $2.6M.
Notes that this budget will compensate for additional expenditure required to gain the resource consent to take water from the new well, as well as to allow sufficient contingency for the completion of the project.

Notes that this additional budget will increase the Oxford Rural No.1 water rate by approximately $11 per unit per year, which is a 2% increase over next year’s projected water rate for the scheme.

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

3. BACKGROUND

3.1. The Oxford Rural No.1 scheme is in need of a new source due to the existing source not complying with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand (DWSNZ). The scheme has been on a boil water notice since E. coli was detected in January 2018, which will remain in place until the source upgrade project is completed.

3.2. On 3 April 2018 staff brought a report to Council following the opening of tenders for the pipeline construction, but while the consent application to take water from the well was still in progress. At that time it was calculated that the remaining budget of $1.6M would be approximately sufficient for the completion of the project (report number 180322031037[v2]).

3.3. Council approved Management Team to award the contract for pipeline installation, but noting that staff discretion was to be used as to the appropriate time to do this based on progress with the resource consent application.

3.4. Since that report was published the resource consent has been gained, which was the key risk to the completion of the project, and pipeline construction has commenced. There were however some complications during the consenting process leading to a hearing. The costs to address the issues raised totalled approximately $120,000.

3.5. These additional costs were a combination of additional pump testing and monitoring, hydrogeological analysis of the new test results, planning advice, legal advice and support at the hearing for the consent, and Environment Canterbury (ECan) fees associated with the hearing. Initial expectations were that this level of additional work would not be required to address issues with the consent, however as the process progressed it was identified that additional work was required to address concerns raised and ensure that the consent was gained.

3.6. The building design has also been completed, including a detailed cost estimate rather than the high level estimate that fed into the budget forecasting at the time of the April 2018 report to Council.

3.7. There are five remaining items of work to be completed. These items are listed below along with their current status:


3. Electrical servicing for new well and headworks site. Awarded to Nairn Electrical and under construction. The majority will be constructed offsite, with final installation late November (to tie in with building completion).

4. Well head construction and well pump installation. Currently being tendered for completion in late November 2018.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. Upon reviewing the budget spent and remaining budget, it has been identified that the remaining budget is approximately sufficient for the remaining physical works, but without any remaining allowance for professional fees (estimated at $50,000), or project contingency. For capital works of this value, a construction contingency of approximately $150,000 which is 10% of the value of the physical works is recommended.

4.2. Further detail on these costs is given in Section 6.

4.3. The recommended approach is to increase the budget to ensure that there is allowance for this contingency and the remaining professional fees that will be associated with the project.

4.4. Council could consider progressing with the project without increasing the budget, however this would introduce a risk of an overspend of the budget by approximately $200,000 if issues arise during construction that have not been allowed for in the prices prepared as part of tendering the physical works, or if tendered costs for the building and well head are higher than those estimated.

4.5. Management Team has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.2. All necessary consultation with directly affected parties and nearby residents will be undertaken prior to any physical works on the site.

5.3. **Wider Community**

5.4. Community engagement will be undertaken as part of the contract works to ensure all affected property owners are aware of the proposed works and disruption is kept to a minimum.

5.5. Staff will update the wider Oxford Rural No.1 community with the projected project completion date via the Oxford Bulletin and the Council’s website in the short term, and individual letters closer to the commissioning date.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.2. The available budget versus the recommended tender price and quotations is summarised in Table 1:
### Table 1: Budget Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Upgrade Level of Service</th>
<th>Source Upgrade - Renewal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budgets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>$1,904,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$2,404,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure to Date</td>
<td>$1,020,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,020,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funds Available</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$884,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$1,384,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remaining Physical Works</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline Contract (18/03)</td>
<td>$335,993</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$835,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical (Nairn + Mainpower)</td>
<td>$159,519</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$159,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well head Engineer’s estimate</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Engineer’s estimate</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total (remaining works)</td>
<td>$885,512</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$1,385,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Fees Estimate</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Contingency 10% allowance</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Costs Forecast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,015,512</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
<td>$1,585,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast shortfall</td>
<td>-$131,512</td>
<td>-$70,000</td>
<td>-$201,512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3. As is demonstrated above, the total remaining physical works forecast are approximately equivalent to the remaining budget. However, this does not allow for professional fees for construction supervision of the remaining physical works, or any project contingency.

6.4. A 10% construction contingency allowance is considered appropriate for a project of this scale. If this contingency is allowed for but not required, this would result in an underspend of the budget. Alternatively is this contingency is required but not allowed for, this would result in an overspend of the budget.

6.5. The recommended budget increase has an associated rating impact of approximately $11 per unit per year, which represents a 2% increase over next year’s projected water rate of $474 per unit per year.

6.6. **Community Implications**

6.7. The Oxford Rural No.1 water supply scheme is currently subject to a permanent boil water notice that is unlikely to be lifted until the new McPhedrons Road well is operational and the Rockford Road shallow well, adjacent to the Waimakariri River, is no longer in operation.

6.8. Based on an award date of 26 June 2018, it is anticipated that the new source will be operational in mid-November. This is based on the construction period in the pipeline, plus a 2 week buffer period to allow for inclement weather or any other unforeseen delays.

6.9. **Risk Management**

6.10. Project specific risks associated with working on critical water infrastructure in Oxford have been communicated to tenderers throughout the tender process. Risk has been eliminated or controlled.
where possible during the design process, however the normal risks associated with construction apply.

6.11. There was previously a risk identified with this project associated with physical works being awarded prior to the consent to take water from the well being gained. This risk has been addressed, as the resource consent to take water from the well has been granted (refer document 180724082264 for resource consent decision).

6.12. Health and Safety

6.13. The project includes normal H&S risks which have been drawn to the attention to tenderers as part of the tender process. The successful tenderers will be required to provide pre-start deliverables including but not limited to the site specific safety plan and traffic management plan for the respective packages of work.

6.14. The existing source presents a public health risk, and for this reason residents have been instructed to boil their water until the new source is online. The key driver for this project is to address this risk, by constructing a source that complies with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

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

7.3. Legislation

7.4. The Oxford Rural No.1 Water Supply requires an upgrade to comply with Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand 2005 (Revised 2008). There is a requirement under the Health (Drinking-water) Amendment Act that water suppliers take all practicable steps to achieve compliance with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand.

7.5. Community Outcomes

7.6. The following community outcomes are relevant in this matter:

- There is a safe environment for all
- There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all
- Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner

7.7. Delegations

7.8. The Council has the delegated authority to allocate the additional funds.
Appendix i. Resource Consent Decision Document
Dear Sir/Madam

Resource Consent Documents

Record Number(s): CRC183143
Record Holder: Waimakariri District Council

Please find enclosed the final resource consent documents for your retention, following the expiry of the appeal period with no appeal being received.

A resource consent document is an important legal document. Please study the document to ensure you understand: what activity is authorised, and the obligations of a consent holder to comply with any conditions.

Lapsing of consent

This resource consent will lapse if the activity is not established or used before the lapse date specified on your consent document. Application may be made under Section 125 of the Resource Management Act 1991 to extend this period.

Monitoring of conditions

It is important that conditions of consent are complied with, and that the consent holder continues to comply with all conditions to ensure that the activity remains lawfully established. You can find online information regarding the monitoring of your consent at: www.ecan.govt.nz/monitoringconsent.pdf.

Charges, set in accordance with section 36 of the Resource Management Act 1991, shall be paid to the Regional Council for the carrying out of its functions in relation to the administration, monitoring and supervision of resource consents and for the carrying out of its functions under section 35 of the Act.
For all queries please contact our Customer Services Section quoting your CRC number noted above.

Yours sincerely

Consents Planning Section

Pattle Delamore Partners Ltd
Attn To: Carl Steffens
PO Box 389
Christchurch 8140
RESOURCES CONSENT CRC183143
Pursuant to Section 104 of the Resource Management Act 1991
The Canterbury Regional Council (known as Environment Canterbury)

GRANTS TO: Waimakariri District Council
A WATER PERMIT (S14): to take and use groundwater
COMMENCEMENT DATE: 06 Jul 2018
EXPIRY DATE: 06 Jul 2053
LOCATION: Road Reserve adj. 342 McPhedrons Road, View Hill

SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. Water shall only be taken from bore BW22/0088, 300 millimetres diameter and 107 metres deep, at map reference NZTM 2000 Easting: 1526570 mE 5203166 mN, as shown in Plan CRC183143A, which forms part of this consent.

2. Water may be taken from bore BW22/0088:
   a. at a rate not exceeding 30 litres per second,
   b. with a volume not exceeding 2,592 cubic metres per day;
   c. with a volume not exceeding 349,920 cubic metres in any period of 150 consecutive days;
   d. with a combined volume with CRC990926.1 and CRC144773, or any replacements thereof, not exceeding 800,000 cubic metres between 1 July and the following 30 June.

3. Water shall only be used for public supply purposes associated with the Oxford Rural No.1 Supply Scheme as shown in Plan CRC183143B, which forms part of this consent.
   Advice note: Public supply includes provision for firefighting purposes.

4. The consent holder shall, before the first exercise of this consent, install an easily accessible straight pipe(s), with no fittings or obstructions that may create turbulent flow conditions, of a length at least 15 times the diameter of the pipe, as part of the pump outlet plumbing or within the mainline distribution system.

5. The consent holder shall before the first exercise of this consent:
   a. install a water meter(s) that has an international accreditation or equivalent New Zealand calibration endorsement, and has pulse output, suitable for use with an electronic recording device, which will measure the rate and the volume of water taken to within an accuracy of plus or minus five percent as part of the pump outlet plumbing, or within the mainline distribution system, at a location(s) that will ensure the total take of water is measured; and
ii. install a tamper-proof electronic recording device such as a data logger(s) that shall time stamp a pulse from the flow meter at least once every 60 minutes, and have the capacity to hold at least one season's data of water taken as specified in clauses (b)(i) and (b)(ii), or which is telemetered, as specified in clause (b)(iii).

b. The recording device(s) shall:

i. be set to wrap the data from the measuring device(s) such that the oldest data will be automatically overwritten by the newest data (i.e. cyclic recording); and

ii. store the entire season’s data in each 12 month period from 1 July to 30 June in the following year, which the consent holder shall then download and store in a commonly used format and provide to the Canterbury Regional Council upon request in a form and to a standard specified in writing by the Canterbury Regional Council; or

iii. shall be connected to a telemetry system which collects and stores all of the data continuously with an independent network provider who will make that data available in a commonly used format at all times to the Canterbury Regional Council and the consent holder. No data in the recording device(s) shall be deliberately changed or deleted.

c. The water meter and recording device(s) shall be accessible to the Canterbury Regional Council at all times for inspection and/or data retrieval.

d. The water meter and recording device(s) shall be installed and maintained throughout the duration of the consent in accordance with the manufacturer’s instructions.

e. All practicable measures shall be taken to ensure that the water meter and recording device(s) are fully functional at all times.

6 Within one month of the installation of the measuring or recording device(s), or any subsequent replacement measuring or recording device(s), and at five-yearly intervals thereafter, and at any time when requested by the Canterbury Regional Council, the consent holder shall provide a certificate to the Canterbury Regional Council, Attention Regional Leader - Monitoring and Compliance, signed by a suitably qualified person certifying, and demonstrating by means of a clear diagram, that:

a. The measuring and recording device(s) has been installed in accordance with the manufacturer’s specifications; and

b. Data from the recording device(s) can be readily accessed and/or retrieved in accordance with clauses (b) and (c) of condition (5).

7 The consent holder shall prepare and implement their Water Conservation Strategy which shall include, but not be limited to:

a. Any proposed water conservation methods and measures to ensure efficient use of water; and
b. Measures to minimize water loss from the water reticulation network; and

c. Detail on how the measures in (a) and (b) will be implemented; and

d. Performance targets to measure the effectiveness of the methods implemented; and

e. The timeframe for review and any specified action listed in the implementation plan; and

f. A drought management plan that includes:
   i. Methods to reduce consumption during periods of water shortage and particularly consumption by non-essential agricultural, residential, industrial or trade processes; and
   ii. Methods of communicating water restrictions; and
   iii. A description of any methods to ensure water conservancy during times of drought, including but not limited to public education programmes and compliance or enforcement measures.

g. The Water Conservation Strategy shall be provided to the Canterbury Regional Council, Attn: Regional Leader - Monitoring and Compliance before first exercise of this consent and at any time that it is updated.

h. The consent holder shall provide a report on performance against the performance targets, as outlined in Clause (d) to the Canterbury Regional Council upon request.

8 The Canterbury Regional Council, Attention Regional Leader - Monitoring and Compliance, shall be informed within five days of first exercise of this consent by the consent holder.

9 Access to allow water level measurements to be taken in the bore(s) shall be established, and maintained, via a bung and socket with a minimum diameter of 20 millimetres installed in the bore casing or headworks.

10 If the system is used to distribute added contaminants the consent holder shall ensure:

   a. An effective backflow prevention device is installed and operated within the pump outlet plumbing or within the mainline to prevent the backflow of contaminants into the water source; and

   b. The backflow prevention device is tested at the time of installation and annually thereafter by a suitably qualified or certified person in accordance with Canterbury Regional Council approved test methods for the device used; and

   c. The test report is provided to the Canterbury Regional Council Attention Regional Leader - Monitoring and Compliance, within two weeks of each inspection.

11 The consent holder shall take all practicable steps to minimize leakage from pipes and structures, including through renewing pipes and structures as they reach the end of their useful life.
12 The Canterbury Regional Council may, once per year, on any of the last five working days of May or November, serve notice of its intention to review the conditions of this consent for the purposes of dealing with any adverse effect on the environment which may arise from the exercise of the consent.

13 If this consent is not exercised before 30 June 2021 then it shall lapse in accordance with section 125 of the Resource Management Act.

Issued at Christchurch on 11 July 2018

Canterbury Regional Council
Exercising of resource consent CRC183143

It is important that you notify Environment Canterbury when you first start using your consent.

GRANTED TO: Waimakariri District Council
A WATER PERMIT (S14): to take and use groundwater
LOCATION: Road Reserve adj. 342 McPhedrons Road, View Hill

Even if the consent is replacing a previous consent for the same activity, you need to complete and return this page.

Providing this information will:

• Validate your consent through to its expiry date
• Minimise compliance monitoring charges
• Help provide an accurate picture of the state of the environment.

If consent CRC183143 is not used before 30 Jun 2021 this consent will lapse and no longer be valid.

Declaration:
I have started using this resource consent.

Action taken: (e.g. pasture irrigated, discharge from septic tank/boiler/spray booth etc).

Approximate start date (Note: this may be different to the date the consent was granted):

Signed: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Full name of person signing (please print): ____________________________________________

Please return to:
Environment Canterbury
PO Box 345
Christchurch 8140

File: CRC183143
Flowmeter, Datalogger
Installation and Commissioning

TO: Environment Canterbury  Ph: 03 353 9007
C/o Water Metering Team
200 Tuam Street
PO Box 345
Christchurch 8140

Consent Holder: 
Consent number: CRC  Well/SWAP number(s): 
Installation date: 

Flowmeter details:
Make: 
Model: 
Serial number: 
(Part) Meter Reading Volume: m³ (state units if different)

Datalogger details:
Make: 
Model: 
Serial number: 

Installation details:
Pipe internal/external diameter: mm
Pipe Wall Thickness mm
Pipe material: □Ductile Iron, □Mild Steel, □PVC, □Polyethylene, □Aluminium, □other: 
Distance of straight, unobstructed pipe upstream of flowmeter (distance (a) in Figure 1): mm
Distance of straight, unobstructed pipe downstream of flowmeter (distance (b) in Figure 1): mm
Is there a straight unobstructed accessible pipe in the system of at least 15 diameters length to verify the flow with a clamp-on flow meter? □Yes/□No  Location in system: 

Figure 1: Installation diagram - Please mark any disturbances upstream of the flowmeter e.g. pipe size reduction, gate valves, pipe bends. Refer to Figure 2 for an example of a good installation.
**Insertion meters only:**
Insertion depth: ___________________________  K-factor: ___________________________

**Ultrasonic meters only:**
Transducer size: ___________________________  Transducer spacing: ___________________________
Transducer mounting:  V or Z (Please circle, V = Reflect, Z = Direct)

**Accuracy details:**
Do you have a WET calibration certificate?  Yes/No (If yes, then please submit the certificate.)
Has the meter been checked against a portable flowmeter?  Yes/No (If yes please fill in water meter verification form)

**Certification:**
I/we certify that the above flowmeter and datalogger have been installed in accordance with Environment Canterbury’s requirements.
- [ ] That a wet calibration certificate from the manufacturer is attached to this form
- [ ] That a water meter verification form is attached to this form.
- [ ] That a picture of the installation is attached to this form.

Installed by: ___________________________  Signed: ___________________________ (by installer)
Company: ___________________________  Date: ___________________________

**Figure 2:** An example of an ideal installation of a flowmeter, including obstructions in pipework.
Flowmeter/Water Measuring Device Verification Form

TO: Environment Canterbury
   C/o Water Metering Team
   200 Tuam Street
   PO Box 345
   Christchurch 8140

Ph: 03 353 9007
Email: water.metering@ecan.govt.nz

Consent Holder: __________
Consent number: __________
Well/swap number(s): __________
Flowmeter Installation date: __________
Verification date: __________

Flowmeter/Water Measuring Device details: (if not already provided on installation and commissioning form)
Make: __________
Model: __________
Serial number: __________
Volume per Pulse: __________ m³/脉冲

Meter Reading Volume: __________ m³ (state units if different)

Datalogger details: Installed Yes/No
Make: __________
Model: __________
Serial number: __________

Telemetry installed for compliance: Yes/No
Data hosted by: __________

Insertion meters only:
Encountered K-factor in the flow meter: __________ Correct Yes/No

Ultrasonic meters only:
Transducer size encountered: __________
Transducer spacing: __________
Transducer mounting: __________ V or Z (Please circle, V = Reflect, Z = Direct) Correct Yes/No

Verification details:
Is a clamp-on water meter used for verification: Yes/No (if no describe the method used) e.g. reservoir/time calculation, volumetric etc)
Verification flow meter brand and type: __________
Verification flow meter serial number: __________
Last calibration date of the flow meter used for verification: __________

(Calendar certificates needs to be send in (once) after every (yearly) calibration to ECan)
Verification parameters:

Used parameters for verification: Pipe diameter: _____ mm   Pipe Wall Thickness _____ mm

Pipe material: ☐ Ductile Iron, ☐ Mild Steel, ☐ PVC, ☐ Polyethelene, ☐ Aluminium, ☐ other: _____

Location in system where the clamp-on was attached: _____

Measured flows:

Undertake three separate observations and record and average the results in the table below.

Verification flows should be taken at or around the consented flow rate and/or the flow rate the well is usually pumped at.

If flows don’t verify within 5% a second clamp-on location can/should be attempted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Location 1 Observation 1</th>
<th>Location 1 Observation 2</th>
<th>Location 1 Observation 3</th>
<th>Location 2 Observation 1</th>
<th>Location 2 Observation 2</th>
<th>Location 2 Observation 3</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>installed meter flow: L/s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verification flow meter: L/s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certification:

☐ I/we certify that the above flowmeter/water measuring device has been verified and the measured flow is within 5% of the verification meter.

OR (circle one)

☐ I/we have found that the installed flowmeter/water measuring device deviates more then 5% above/below the verified flow.

Recommend remedial action:

Verified by: _____

Signed (by verifier): _____________________________

Verifiers Certificate No *: _____

Date: _____

Company: _____

* Each verifier will be registered by the manufacturer/supplier on having attended a verifier course for their equipment. ECAn will keep a list of the approved verifiers and certificate numbers.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: WAT-05-03-07-115 / 180726083675

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 7 August 2018

FROM: Colin Roxburgh, Water Asset Manager

SUBJECT: Southwest Rangiora Supply Main – Request for Additional Budget

SIGNED BY:

Department Manager Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report is to request an additional capital budget of $40,000 for the Southwest Rangiora Supply Main – Stage 1 project.

1.2 The current budget for the project is $274,000, while the required budget to complete the project is $314,000.

1.3 The scope of the budget is to cover the extra-over costs for the installation of a 300mm diameter main over and above the costs of a 150mm diameter main in the Townsend Fields development, as well as the cost of installing a 375mm diameter main to provide a connection from the South Belt Headworks to the new development area.

1.4 The costs for the connection from the headworks to the development area has been quoted by the Council's Water Unit at $147,776.36, which is approximately $40,000 greater than the remaining available budget.

1.5 The additional budget allocation is required to ensure there is sufficient budget to accept the Water Unit’s quote and complete the project.

1.6 The costs against this project will be recovered through the West Rangiora water development contribution. This development contribution is currently $1,175 per new connection, with the additional budget forecast to increase the development contribution for future years by $49 per connection.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180726083675.

(b) Approves an additional capital budget of $40,000 to the Southwest Rangiora Supply Main – Stage 1 project for the 2018/19 financial year to give a total budget figure of $314,000.

(c) Approves staff to engage the Council’s Water Unit to complete these works for the quoted price of 147,776.36 without seeking alternative prices.
Notes that the reason for not publicly tendering the work is because the Water Unit have the capability and capacity to complete the work at a competitive price.

Notes that the costs associated with this project will be recovered through the West Rangiora Water development contribution, and that the increase in budget will increase this development contribution by $49 per new connection from the 2019/20 financial year onwards.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The Townsend Fields development is currently being completed within the west Rangiora area. As part of this development water infrastructure is required to be installed.

3.2 If the water infrastructure was required solely to serve the development area a 150mm diameter trunk main would be required. Council has required that a 300mm diameter trunk main be installed to future proof this main so that it can serve the wider west Rangiora area in the future, rather than just the current development area.

3.3 The “extra-over” costs of this increased pipe size are to be paid by Council, while the base cost if only a 150mm diameter pipe was to be installed are covered by the developer.

3.4 Council is also required to fund the connection from the headworks to the development area. This has been sized as a 375mm internal diameter main to serve not only the Townsend Fields development but the wider area.

3.5 The total costs allocated for the Council funded portion of this work is $274,000, and is to be recovered through the West Rangiora Water development contribution.

3.6 The work within the development area is being completed at present by the developer. The Council’s Water Unit have provided a quote of $147,776.36 to complete the connection to the development.

3.7 The remaining budget for this work is approximately $120,000. A additional budget of $40,000 is recommended such that there is sufficient budget to complete the works, taking into account a construction contingency of approximately $10,000.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

Direct Engagement of Water Unit

4.1. Trenching, pipework and fittings, reinstatement, and miscellaneous civil works are to be completed by the Council’s Water Unit. These types of work are typical of work undertaken by the Water Unit and are within the abilities of the Water Unit to complete.

4.2. The advantages of engaging the Water Unit for this project are:

   a. The Water Unit is technically capable of completing the this works having already completed similar works in the past.

   b. Unit rates from the Water Unit are typically below market rates when projects have been competitively tendered.

4.3. The Water Unit is able to undertake the work in the timeframes required. The budget and total expenses on this project are presented in Section 6.1.

4.4. Council Policy S-CP 4160 requires that contracts are put out to competitive tender or, where practical, three prices are sought. Competitive prices were not sought for this work;
therefore Management Team approval is required by Council Policy S-CP 4160. The reasons for selecting the Water Unit as a preferred contractor are as follows:

∑ The Council’s Water Unit provides very competitive rates that are below the tendered rates of other civil contractors.
∑ The Water Unit is responsible for operating the infrastructure and thereby has a greater ownership of the infrastructure. Especially as the Water Unit will be called upon to undertake any necessary maintenance.

4.5. The Council could instruct the Water Asset Manager to competitively tender the works. However, this is unlikely to yield a better contractual arrangement (price and quality of contractor).

Allocation of Additional Budget

4.6. Council could choose not to allocate the additional budget required to complete the project. However, this would mean that the new development would not be able to be sufficiently serviced with drinking-water, and further growth to the west of Rangiora would be restricted.

4.7. The benefits associated with the additional budget are considered to outweigh the minor impact that this will have on the West Rangiora Water development contribution.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

5.2. The remaining works are to be undertaken within Council’s utilities reserve land. Community groups are unlikely to be negatively affected by the works.

5.3. Wider Community

5.4. The works will provide benefits to the wider community. In particular those looking to move into the new development area, or the wider west Rangiora area in the future.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.2. The budgetary status of this project are summarised below:
**Table 1: Budget Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost (rounded)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extra-over costs of DN300 over DN150 main</td>
<td>$134,000</td>
<td>Work completed as part of development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New DN375 Connection to Development Area</td>
<td>$148,000</td>
<td>Water Unit quote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Already Procured for DN375 Connection</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>Some critical materials with long lead times already purchased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Fees and other Minor Project Costs</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contingency</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Required Budget</td>
<td>$314,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Budget</td>
<td>$274,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Shortfall</td>
<td>$ 40,000</td>
<td>Required budget minus existing budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3. As demonstrated above, an additional budget of $40,000 is required to allow the completion of this project.

6.4. This increase in budget is calculated to have a $49 increase to the West Rangiora water development contribution.

6.5. **Community Implications**

6.6. The installation of this pipe will be of benefit to the community. It will benefit those who will live in the development area, those who live in the wider west Rangiora area in the future, as well as provide some additional resilience to the greater Rangiora scheme by having another trunk main out of the South Belt water supply headworks.

6.7. **Risk Management**

6.8. The normal construction risks apply to this project.

6.9. There are some additional risks given that this is a key trunk main for the scheme. There would be risks in tendering the installation of a key trunk main through an open process, however this has been managed through the direct engagement of the Council’s Water Unit. The Water Unit are competent in the installation of pipework of this size, and have a good understanding of the importance of this infrastructure and therefore carry out works of this nature with a high degree of care.

6.10. **Health and Safety**

6.11. Health and Safety will be managed for this work through the Council’s Health and Safety System.

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. There are no significant legislative implications associated with this project.
7.4. **Community Outcomes**

7.5. The following key community outcomes are relevant in this matter:

- 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.

7.6. **Delegations**

7.7. The Council has the delegated authority to allocate the additional budget requested.

7.8. The Management Team has the delegated authority to approve the direct engagement of the Water Unit. However, as this cannot be done until the additional budget is allocated, this has been requested from Council for efficiency of reporting and to ensure there are not unnecessary delays with a further report being required subsequent to the allocation of the additional budget.
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report is seeking Council approval to lodge a proposed plan change and notice of requirement for Rangiora Airfield

Attachments:

i. Rangiora Airfield Proposed Plan Change (Trim 180730084763)
ii. Rangiora Airfield Notice of Requirement (Trim 180730084766)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No.180730084697

(b) Approves staff lodging the Proposed plan change and notice of requirement for Rangiora Airfield (Trim 180730084763 and 180730084766)

(c) Circulates this report to the Boards.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The concept of designating the Rangiora Airfield has been discussed with Council on several occasions since 2001.

3.2 In August 2015 Council approved staff proceeding with preparing a notice of requirement to designate the Rangiora Airfield and a Plan Change to introduce noise contours around the airfield.

3.3 The predominant use of the airfield is for recreational, agricultural and training operations. The airfield currently supports 40-45,000 aircraft movements per annum, comprising aeroplanes, microlight planes, helicopters, gliders, and gyroplanes. Based on recent data collected, operations generally peak annually in October with approximately 3,500 aircraft movements over the month, with operations peaking on Sundays. The airfield is capable of handling take-offs and landing at three minute intervals. There are no commercial passenger flights from the airfield, however there are limited commercial helicopter operations from the airfield. The airfield does not contain lighting or navigational aids and therefore there are no operations outside of daylight hours.
3.4 In 2015 Council approved the engagement of PLANZ consultants to prepare the necessary documentation supported by Marshall Day for the preparation of noise contours.

3.5 Since 2015 there have been several update briefings to Council.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1 In addition to the preparation of the appropriate documentation, PLANZ have met with directly affected landowners, the Airfield Advisory Group and hosted two public meetings.

4.2 The Proposed Plan Change and Notice of Requirement documents are comprehensive and the data used for the preparation of the noise contours is based on the AIMM airfield monitoring system which monitors and records each pilots broadcast for take off and landings at the Rangiora Airfield.

4.3 The proposed designation is required to enable the efficient and effective on-going operation of the existing Rangiora Airfield, which is owned by Waimakariri District Council, for airport purposes and to limit noise sensitive development and manage activities which pose a risk to aircraft movements within the proposed 65dBA noise contour to ensure the safe and continued functioning of the airfield.

4.4 This Notice of Requirement (NoR) seeks to designate the whole of the airfield site as well as the adjoining privately owned land within the 65dBA noise contour.

4.5 The purpose of the proposed designation comprises two parts:

(i) For the land owned by Waimakariri District Council to be recognised for providing for efficient and effective airport facilities and operations;

(ii) For the balance of private/public land within the identified 65dBA, the purpose is more constrained, and seeks only to protect the safe and continued use of the airfield operations. The designation in these areas does not extend to airport activities or associated works onto this land.

4.6 This Notice of Requirement is accompanied by a Proposed Plan Change (PPC). The PPC primarily seeks to introduce noise contours and associated objectives, policies and rules to ensure development in the vicinity of the airfield does not affect its ongoing and future operations.

4.7 The objectives of the Waimakariri District Council in preparing this NoR are:

- Safeguard the operations of the Rangiora Airfield and to minimise the impacts of surrounding noise sensitive land uses on the continued operation.

- Provide recognition of the social, economic and cultural contribution of Rangiora Airfield, and ensure that aviation clubs and businesses which locate at the airfield will not be at risk from development surrounding the airfield.

- Provide greater clarity within the district plan of the operational requirements of Rangiora Airfield, and provide notice of its location to surrounding landowners.

- Give effect to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement which recognises Rangiora Airfield as 'regionally significant infrastructure'.

4.8 Once lodged with the Council the plan change will be the subject of a report to the District Planning and Regulation Committee.
4.9. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

There has been consultation with affected groups and organisations and there will be further opportunities through the Plan Change Process for groups to express their views on the proposal.

5.2. **Wider Community**

There have been two opportunities for input and there will be opportunities through the Plan Change Process for members of the community to express their views on the proposal.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

The designation positively contributes economically, socially and culturally through supporting local aviation-related clubs and businesses.

The costs of progressing the plan change will be met from within existing budgets.

6.2. **Community Implications**

The designation provides for a more enabling planning framework for the future use of the Rangiora Airfield Land for aviation purposes.

6.3. **Risk Management**

6.4. **Health and Safety**

The designation will improve airfield safety and limit potential reverse sensitivity effects on the airfield albeit that there is some restriction on land use in those areas outside of the airfield itself.

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**

Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality

7.4. **Delegations**

The Council is the appropriate decision making body.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Outline of Requested Plan Change

The Rangiora Airfield has been present on the land just south of the Ashley River since the 1950’s. Since that time the use of the airfield has increased with various aircraft related buildings now occupying the site and supporting aircraft movements approaching 40,000 annually.

This growth has meant the Rangiora Airfield is now listed as strategic infrastructure within the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. In recognition of that status, and projected future continued growth, the Waimakariri District Council (“the Council”) has resolved to undertake a plan change to the Operative Waimakariri District Plan (“the District Plan”) in accordance with Clause 21 of Part 2 of the First Schedule to the Resource Management Act (“the RMA”). The Proposed Plan Change is referred to as the “PPC”.

The land subject to the PPC comprises the properties located within the proposed 55dBA Ldn noise contour lines and the Obstacle Limitation Surfaces associated with the existing and future use of the Rangiora Airfield as identified in Figure 1.

The existing Obstacle Limitation Surfaces currently identified on Planning Map 145 do not reflect the current runway lengths. Accordingly, revised Obstacle Limitation Surfaces are proposed to be adopted as part of the Proposed Plan Change.

The legal descriptors of the properties affected by the PPC are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contours (*both contours and Obstacle Limitation Surfaces)</th>
<th>Obstacle Limitation Surface Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1 DP 320694*</td>
<td>Lots 9 &amp; 10 DP 83612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2 DP 320694</td>
<td>Lots 11, 12, 13 &amp; 14 DP 83612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots 2 DP 410643*</td>
<td>Lot 1 DP 68030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots 3 and 4 in DP 410643</td>
<td>Lot 1 DP 81053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1 DP 24674*</td>
<td>Pt RS 5928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS 38634*</td>
<td>RS 5655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1 in DP 410643</td>
<td>RS 2720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 5 in DP 410643*</td>
<td>Lot 3 DP 496829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part RES 3101 (Ashley River Riparian Reserve)*</td>
<td>RS 3320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots 1 and 2 DP 426606*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS 5727*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS 5751*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS 5926*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots 1 and 2 DP 46093*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt RS 10471*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1 DP 83612*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots 2 and 3 DP 83612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lot 2 DP 27290*
RS 42645*
Section 1 SO 18768*
Lot 2 DP 4449*
Lots 1 and 2 DP 484368*
Lot 2 DP 415561*
Lot 1 DP 22924*
Lot 2 DP 5225
RS 10449*
Pt RS 33396

In accordance with clause 21 of Schedule 1 to the Resource Management Act 1991 (“the RMA”), the Council seeks to make the following principal changes to the District Plan:

- Amend Planning Map 145 by identifying the 65dBA L_{dn} (the air noise boundary) and 55dBA L_{dn} (outer control boundary) noise contour lines around the Rangiora Airport site based on the application of NZS 6805:1992;
- Amend Planning Map 145 to amend the Obstacle Limitation Surface for the Rangiora Airfield based on the current and projected runway configuration and the present land ownership of Rangiora Airfield;
- Amend the objective and policy framework for the Utilities and Traffic and Rural Chapters to avoid the potential for reverse sensitivity effects by providing on-going protection for the operation, efficient use and development of the Rangiora Airfield, which is recognised as ‘strategic infrastructure’ within the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement;
- Amend the rule framework in Chapter 31 Health, Safety and Wellbeing to:
  1. require any noise sensitive activity (including new dwellinghouses or additions to dwellinghouses) to be insulated from aircraft noise within the 55dBA L_{dn} noise contour lines around the Rangiora Airport site; and
  2. Prohibit noise sensitive development (which includes dwellinghouses) within the proposed Rangiora Airfield 65dBA L_{dn} noise contour; and
  3. Amend Rule 30.5 to require Rangiora Airfield to operate so that the noise from the aircraft operations does not exceed L_{dn} 65dBA outside the L_{dn} 65dBA airport noise contour in accordance with NZS6805:1992.

Note: The Plan Change also includes any consequential amendments to the Waimakariri District Plan as a result of the above changes, including numbering and cross referencing. This may include Planning Maps 33, 34 and 110A being amended to include the contours proposed to be shown on Planning Map 145.
1.2 Notice of Requirement

In conjunction with this PPC the Council is also issuing a Notice of Requirement pursuant to section 168A of the RMA to designate the airfield site owned by the Waimakariri District Council, as well as the adjoining privately owned land within the 65dBA noise contour.

The purpose of the proposed designation comprises two parts:

i. For the land owned by Waimakariri District Council to be recognised for providing for efficient and effective airport facilities and operations; and

ii. For the balance of the land within the identified 65dBA, the purpose is more constrained, and seeks only to protect the efficient and effective use of the airfield operations. The designation does not extend the airport activities or associated works onto this land.

1.3 Scope of Report

This report has been prepared to support the PPC and is intended to fulfil the requirements of Section 32, and Schedules 1 and 4 of the RMA.

The report:

- Explains the purpose of the noise contours and other matters included in the PCC;
- Outlines the extent of the land included within the proposed noise contours;
- Sets out the changes sought to the operative District Plan;
- Discusses the statutory requirements for the preparation and consideration of the PPC;
▪ Assesses the effects on the environment of the PPC;
▪ Presents a Section 32 evaluation; and
▪ Outlines the extent of consultation undertaken.

1.4 Supporting Information

Specific investigations and assessments in relation to aircraft noise have been commissioned by the Council to support the PPC.

The following supporting technical information is appended to this report:

▪ Appendix 1 – Certificates of Title
▪ Appendix 2 – Noise Contour Plans prepared by Marshall Day Acoustics
▪ Appendix 3 – Noise Assessment Report prepared by Marshall Day Acoustics
▪ Appendix 4 – Waimakariri District Plan Maps (proposed amendments)
▪ Appendix 5 – Economic Benefits Report prepared by Brown Copeland & Co Ltd

The supporting technical information forms the basis upon which the PPC is sought, while also contributing to satisfying the requirement under Clause 22(2) of Schedule 1 to the RMA for an assessment of the anticipated effects on the environment of implementing the PPC.
2 Existing Environment

The Rangiora Airfield is located on the southern side of the Ashley River, at the northern end of Merton Road. The site is located approximately 1.3km west of Rangiora township’s urban limits. The northern site boundary is approximately 130m from the Ashley River bank at its closest point.

Three grass runways are located on site, capable of handling regular light aircraft operations such as microlights, agricultural aircraft, general aviation aircraft, light twin engine aircraft and DC3s. The main east west runway is approximately 1km in length and is known as 25/07. A helicopter pad accounts for some 13% of all current movements.

On the north side of the runway, the site contains a cluster of aviation related buildings, including aircraft hangars (approximately 95), workshops, offices and clubrooms. There are currently no buildings located south of the main runway. All buildings on site are used for activities that are directly related to the airfield.

The predominant use of the airfield is for recreational, agricultural and training operations. The airfield currently supports 40-45,000 aircraft movements per annum, comprising aeroplanes, microlight planes, helicopters, gliders, and gyroplanes. Based on recent data collected, operations generally peak annually in October with approximately 3,500 aircraft movements over the month, with operations peaking on Sundays. The airfield is capable of handling take-offs and landing at three minute intervals. There are no commercial passenger flights from the airfield, however there are limited commercial helicopter operations from the airfield. The airfield does not contain lighting or navigational aids and therefore there are no operations outside of daylight hours.

The Rangiora Airfield site is approximately 49ha in area, being held in seven separate titles as described below in Table 1. The relevant Certificates of Titles are attached in Appendix 1.

Table 1 - Rangiora Airfield Landholdings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Legal Description</th>
<th>CT Reference</th>
<th>Land Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2178 Merton Road</td>
<td>Lot 1 DP 320694</td>
<td>439710</td>
<td>6.9205ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217 Merton Road</td>
<td>Lot 1 DP 24674</td>
<td>439710</td>
<td>20.4872ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219 Merton Road</td>
<td>RS 38634</td>
<td>CB795/5</td>
<td>9.0037ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217A Merton Road</td>
<td>Lot 2 DP 320694</td>
<td>439710</td>
<td>0.7195ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 Priors Road</td>
<td>Lot 2 DP 410643</td>
<td>439710</td>
<td>4.0000ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 Priors Road</td>
<td>Lot 3 DP 410643</td>
<td>439710</td>
<td>4.0000ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 Priors Road</td>
<td>Lot 4 DP 410643</td>
<td>439710</td>
<td>4.0000ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LAND AREA:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49.1309ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1 Surrounding Environment

The environment surrounding the airfield is zoned Rural in the Waimakariri District Plan and is characterised by relatively flat rural pastureland, with large trees, shelterbelts and paddocks and is generally occupied by farming activities and lifestyle blocks. Two stands of pine trees are located immediately to the east and south-east of the site.
To the east of the site is rural pastureland, with several 4 hectare properties containing a residential dwelling. These properties appear to be used for a mix of hobby, intensive and small holding farm blocks. The properties to the south and west of the airfield are generally large and have a lower dwelling density.

The Rangiora Holiday Park and Racecourse are located further to the east of the site, with Rangiora Township located beyond these facilities to the east and south-east, with the closest residential zoning to the airfield located 1.3km to the east. Additionally, there is a block of residential zoned land approximately two kilometres to the south of the site, in the block bound by Swannanoa Road, Johns Road and Mt Thomas Road.

The Ashley River is located directly to the north of the site. The river forms a broad braid in this location, with extensive willow trees and other riverbed vegetation screening the airfield from view within the bed of the river. The land to the north of the Ashley River is predominantly flat pastureland.

2.2 Rural Zone

The purpose of the Rural Zone as identified in the District Plan (14.1) is to maintain the existing open space character of the rural environment, and to protect existing farming activities from being constrained by residential development. The zone rules provide for a minimum allotment size of 4 hectares.

The existing noise provisions in the Waimakariri District Plan require that the daytime noise environment shall not exceed the noise limits contained in Rule 31.12.1.1 within the notional boundary of any dwellinghouse in the Rural Zone. The District Plan noise limits are set out below in Table 2.

It is noted there is no height limit for buildings in the Rural zone.

Table 2 - Noise Limits for residential dwellings in Rural Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Permitted Noise Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday – Saturday</td>
<td>7am – 7pm, 50dBA $L_{10}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundays and Public Holidays</td>
<td>9am – 7pm, 50dBA $L_{10}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other times</td>
<td>40dBA $L_{10}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>10pm – 7am the following day, 70dBA $L_{\text{max}}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Natural Hazards

The Rangiora Airfield is located directly to the south of the Ashley River. Chapter 27 ‘Natural Hazards’ of the Waimakariri District Plan contains setback requirements from the Ashley River. These provisions require any structure to be setback a minimum of 100 metres, as measured from the edge of the bed of the waterbody.

Part of the Rangiora Airfield is located within 100 metres from the Ashley River. While the PPC and accompanying NoR do not include any specific proposal to expand the existing airfield activities within 100 metres of the Ashley River, the NoR for the designation of the Airfield includes a condition which replicates the District Plan requirement for buildings to be setback a minimum of 100 metres from the Ashley River.
3 Purpose of the Proposed Plan Change

3.1 Overall Purpose

The overall purpose (objective) of the PPC is to:

- Introduce noise contours for the Rangiora Airfield. The noise contours have a dual purpose; to provide protection for the airfield in relation to noise sensitive uses beyond the airfield boundary, as well as providing a definable monitoring requirement for managing airport noise;
- Safeguard the operations of the Rangiora Airfield and to minimise impacts of surrounding land uses on its continued operation;
- Provide strategic recognition of the economic, social and cultural contribution of Rangiora Airfield, and ensure that aviation clubs and businesses which locate at the airfield will not be at risk from development surrounding the airfield; and
- Provide greater clarity within the district plan of the operational requirements of Rangiora Airfield, and provide notice of its location to surrounding landowners.

Where there are no current residential or other noise sensitive activities within the 55dBA $L_{dn}$ airport noise contour, it is advantageous to protect the Rangiora Airfield from new sensitive activities from establishing in these Rural Zones immediately surrounding the airfield. This will create a noise buffer between the airfield and neighbouring activities before potential land use conflicts are created.

In areas where noise-sensitive activities exist within the 55dBA airport noise contour, such as residential development, acoustic insulation for additions or alterations to existing activities to mitigate against noise would be required.

The purpose of the PPC is to ensure new noise sensitive activities are avoided within areas affected by the 55dBA airport noise contour in order to mitigate noise and ensure safety from airport operations. It is noted that noise sensitive activities as defined in the District Plan does not include residential activities provided that these are in conjunction with rural activities that comply with the rules in the plan, including but not limited to any dwellinghouse shall be on a site which has a minimum area of 4ha.

3.2 Need for the Proposed Plan Change

The PPC is required to:

- Recognise the Rangiora Airfield operations in the Waimakariri District Plan, which has operated on this site circa 1950’s;
- Avoid new noise sensitive activities within the proposed 55dBA noise contour, and prohibit sensitive activities within the 65dBA noise contour;
- Formally recognise the existence and ongoing operation of the Rangiora Airfield in the Waimakariri District Plan; and
- Recognise, and ‘give effect’ to the status of the Rangiora Airfield as ‘Strategic Infrastructure’ in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement by ensuring that status is reflected in the Waimakariri District Plan.
3.3 **Area Affected by the Proposed Plan Change**

The Proposed Plan Change will apply to the Rangiora Airfield landholdings which are illustrated in Figure 2 below. In addition, the Proposed Plan Change will also affect:

- The land surrounding the Rangiora Airfield out to the 55dBA noise contour modelled by Marshall Day Acoustics (Appendix 2); and
- Land within the revised Obstacle Limitation Surfaces for the Airfield as illustrated on revised Planning Map 145 which accompanies this report as Appendix 4.

![Figure 2 - Rangiora Airfield (QuickMaps 2017)](image)

The properties beyond the Rangiora Airfield which are identified as being affected by the 65dBA noise contour are listed in **Table 3** below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registered Title</th>
<th>Registered Owner</th>
<th>Approximate Allotment Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1 DP 410643</td>
<td>Neil William Smith</td>
<td>8ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 5 DP 410643</td>
<td>Neil William Smith</td>
<td>43.9ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2 DP 426606</td>
<td>Amy and Graham Boyce</td>
<td>4.52ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley River Riparian Area</td>
<td>Crown Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of these properties are zoned Rural on Planning Maps 33, 34 and 110A. These properties are rural in character and include pasture grasslands, shelterbelts and ancillary buildings. While Lot 1 DP 410643 contains a dwellinghouse, this building is located outside the proposed 65dBA noise contour and was constructed circa 1950’s.
4 Proposed Changes to the Waimakariri District Plan

The Proposed Plan Change includes amendments to the District Plan text and the associated maps. The changes proposed to the text include new objectives, policies and rules, as well as amendments to the existing objectives and policies. These changes are discussed in detail in the following subsections.

4.1 Introduction of Noise Contours for Rangiora Airfield on Planning Maps

The Proposed Plan Change includes amendments to Planning Map 145 which is attached as Appendix 4. The key changes proposed to this map are:

- The introduction of 55dBA and 65dBA Noise Contours for the projected operation of the Rangiora Airfield; and
- Revised Obstacle Limitation Surface height controls which will maintain the safe on-going operation of the existing airfield runways.

The proposed Noise Contours include a 65dBA and 55dBA noise contour are extracted below in Figure 3 below, along with the airfield land ownership boundary, and are attached in Appendix 2.

![Figure 3 - Proposed Rangiora Airfield Noise Contours](image)

4.2 Proposed New Objectives and Policies in the Waimakariri District Plan

This PPC proposes to introduce two new objectives and related policies. The proposed new text is shown as underlined.
4.2.1 Chapter 11: Utilities and Traffic

After Policy 11.1.1.8 insert the following and renumber accordingly:

**Objective 11.1.2**

Provide for the safe, efficient and effective development and use of Rangiora Airfield to ensure it continues to contribute to the social and economic wellbeing of the Waimakariri district.

**Policy 11.1.2.1**

Recognise and provide for the social and economic benefits of Rangiora Airfield, and avoid adverse effects from incompatible activities, including reverse sensitivity effects on Airport operations.

**Explanation**

The Rangiora Airfield is a significant physical resource, contributing to the social and economic welfare of the community of the Waimakariri District and the wider Canterbury region. The significance of the Rangiora Airfield is recognised in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement as strategic infrastructure, for its importance in supporting commercial and recreational aviation activities in the region.

The Rangiora Airfield provides significant transport and recreational infrastructure which supports both commercial and recreational aviation activities. Designation of the Rangiora Airfield provides protection of current and future aviation activities, which contribute to the social and economic wellbeing of Waimakariri District.

Defined noise contours enable potential conflict between Rangiora Airfield operations and noise sensitive activities to be appropriately addressed. This includes avoiding intensive subdivision and noise sensitive development within the 55 dBA Ldn noise contour, prohibiting dwellinghouses and noise sensitive activities within the 65 dBA Ldn contour and requiring new residential activities or alterations to existing residential activities associated with permitted rural uses subject to appropriate noise insulation being provided.

**Methods**

District Plan Rules 11.1.2.1.1

Rules providing that subdivision and dwellinghouse development involving areas of less than four hectares in the Rural Zone is a non-complying activity.

Rules requiring acoustic insulation for new rural dwellinghouses or additions to existing dwellinghouses.

Rules restricting noise sensitive activities within a 55 dBA Ldn contour.

Rules prohibiting dwellinghouses and noise sensitive activities within a 65 dBA Ldn contour.

Rules restricting land use where any structure or vegetation penetrates the height control surfaces.

District Plan Maps 11.1.2.1.2

Map showing the location of the 65 and 55 dBA Ldn noise contours.

4.2.2 Chapter 14: Rural Zones

After Policy 14.3.1.1 insert the following and renumber accordingly:
**Issues 14.4**

The adverse effect on the health and safety of people occupying properties in the Rural Zone affected by noise of aircraft using Rangiora Airfield, and the reverse sensitivity effect on the operation, efficient use and development of Rangiora Airfield, from complaints from people occupying properties in the Rural Zone affected by the noise of aircraft using the Airfield.

**Objective 14.4.1**

The avoidance of noise sensitive activities within the 55dBA Ldn noise contour for Rangiora Airfield.

**Policy 14.4.1.1**

Avoid the development of noise sensitive activities in the Rural Zone within the 55dBA Ldn noise contour relating to Rangiora Airfield as shown on District Plan Map 145.

**Explanation**

Rangiora Airfield is a valuable strategic asset providing for recreational, agricultural and training operations. The Airfield operates during daylight hours, seven days a week. As a consequence, occupiers of properties located on land in the Rural Zone, within the projected noise contours for Rangiora Airfield, may be exposed to noise effects from aircraft operations.

To address the potential for conflict between Rangiora Airfield operations and noise sensitive activities, it is prudent to avoid intensive subdivision and noise sensitive development in the Rural Zone within the 55 dBA Ldn noise contour relating to Rangiora Airfield and prohibit such activities within the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour. Residential activities associated with permitted rural uses remain permitted subject to appropriate noise insulation, being provided.

**Methods**

District Plan Rules 14.3.4.1.1

- Rules providing that subdivision and dwellinghouse development involving areas of less than four hectares in the Rural Zone is a non-complying activity.
- Rules requiring acoustic insulation for new rural dwellinghouses or additions to existing dwellinghouses.
- Rules restricting noise sensitive activities within a 55 dBA Ldn contour.

### 4.3 Proposed Amendments to the Objectives and Policies in the Waimakariri District Plan

In addition to the proposed new policies above, the following amendments to the existing provisions of the Waimakariri District Plan are proposed. Text shown to be deleted is shown as **strikethrough** and text to be added is shown as **bold underlined**.

#### 4.3.1 Chapter 11: Utilities and Traffic Management

**Policy 11.2.1.1**

Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse environmental effects caused by the provision, use, maintenance and upgrading of utilities by:

m. avoiding noise sensitive activities within the 55dBA Ldn noise contour for Rangiora Airfield.

**CROSS REFERENCE: Policy 12.1.1.12**
Explanation

...The ability to control the effect of the operation of Christchurch International Airport is limited. However the effects can be:

- Avoided to some degree by requiring that noise sensitive activities be discouraged from locating within areas identified as likely to be effected by such noise and in particular within the 50dBA Ldn noise contour; and

- Partially mitigated by a requirement for noise insulation of buildings or activities shown in Table 31.2 within the 55dBA Ldn noise contours.

In the case of Rangiora Airfield, noise sensitive activities within the 55dBA Ldn contour will be avoided. Further, the protection of Obstacle Limitation Surfaces take-off and approach paths avoids potential for conflict and safety issues as a result of inappropriate development. ...

Methods

District Plan Rules 11.2.1.1.1

... Controls requiring noise insulation of dwellinghouses within the 55dBA Ldn contours of Christchurch International Airport and Rangiora Airfield.

Rules restricting noise sensitive activities within a 55 dBA Ldn contour for Rangiora Airfield.

4.3.2 Chapter 12: Health Safety and Wellbeing

Policy 12.1.1.12

Avoid the noise effect from aircraft and avoid or mitigate the noise effect from road traffic in the receiving environment.

Explanation

Aircraft can only be controlled in relation to the use of airports. There are also limitations on the control of traffic noise. Mitigation of the noise effect in the receiving environment involves consideration of the appropriateness of residential development in some areas, and the extent to which building design can reduce the noise, eg insulation, setbacks.

There is no current noise data for Rangiora Airfield. Noise data collected for the current Rangiora Airfield operation has been used to create aircraft noise contours which show the future 65 dBA and 55 dBA contours will encroach on land surrounding the Rangiora Airfield. To mitigate the noise effects of the Rangiora Airfield on surrounding properties, new residential dwellinghouses and other noise sensitive activities are to be prohibited inside the 65 dBA noise contour, while between the 65 and 55 dBA noise contours noise sensitive activities are to be avoided while new dwellinghouses or additions to existing dwellinghouses associated with rural activities will require acoustic attenuation. Noise associated with aircraft operations is also restricted so that it does not exceed 65 dBA Ldn outside the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour thus providing an assurance as to the future noise levels that can be anticipated.

However, the take-off and landing vectors associated with Rangiora Airfield are known and also protected by rules protect their use.

Methods

Research/Information Collection 12.1.1.12.1

Measure the noise levels within land surrounding Rangiora Aerodrome.
Measure the noise levels within land adjoining strategic roads.

Information 12.1.1.12.2

Provide land developers with available information on likely noise effects from aircraft landing and taking off, road traffic and suitable methods of noise insulation.

Information about the 50 dBA Ldn aircraft noise contour for Christchurch International Airport on Land Information Memoranda for all properties within the contour as shown on Plan Map 138.

Information about the 55 dBA Ldn aircraft noise contour for Rangiora Airfield on Land Information Memoranda for all properties within the contour as shown on Plan Map 145.

District Plan Maps 12.1.1.12.3

Map the noise contours, and sound exposure levels for a Boeing 747-200 single event, for Christchurch International Airport.

Map the noise contours for Rangiora Airfield.

Liaison 12.1.1.12.4

Meet with Christchurch City Council, Christchurch International Airport Ltd, and Rangiora Aerodrome Airfield users, to monitor effects of aircraft noise, and appropriateness of District Plan provisions.

Processes to Deal With Cross Boundary Issues 12.1.1.12.5

NOTE: See Chapter 19: Cross Boundary Issues

District Plan Rules 12.1.1.12.6

Noise insulation standards within the 55Ldn dBA noise contour of Christchurch International Airport and Rangiora Airfield.

Rural Zone subdivision standards for allotment area as a controlled activity.

Rural Zone minimum site areas for dwellinghouses as a permitted activity.

Rules restricting aircraft operations so that they do not exceed 65 dBA Ldn outside the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour.

Rules restricting noise sensitive activities within the 55 dBA Ldn contour for Rangiora Airfield.

Rules prohibiting dwellinghouses and noise sensitive activities within a 65 dBA Ldn contour for Rangiora Airfield.

Rules restricting land use where any structure or vegetation penetrates the height control surfaces for Rangiora Airfield.

4.3.3 Chapter 14: Rural Zones

Policy 14.5.1.1

To avoid new residential and rural residential activities and development outside of existing urban areas and priority areas within the area identified in Map A in Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement; rural residential development areas identified in the Rural Residential Development Plan and MR873.

Anticipated Environmental Results and Monitoring 14.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anticipated Environmental Result</th>
<th>Monitoring Indicator</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Monitoring Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Amendments to the Rules

To achieve the outcomes of the proposed objectives and policies detailed in Sections 4.12 and 4.3, the following additional rules and changes to rules are proposed:

4.4.1 Chapter 30: Utilities and Traffic Management

30.5 Non-complying Activities

Rangiora Airfield Aerodrome

30.5.1 Any land use where any structure or vegetation penetrates the Obstacle Limitation Surfaces shown on District Plan Map 145 and described as:

a. take-off climb/approach surface and approach obstacle limitation surfaces, commencing at ground level at the end of the runway and with a width of 80m at the end of each runway, rising at a gradient of 1 in 20 for a horizontal distance of 1200m 1600m from the end of each runway; or

b. side surfaces, commencing at the edge of each runway and rising at a gradient of 1 in 20 5 for horizontal distance of 300m 115m from the edge of each runway,

shall be a non-complying activity.

30.5.2 Rangiora Airfield shall operate so that the noise from the aircraft operations does not exceed Ldn 65 dBA outside the Ldn 65dBA airport noise contour shown on District Plan Map 145.

Measurement and Assessment of noise from Rangiora Airfield shall be carried out in accordance with New Zealand Standard NZS 6805:1992 “Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning”.

30.5.3 When recorded aircraft movements exceed 70,000 movements per annum compliance with Rule 30.5.2 shall be determined by calculations of noise from airfield operations and shall be based on noise data from the Rangiora Airfield Noise Model and records of actual aircraft operations at Rangiora Airfield and the results shall be reported to the Council’s Manager, Regulation.

30.5.4 Measurement of the noise levels at the site shall commence once aircraft operations reach 88,000 movements per annum and shall be calculated over the busiest three-month period of the year. The measurements shall be undertaken annually while aircraft operations are at 88,000 movements or higher and the results shall be reported to the Council’s Manager, Regulation.

The following activities are excluded from Aircraft Operations:

▪ Aircraft operating in an emergency for medical or national / civil defence reasons
• Air shows
• Military operations
• Aircraft using the airfield as a necessary alternative to an airfield elsewhere
• Aircraft taxiing
• Aircraft engine testing

4.4.2 Chapter 31: Health, Safety and Wellbeing

Noise

31.12 Permitted Activities

Any land use is a permitted activity if it:

i. is not otherwise listed as a discretionary activity (restricted) or non-complying activity under Rules 31.13 and 31.13A; ...

31.12.1 Conditions

31.12.1.4 Within the 55dBA Ldn noise contour shown on District Plan Map 138 and 145, any proposed dwellinghouse, or any building or part of a building described in Table 31.2, shall be insulated from aircraft noise to ensure that indoor sound levels stated in that table are not exceeded.

31.12.1.5 Within the 55dBA Ldn noise contour shown on District Plan Map 138 and 145, any additions to existing dwellinghouses, or any building or part of a building described in Table 31.2, shall be insulated from aircraft noise to ensure that indoor sound levels stated in that table are not exceeded.

31.14 Non-Complying Activities

31.14.1 Any noise sensitive activity within the 55dBA Ldn noise contour shown on District Plan Map and 145.

31.15 Prohibited Activities

31.15.1 Any residential dwellinghouse or noise sensitive activities within the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour shown on District Plan 145 is a prohibited activity and no resource consent will be granted.

[Renumber following clauses accordingly].

4.5 Amendments to Chapter 1: Definitions

To support the revisions in Rule 30.5 add to Chapter 1: Definitions the following:

Aircraft operations means:

• The landing and take-off aircraft (including helicopters) at Rangiora Airfield.
• Airfield flying along any flight path associated with a landing or take off at Rangiora Airfield.

4.6 Amendments to the Planning Maps and Appendices of the District Plan

To implement the proposed Plan Change, the amendments outlined in Table 4 below will be required to the Planning Maps.
Table 4 - Required Amendments to Planning Maps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Map</th>
<th>Required Amendment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Map 145*</td>
<td>- Indicate the 65dBA and 55dBA noise contours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Update the Take Off Climb and Approach obstacle limitation surface paths to reflect the current runway lengths and requirements (the location and angle of these obstacle limitation surface paths are detailed in Rule 30.5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Amend the Rangiora Airfield landholding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Planning Map 145 will also show the designation arising from the Notice of Requirement being issued concurrently with this PPC.

Planning Map 145 reflecting all the above required changes is attached as Appendix 4 to this report.

4.7 Consequential Amendments

The Plan Change will enable any consequential amendments to the District Plan as a consequence of the above, including numbering and cross referencing. This may include Planning Maps 33, 34 and 110A being amended to include the contours.
5 Statutory Framework

5.1 Introduction

This section of the report outlines the statutory documents which must be had regard to in the preparation of changes to district plans. These are as follows:

- Resource Management Act 1991 (specifically the purpose and principles of the RMA as set out in Part II)
- Canterbury Regional Policy Statement;
- Canterbury Regional Plans; and
- Operative Waimakariri District Plan.

5.2 Matters to be considered

Section 74 of the RMA provides the statutory framework for assessing the PPC, and sets out those matters the Council must consider. These include:

- The extent to which the PPC is in accordance with the functions of the Council for the purpose of giving effect to the RMA as set out in Section 31;
- The extent to which the PPC achieves the purpose and principles of the RMA as set out in Part II;
- The extent to which the PPC is appropriate in terms of Section 32 and is the most effective and efficient means of achieving the purpose of the RMA and the objectives of the District Plan; and
- any national policy statement.

Section 74 also requires the Council to have regard to other documents when considering the PPC, which in this case includes the following:

- Management plans and strategies prepared under other Acts;
- Relevant entries in the Historic Places Register (although it is noted that none apply to the subject site);
- The extent to which the district plan needs to be consistent with the plans of adjacent territorial authorities; and
- Any relevant planning document recognised by an iwi authority.

Under Section 75 of the RMA, the Council is also required to ensure that the PPC gives effect to any national policy statement and any regional policy statement.

5.3 Part 2 – Section 5 of the RMA

Part 2 of the RMA sets out the purpose and principles of the Act. Section 5 sets out the purpose of the RMA, being “to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources” which is defined to mean:

“managing the use, development and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety, while –
(a) Sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and 

(b) Safeguarding the life supporting capacity of air, water, soil and ecosystems; and 

(c) Avoiding, remedying or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment.”

To achieve the purpose of the RMA, the PPC seeks, in conjunction with a Notice of Requirement (NoR), to maintain and provide for the continued use and development of the Rangiora Airfield for airport purposes. However, this outcome needs to be balanced with the welfare and needs of the community in the surrounding area. Accordingly, the PPC proposes objectives, policies and rules which seek to manage any adverse effects of the Rangiora Airfield’s activities on the local environment and also address the effects of potential future reserve sensitivity on airfield operations moving forward.

The proposal has been considered in the context of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (“CRPS”). The analysis of the relevant planning provisions (refer to Section 5.7 of this report) has shown that the PPC gives effect to the strategic direction established by the CRPS. As such, the PPC will continue to ensure that the sustainable management purpose of the RMA can be achieved through the District Plan.

The PPC (in conjunction with the NoR) will enable the ongoing operation of strategic infrastructure, in the form of the Rangiora Airfield. The PPC provides a rule framework for addressing the potential for conflict between the airfield operations and noise sensitive activities. This is to be achieve by prohibiting any future dwellinghouse or noise sensitive development with the modelled 65 dBA $L_{dn}$ contour. Within the 55 dBA $L_{dn}$ contour, the PPC seeks to avoid intensive subdivision and associated dwellinghouse development, as well as other noise sensitive activities such as education activities and travellers accommodation. It is considered that the social and economic welfare of the community which includes the airfield would be better enabled through the proposed noise contours than the current status quo.

In addition to the above the PPC includes amendments to the current Obstacle Limitation Surfaces to reflect the current runway lengths. These are important in ensuring the on-going safe operation of the airfield for aircraft taking off and landing in accordance with Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) requirements.

The airfield is not known to have any significant values from an ecological perspective. Given its current use for aircraft operations and the associated existing noise environment, it is considered that the PPC will not result in an impact on the life supporting capacity of the air, water, soil and ecological resources in the area.

The proposed inclusion of a policy and rule (including mapping) framework for Rangiora Airfield will ensure that the provisions of the District Plan will manage any potential adverse effects associated the operational activities of the airfield. The evaluation report prepared pursuant to section 32 of the RMA has shown that the proposed provisions are appropriate and will ensure that any potential for adverse effects on the environment can be appropriately addressed.

Overall, allowing for the proposed changes to the District Plan is considered to better achieve the overriding purpose of the RMA, being the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.

5.4 Part 2 – Section 6 of the RMA

The PPC does not relate to any of the values within the scope of subsections 6(a) to (g) of the RMA.
5.5 Part 2 – Section 7 of the RMA

Section 7 requires particular regard to be had to “other matters”. Of relevance to the PPC are:

(a) The efficient use and development of natural and physical resources;
(b) The maintenance and enhancement of amenity values;
(f) The maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment.

Rangiora Airfield represents an existing physical resource. The PPC, in conjunction with the NoR for designation of the airfield for airport purposes, seeks to protect both the ongoing operations of the Rangiora Airfield, and the acoustic amenity of the surrounding area. These two mechanisms seek to balance the efficient use of the airfield operations with the use of the surrounding land for rural activities. The substantive changes to the District Plan have been designed to enable the continued use of surrounding properties for rural purposes, subject to a level of noise insulation for dwellinghouses, while restricting the establishment of noise sensitive activities within areas identified to be exposed to aircraft noise greater than 55 dBA. The provisions also ensure that overall airfield operations will meet an established noise limit thereby protecting the amenity of the surrounding area from increasing aircraft noise beyond the set limit.

For the area within the 65 dBA contour dwellinghouses and noise sensitive activities have been prohibited. The noise levels in this area are considered to have a too greater impact on amenity to allow such development to occur.

The PPC will not result in any adverse impacts on the natural or physical environment surrounding the airfield, including the Ashley River as assessed later in this report.

5.6 Part 2 – Section 8 of the RMA

Section 8 of the RMA requires that the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi be taken into account.

These principles have been considered. There are no known cultural values that need to be taken into account in respect of this PPC on the subject properties.

5.7 The Canterbury Regional Policy Statement

The Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (“CRPS”) sets the overall strategic direction for growth and development within the region by identifying relevant issues for which objectives and policies are detailed. Rangiora Airfield sits inside the Greater Christchurch area shown on Map A of the CRPS.

The CRPS contains under the ‘Definitions for Greater Christchurch’ the following definition of ‘strategic infrastructure’:

Strategic infrastructure means those necessary facilities, services and installations which are of greater than local importance, and can include infrastructure that is nationally significant. The following are examples of strategic infrastructure:

- Strategic transport networks
- Christchurch International Airport
- Rangiora Airfield
- Port of Lyttelton
- Bulk fuel supply infrastructure including terminals, wharf lines and pipelines
▪ Defence facilities including Burnham Military Camp and West Melton Military Training Area
▪ Strategic telecommunications facilities
▪ The electricity transmission network
▪ Other strategic network utilities

(Emphasis added)

In addition, the CRPS includes the following definition of ‘Regionally significant infrastructure’ for the entire region which the CRPS relates:

Regionally significant infrastructure is:
1. Strategic land transport network and arterial roads
2. Timaru Airport
3. Port of Timaru
4. Commercial maritime facilities at Kaikōura
5. Telecommunication facilities
6. National, regional and local renewable electricity generation activities of any scale
7. The electricity transmission network
8. Sewage collection, treatment and disposal networks
9. Community land drainage infrastructure
10. Community potable water systems
11. Established community-scale irrigation and stockwater infrastructure
12. Transport hubs
13. Bulk fuel supply infrastructure including terminals, wharf lines and pipelines.
14. Electricity distribution network
15. Infrastructure defined as ‘strategic infrastructure’ in this regional policy statement.

Note: For the avoidance of doubt, this infrastructure is also referred to as ‘infrastructure that is regionally significant’.

(Emphasis added)

Based on the application of these definitions within the CRPS, the Rangiora Airfield is both ‘strategic infrastructure’ and ‘regionally significant infrastructure’. The rules to implement, and the objectives and policies introduced through the PPC are therefore required to give effect to the respective provisions of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement which seek to recognise and provide for Rangiora Airport as ‘strategic infrastructure’ and ‘regionally significant infrastructure’. A summary of how the PPC directly contributes to giving effect to the relevant CRPS objectives and policies, which include those for the Entire Region and those of Chapter 6, is outlined in Table 5 below.

Table 5 - Contribution of the Proposed Plan Change to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement Objectives and Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives and Policies</th>
<th>Proposed Plan Change Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5 - Land-use and Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 5.2.1 – Location, design and function of development (Entire Region)</td>
<td>▪ Provides for the ongoing economic and social well-being of airfield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Development is located and designed so that it functions in a way that:

2. Enables people and communities, including future generations, to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being and health and safety; and which:
   (c) Encourages sustainable economic development by enabling business activities in appropriate locations;
   (f) Is compatible with, and will result in the continued safe, efficient and effective use of regionally significant infrastructure;
   (g) Avoids adverse effects on significant natural and physical resources including regionally significant infrastructure, and where avoidance is impracticable, remedies or mitigates those effects on those resources and infrastructure;
   (i) avoids conflicts between incompatible activities.

Chapter 6 - Recovery and Rebuilding of Greater Christchurch

**Objective 6.2.1 – Recovery Framework**

Recovery, rebuilding and development are enabled within Greater Christchurch through a land use and infrastructure framework that:

9. Integrates strategic and other infrastructure and services with land use development.

10. Achieves development that does not adversely affect the efficient operation, use, development, appropriate upgrade, and future planning of strategic infrastructure and freight hubs.

11. Optimise use of existing infrastructure.

**Policy 6.3.5 – Integration of land use and infrastructure**

Recovery of Greater Christchurch is to be assisted by the integration of land use development with infrastructure by:

4. Only providing for new development that does not affect the efficient operation, use, development, appropriate upgrading and safety of existing strategic infrastructure ...

5. Managing the effects of land use activities on infrastructure, including avoiding activities that have the potential to limit the efficient and effective, provision, operation, maintenance or upgrade of strategic infrastructure and freight hubs.

**Policy 6.3.9 - Rural residential development**

In Greater Christchurch, rural residential development further to areas already zoned in district plans as at 1st January 2013 can only be provided for by territorial users.

- Supports and guides land uses on land surrounding the Rangiora Airfield, in a manner which will avoid the location of activities which are sensitive to noise.
- Provides for the safety of airfield users.
- Specifically recognises the Airfield as a significant infrastructure resource and the benefits it has to user groups.
- Addresses potential reverse sensitivity issues.
- Sets a limit for the level of overall aircraft noise that can emulate from the airfield.

- The introduction of planning rules which will support the ongoing operations of the Rangiora Airfield, and manage the effects on surrounding properties.
- The prioritisation of the ongoing operations of the Rangiora Airfield, which is identified as significant infrastructure, and the management of development surrounding the Airfield to mitigate adverse impacts on new noise sensitive activities and ensure its operation is not compromised.
- Introduction of planning rules which will manage and protect surrounding landowners from airfield operations.
- Ensures that Rangiora Airfield is not compromised by urban growth and intensification.
- Protects the existing investment in the Airfield recognising that it would be extremely inefficient to relocate as a result of the effects of other more sensitive land uses.
- Acknowledges that the operation of the Airfield can affect the liveability of residential development in the...
authorities in accordance with an adopted rural residential development strategy prepared in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002, subject to the following:

(e) not compromise the operational capacity of the Burnham Military Camp, West Melton Military Training Area or Rangiora Airfield;

vicinity, despite the application of practicable mitigation measures to address effects, which can in turn exert pressure to further mitigate effects and that it is better avoid such reverse sensitivity constraints.

Pursuant to Section 75(3)(c) of the RMA, the PPC is considered to give effect to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement’s recognition of the Rangiora Airfield as ‘Strategic Infrastructure’ by ensuring that it is appropriately recognised and is protected from reverse sensitivity effects through the introduction of noise contours and associated provisions.

5.8 Regional Plans

The various Regional Plans are not considered to have any relevance in terms of the Proposed Plan Change.

5.9 National Policy Statements

The only National Policy Statement (NPS) that is of some relevance is that on Urban Development Capacity (UDC).

The NPS on UDC requires councils to provide in their plans enough development capacity to ensure that demand can be met. This includes both the total aggregate demand for housing and business land, and also the demand for different types, sizes and locations.

The relevance of this NPS is limited to the fact that the PPC will essentially curtail the potential for future urban growth in the direction of Rangiora Airfield via the proposed noise contours. The NPS contains objectives that seek:

OC1: Planning decisions, practices and methods that enable urban development which provides for the social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing of people and communities and future generations in the short, medium and long-term; and

OD2: Coordinated and aligned planning decisions within and across local authority boundaries.

Therefore, while the PPC will effectively prevent the urban development of Rangiora growing in this direction it is for sound environmental reasons (the impact of aircraft noise) and relates to existing infrastructure which would be difficult to move and replicate. It is therefore considered that the PPC is an appropriate planning decision for these reasons within the local authority boundary.

5.10 Management Plans and Strategies

The Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) Advisory Circular AC139-7 & AC91-15 addresses Aerodrome Standards and Requirements—Aeroplanes at or below 5700 kg MCTOW—Non Air Transport Operations (18 December 2009).

While the aerodrome current exists and meets CAA standards of particular relevance to the PPC is the change to the Obstacle Limitation Surface in clause 3.2.1 of the circular. This requires that each runway should have a takeoff climb and approach surface which should:

(a) Rise from the end of the runway strip; and

(b) Be obstacle free above a gradient of 1:20; and
(c) Extend horizontally 1200 m from the inner edge; and

(d) Have sides that are splayed outwards at the rate of 1:20; and

(e) Not turn before 300 m from the inner edge, if a turn is necessary.

Since the current District Plan was made operative there have been amendments to the length of runways at the Airfield which are now registered in the Aeronautical Information Publication NZ. It is therefore considered important to update the District Plan (Planning Map 145) by revising the take-off climb and approach Obstacle Limitation Surface in accordance with the above requirements to reflect the new runway lengths.

5.11 Waimakariri 2048 District Development Strategy June 2017

Rangiora Airfield is referred to with the District Development Strategy under the Strategic Aim of being well-connected through infrastructure. The strategy notes that infrastructure, which includes Rangiora Airfield, is critical for sustainable development of the District and that in order to efficiently provide for infrastructure an integrated approach is required.

The PPC is considered to be consistent with this particular aim of the District Development Strategy as the Rangiora Airfield is an example of strategic infrastructure as defined in the CRPS.

5.12 Consistency with the Plans of Adjacent Territorial Authorities

The PPC is considered to be consistent with the Plan of adjoining local authorities noting that the in the Replacement Christchurch District Plan a 50dBA contour is used for certain situations in terms of urban growth which reflects its own circumstances.

5.13 Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan 2013

The Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan provides a values-based policy framework for the protection and enhancement of Ngāi Tahu values, and for achieving outcomes that provide for the relationship of Ngāi Tahu with natural resources. The Rangiora Airfield sits within the Rakahuri Catchment as identified within the Plan.

Key provisions of relevance to the PPC are:

Policy P3.2
To ensure early, appropriate and effective involvement of Papatipu Rūnanga in the development and implementation of urban and township development plans and strategies, including but not limited to:

(c) Plan changes and Outline Development Plans;

Policy P4.1
To work with local authorities to ensure a consistent approach to the identification and consideration of Ngāi Tahu interests in subdivision and development activities, including:

(a) Encouraging developers to engage with Papatipu Rūnanga in the early stages of development planning to identify potential cultural issues; including the preparation of Cultural Impact Assessment reports;

(b) Ensuring engagement with Papatipu Rūnanga at the Plan Change stage, where plan changes are required to enable subdivision;

1 Waimakariri 2048 District Development Strategy, June 2017, Page 25
Policy R1.1
To require that land and water management in the Rakahuri catchment recognises and provides for the importance of this river as mahinga kai to generations of Ngāi Tahu. This means that:

(c) Inappropriate land use on floodplains and river margins is discontinued;

The PPC/NoR process has involved engagement with Ngai Tūāhuriri Rūnanga. No matters of cultural significance were identified. Further, it is noted that the NoR contains a condition restricting development within 100 metre of the Ashley River.

On the basis of the above it is considered that the PPC is consistent with the Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan.
6 Section 32 Evaluation

6.1 Overview

The purpose of the PPC is principally to provide a clear policy framework for the Rangiora Airfield’s continued safe operation. To achieve that outcome the PPC introduces noise contours to provide on-going protection for the airfield operations from reverse sensitivity effects arising from noise sensitive land uses seeking to establish on the immediately surrounding land.

The Rangiora Airfield has operated on the site circa 1950s, and provides an important recreational facility within Canterbury, supporting a number of local and regional aviation clubs. The airfield has three runways which support a wide range of aircraft movements including aeroplanes, microlight planes and helicopters. While there are no commercial passenger movements from the Airfield, a small number of commercial helicopter movements occur from the Airfield.

Based on technical evidence gathered for the Airfield and a review of the relevant statutory documentation, the Council is seeking to make the following broad changes to the Waimakariri District Plan:

- Amend Planning Map 145 by identifying the 65dBA L_{dn} and 55dBA L_{dn} noise contour lines around the Rangiora Airport site;
- Amend Planning Map 145 to reflect the amended Obstacle Limitation Surface height slopes for the Rangiora Airfield based on the current and projected runway configuration and the land ownership of Rangiora Airfield;
- Amend the objective and policy framework for the Utilities and Traffic and Rural Chapters to recognise the reverse sensitivity effects on, and providing protection for the operation, efficient use and development of the Rangiora Airfield which is identified as ‘strategic infrastructure’ within the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement;
- Amend the rule framework in Chapter 31 Health, Safety and Wellbeing to:
  - require any noise sensitive activity (including new dwellings or additions to dwellings) to be insulated from aircraft noise within the 55dBA L_{dn} noise contour lines around the Rangiora Airport site; and
  - Prohibit noise sensitive development (which includes dwellings) within the proposed Rangiora Airfield 65dBA noise contour;
- Amend Rule 30.5 to update the take-off climb/approach Obstacle Limitation Surface provisions and require Rangiora Airfield to operate so that the noise from the aircraft operations does not exceed L_{dn} 65dBA outside the L_{dn} 65dBA airport noise contour.

The PPC does not cover the airport related activities on the Airfield land, as the airport activities will be managed through the proposed designation of the site which is outlined in the accompanying Notice of Requirement for the Rangiora Airfield.

In accordance with clause 5 of Schedule 1 to the Resource Management Act 1991 (“the RMA”), Section 32(1) and (2) of the Resource Management Act 1991 requires a Plan Change to be accompanied by:

(1) An evaluation report required under this Act must—
(a) examine the extent to which the objectives of the proposal being evaluated are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of this Act; and
(b) examine whether the provisions in the proposal are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives by—
  (i) identifying other reasonably practicable options for achieving the objectives; and
  (ii) assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions in achieving the objectives; and
  (iii) summarising the reasons for deciding on the provisions; and
(c) contain a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the proposal.

(2) an assessment under subsection (1)(b)(ii) must -
  (a) identify and assess the benefits and costs of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the provisions, including the opportunities for—
    (i) economic growth that are anticipated to be provided or reduced; and
    (ii) employment that are anticipated to be provided or reduced; and
  (b) if practicable, quantify the benefits and costs referred to in paragraph (a); and
  (c) assess the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions.

(3) If the proposal (an amending proposal) will amend a standard, statement, national planning standard, regulation, plan, or change that is already proposed or that already exists (an existing proposal), the examination under subsection (1)(b) must relate to -
  (a) the provisions and objectives of the amending proposal; and
  (b) the objectives of the existing proposal to the extent that those objectives -
    (i) are relevant to the objectives of the amending proposal; and
    (ii) would remain if the amending proposal was to take effect.

(4) ...........

(4A) If the proposal is a proposed policy statement, plan, or change prepared in accordance with any of the processes provided for in Schedule 1, the evaluation report must—
  (a) summarise all advice concerning the proposal received from iwi authorities under the relevant provisions of Schedule 1; and
  (b) summarise the response to the advice, including any provisions of the proposal that are intended to give effect to the advice.

(5) ...........

(6) In this section, -
  objectives means, -
  (a) for a proposal that contains or states objectives, those objectives;
  (b) for all other proposals, the purpose of the proposal

proposal means a proposed standard, statement, national planning standard, regulation, plan or change for which an evaluation report must be prepared under this Act

provisions means, -
  (a) for a proposed plan or change, the policies, rules, or other methods that implement, or give effect to, the objectives of the proposed plan or change;
  (b) for all other proposals, the policies or provisions of the proposal that implement, or give effect to, the objectives of the proposal.

Section 32 (1)(a) requires an examination of the extent to which the objectives of the proposal being evaluated are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA. In terms of the meaning of "objectives", subsection (6) is therefore relevant. This requires an evaluation to be assessed in terms of the purpose of the proposal. The purpose of the proposal is set out under Part 3 of this Plan Change request.
Section 32(1)(b) requires an examination as to whether the provisions of the proposal are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives (i.e., the purpose of the proposal). Under Section 32(1)(b), subclauses (i) and (ii), this requires consideration of other reasonably practicable options for achieving the purpose of the proposal, assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of these provisions, and a summary of the reasons for deciding on the provisions as proposed through the PPC.

In terms of subsections 32(3) and 32(6), the PPC is an amending proposal as it amends an operative district plan that already exists. Accordingly, the examination under subsection (1)(b) must relate to the provisions and objectives (the purpose) of the amending proposal, and the objectives of the existing proposal (the operative district plan) to the extent that these are relevant to the PPC and would be able to remain if the amending proposal was to take effect. In other words, the PPC must not have the effect of creating inconsistencies or conflict with the existing objectives of the operative district plan.

Section 32(1)(c) requires that the evaluation contain a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the environmental, economic, social and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the proposal.

6.2 Section 32(1)(a)
- the extent to which the objectives of the proposal (the purpose of the PPC) is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act.

The purpose of the Act (as quoted earlier in this assessment) is to provide for people’s social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and their health and safety while (at the same time) satisfying the requirements of subsections (a) to (c). This is to be achieved by sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations and safeguard the life supporting capacity of air, water, soil and ecosystems.

Rangiora Airfield is a physical resource within Waimakariri District and as noted earlier is recognised in the CRPS as strategic infrastructure, but has little recognition within the present District Plan. As a physical resource with approximately $10 million worth of investment it sustains a number of jobs and is a significant contributor to the Waimakariri economy.

The objective of the PPC, in conjunction with the accompanying NoR, is therefore to provide recognition of the Airfield’s economic, social and cultural contribution to the Waimakariri District and to provide for its protection in relation to noise sensitive uses beyond the airfield boundary as well as providing a definable monitoring requirement for managing airport noise. The PPC therefore in terms of is proposed rules is essentially restrictive in character - that is, it imposes controls and limits the range of activities that can occur within the proposed noise contours as well as restricting noise from Airfield operations to the limits set by the 65 dBA contour. To that extent, it can be considered consistent with providing for health and safety and avoiding or mitigation adverse effects.

Based on the above it is considered that PPC is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act.

6.3 Section 32(1)(b)(i)
- whether the provisions of the proposal are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives (the purpose of the proposed plan change) in terms of other reasonably practicable options for achieving the objectives.
As an amending proposal which adds additional objectives or policies, the analysis below is confined to assessing alternative means of achieving the purpose of the PPC. In this context, the do nothing option is not considered relevant, as it would not achieve the purpose of the PPC. Notwithstanding this, the status quo position has been included in the table below in order to provide context to the other options.

Note: moving the airfield to a new location was not considered as a practical option due to the level of existing investment and costs associated with relocation.

A summary of the advantages and disadvantages of the selected option (Option E below), and alternative options is provided below in Table 6.

Table 6 - Summary of Evaluation of Alternative Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION</th>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>DISADVANTAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A – Status Quo</td>
<td>▪ No cost for the Plan Change would be incurred.</td>
<td>▪ Retains current uncertainty and confusion as to appropriate activities undertaken within and proximate to the airfield through having no integrated recognition of Rangiora Airfield in the District Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue with existing Rural zoning, with no planning rules or policies which acknowledge the continued operation of the Rangiora Airfield.</td>
<td>▪ No new regulation imposed upon properties surrounding the airfield.</td>
<td>▪ Continues the situation of having to deal with proposed activities on the Airfield against the existing Rural Zone requirements, including incongruent buildings and structures with Rural zone outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Provides no protection for the ongoing operations of the Airfield from development on surrounding properties which could cause reverse sensitivity, or generate aviation hazards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Reduces the long-term sustainability of Airfield activities on the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B – Plan Change Only</td>
<td>▪ Would provide an objective, policy and rule framework to protect the Airfield operations from activities which are sensitive to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce the changes to the District Plan outlined in the PPC which include amendments to the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Waimakariri District Council
Rangiora Airfield
Proposed Plan Change
July 2018
### Planning Maps to include noise contours.
- aviation noise or generate aviation hazards.
- Would provide an objective and policy framework protecting the operation, efficient use and development of the Rangiora Airfield and acknowledging its ‘strategic infrastructure’ status thus giving effects to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.
- Limits activities on adjoining properties within the identified noise contours.
- Relies on a continuation of the resource consents within the Rural Zone for airport related activities.

### C – Designation only
Manage the operation of the Airport through Designation of the land only, with no new objectives or policies.
- Provides for Airfield activities on the site.
- Would establish exactly what is permitted to occur on the Airfield land.
- Reduces the reliance on the resource consent process and provides greater control over the activities that can occur within the designation purpose.
- Would not protect the ongoing Airfield operations from the establishment of noise sensitive activities or activities which could generate aviation hazards.
- Does not provide an objective and policy framework for the Airfield.
- Unlikely to entirely give effect to the CRPS in terms of recognising the strategic infrastructure status of the Rangiora Airfield.

### D – Introduce Airfield Zone alongside the Plan Change
Would require consideration of activity status of various activities, and would likely still require similar objectives and policy amendments to occur.
- Would a policy framework to protect and support Airfield operations on the Airfield land.
- Would provide an objective, policy and rule framework to protect the Airfield operations from activities which are sensitive to aviation noise or generate aviation hazards.
- Would establish a level of permitted activity which reduces the reliance on the resource consent process.
- Would require significant changes to the existing District Plan beyond those proposed in this PPC.
- Would be a greater cost to the Council through the preparation of the Plan Change.
- Provides less certainty and control than a designation.
- Limits activities on adjoining properties within the identified noise contours.

### E – Plan Change and Designation
- Provides recognition of the Airfield activities on the site.
- Costly and timely process.
| As proposed in this PPC and accompanying NoR. | ▪ Would establish exactly what is permitted to occur on the Airfield land.  
▪ Reduces the reliance on the resource consent process and provides greater control over the activities that can occur within the designation purpose.  
▪ Would provide an objective, policy and rule framework to protect the Airfield operations from activities which are sensitive to aviation noise or generate aviation hazards.  
▪ Gives effect to the CRPS. | ▪ Limits activities on adjoining properties within the identified noise contours. |

Overall it is considered that the ‘Proposal’ (Option E) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the plan change taking into account the various advantages and disadvantages of each option.

6.4 Section 32(1)(b)(ii)  
- whether the provisions of the proposal (the proposed plan change) are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives in terms of the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions in achieving the objectives.

The requirements of this subclause are further subject to subclause section 32(2) as quoted above. In summary, this requires that the assessment under section 32(1)(b)(iii) must identify and assess the benefits and costs of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the provisions, including the opportunities for economic growth and employment that are anticipated to be provided or reduced.

The RMA states that the benefits and costs should be quantified where practicable and that the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions should also be assessed.

6.4.1 Evaluation of the Effectiveness of the Proposed Provisions

*Effectiveness* means how successful a provision is in achieving the stated objective, or the purpose of the Act.

The proposed new and amended objectives, policies and rules are intended to protect the ongoing operation of the Rangiora Airfield, and restrict the opportunity for noise sensitive activities on land surrounding the airfield which may create reverse sensitivity issues.

The inclusion of amended Obstacle Limitation Surface height restrictions will protect the safe operation of the airfield as development occurs on surrounding properties.
The proposed objective and policy changes must be considered in conjunction with the proposed designation. That designation, amongst other things, limits the location of activities which could cause safety risks to the airfield operations and regulates the activities on the Airfield.

Accordingly, the proposed PPC and associated designation are considered to be effective in achieving the overall objective of the PPC, being to protect the ongoing safe operation of the Rangiora Airfield.

6.4.2 Evaluation of the Efficiency of the Proposed Provisions

Efficiency means whether the benefits of the provisions outweigh the costs, either immediately or over time.

In essence the assessment of benefits and costs needs to consider both qualitative and quantitative attributes with a view to understanding what proposal is most efficient overall. A summary assessment of the costs and benefits of the proposed rules and methods is set out in Table 7 below.

Table 7 - Cost and Benefit Analysis of Proposed Plan Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Financial cost to the Council in undertaking the plan change, which is borne by the ratepayers. Such a cost is likely to be in excess of $100,000.</td>
<td>▪ Supports the continued operation of the airfield which is owned and operated by Council, and receives income from airfield users ($115,000 in the 16/17 year).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Reduced future development potential for land within the proposed 55dBA noise contour, albeit these areas are already restricted in terms of the range and intensity of uses that can establish as of right.</td>
<td>▪ Increases the airfields regional competitiveness for aviation clubs and enthusiasts, which will result in increased income generated by Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Efficient utilisation of existing significant infrastructure which in terms of private sector interests (hangars and other facilities) is estimated at approximately $10 million.</td>
<td>▪ Provides certainty for existing and future Airfield operations and promotes employment opportunities. There are currently 24 full-time employees at the airfield and up to six part time employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Provides certainty for future investment in support infrastructure and improvements related to the Airfield operations.</td>
<td>▪ Provides certainty for future investment in support infrastructure and improvements related to the Airfield operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Reduces resource consent costs, whilst acknowledging that there will be costs, albeit that they are likely to be lesser (in the order of $10 million).</td>
<td>▪ Reduces resource consent costs, whilst acknowledging that there will be costs, albeit that they are likely to be lesser (in the order of $10 million).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of 25%), associated with Outline Plans of Works.

**Environmental**

- Could support expansion of existing airfield activities, which in turn generate additional effects associated with:
  - a greater frequency and volume of vehicles on the surrounding road network;
  - noise effects associated with increased aircraft movements; and
  - visual effects associated with an increase in airfield related buildings on the subject site.

- Models anticipate airfield related growth with management via rules thus providing a greater level of certainty.

- Ensures avoidance of incompatible activities, and accordingly a reduced prospect of reverse sensitivity effects, by introducing suitable rules and associated designation.

**Social / Cultural**

- The proposed rules would support increased activity at the airfield which may not have been contemplated by surrounding landowners.

- The PPC and associated designation will provide clarity and certainty around what is anticipated to occur on the Airfield land.

- The proposed rules will avoid adverse effects on activities surrounding the airfield.

Based on this analysis it is considered that the benefits of the proposed objectives, policies, rules and associated designation outweigh the costs and therefore the provisions represent an efficient approach to the issue.

In addition to the above it is considered that the key elements of the PPC being the establishment of noise contours and the associated rules are now well accepted practice and provide a high degree of certainty. Therefore, an assessment of the risk of acting or not acting is not considered to be required in this instance.

**6.5 Section 32(3)**

- (where) the (amending) proposal will amend a standard, statement, national planning standard, regulation, plan, or change that is already proposed or that already exists (an existing proposal) the examination under subsection (1) (b) must relate to -
  
  (a) the provisions and objectives of the amending proposal; and

  (b) the objectives of the existing proposal to the extent that those objectives -
    
    (i) are relevant to the objectives of the amending proposal; and

    (ii) would remain if the amending proposal was to take effect.

There are two matters to be considered under this clause of Section 32 - firstly, whether the provisions contained in the PPC are appropriate or necessary to achieve the objectives of the amending proposal (refer to Part 3 of this assessment), and secondly - whether the approval of the PPC would enable the objectives of the District Plan to remain without change. These are dealt with in turn below.
6.5.1 Evaluation of the Proposed Provisions

The overall premise behind the PPC and associated NoR is that the provisions are necessary to protect ongoing Rangiora Airfield operations, and manage adverse effects on the surrounding receiving environment.

To enable the ongoing airfield operations, it is considered appropriate to provide for activities that have an airport purpose. Similarly, the restrictions on activities in surrounding properties have been limited to only those which would interfere with the ongoing airfield operations. In this regard it is noted that ‘noise sensitive activities’ which are permitted within the rural zone (being dwellinghouses with an appropriate rural site size) could continue or be establish, subject to appropriate noise insulation.

The key goals of the new and amended provisions are to:

▪ Provide certainty and a clear direction for development of the Airfield in the District Plan;
▪ Include provisions which support the ongoing Airfield operation; and
▪ Enable acceptable growth of the Airfield operations while addressing the potential adverse effects associated with development on surrounding properties.

The PPC includes both new and amended provisions in the Waimakariri District Plan, which are detailed in Sections 4.2 and 4.3 respectively.

A summary of the consideration of each of the proposed new and amended provisions is provided in Table 8 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8 - Consideration of Proposed Provisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provision</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 11 – Utilities and Traffic Management Objective 11.1.1A &amp; Policy 11.1.1A.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 11 – Utilities and Traffic Management Policy 11.2.1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
potential for the creation of reverse sensitivity issues associated with noise generating activities such as airfields and airports, and also ensures an acceptable level of amenity to surrounding properties.

The inclusion of the noise contours on the District Plan Maps will provide increased certainty within the planning framework of the operational impacts of the Rangiora Airfield, and the requirements for noise sensitive activities to be limited in these areas to protect the health, safety and wellbeing of the surrounding community.

Chapter 14 – Rural Zones
Objective 14.3.1A and Policy 14.3.1A.1

This new objective and policy promote the avoidance of noise sensitive activities within the proposed 55dBA noise contour for the Airfield so as to both limit the nuisance suffered from aircraft noise and prevent reverse sensitivity effects. This is to be achieved through restricting intensive subdivision and noise sensitive development within the 55 dBA Ldn noise contour and prohibit such activities within the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour. The provisions take account of residential activities associated with permitted rural uses enabling them subject to appropriate noise insulation, being provided.

The proposed explanation notes that Rangiora Airfield is a valuable strategic asset and that the Airfield operations are limited to daylight hours, and the adoption of the 55dBA noise contour reflects this limitation.

Chapter 12 – Health, Safety and Wellbeing
Policy 12.1.1.12

An amendment is proposed to the explanation this policy to bring it up-to-date in terms of the overall plan change. The amendment identifies that noise data has now been collected from Rangiora Airfield operations and that this has been used in the establishment of the noise contours. It goes onto identify the resulting mitigation measures in terms of rules relating to the contours.

Chapter 30 - Utilities and Traffic Management
Rule 30.5.2

Having proposed the introduction of the noise contours it is appropriate to ensure the future aircraft operations do not result in the levels set by the contours being exceeded.

A new rule is included at a non-complying status requiring that noise associated with aircraft operations not exceed 65 dBA Ldn outside the established 65 dBA Ldn airport noise contour. The rule is to be based on noise data calculated over the busiest three month period of the year from the Rangiora Airfield Noise Model and records of actual aircraft operations. The rule will ensure that the noise levels predicted are not exceeded thus providing a high level of assurance to affected landowners as to the future noise levels that can be anticipated.

There are some exclusions provided for relating to emergency situations, air shows, military operations, engine testing and taxiing.

Chapter 31 – Health, Safety and Wellbeing
Rules 31.12.1.4 and 31.12.1.5, 31.13A.1 and 31.13B.1

The amendments to Chapter 31 adopt the proposed 55dBA noise contour for the Rangiora Airfield for rule purposes. The first of those is in terms of acoustic insulation for new dwellinghouses or additions or alteration to existing dwellinghouses that are associated with rural activities. The changes are made to Rules 31.12.1.4 and 31.12.1.5 which currently only apply to Christchurch Airport, and extends these as these relate to Rangiora Airfield.

In addition to the above, noise sensitive activities, as defined, within the 55dBA contour are restricted as a non-complying activity to ensure that they are primarily excluded from this area.
The use of the 55dBA noise contour for requiring acoustic insulation and restricting noise sensitive activities is consistent with national guidance (NZ Standard 6805:1992 “Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning) and is designed to protect amenity values and to avoid the potential for issues of reverse sensitivity to arise.

The final rule addition is a prohibition of any residential dwellinghouse or noise sensitive activity within the 65 dBA contour. This is the area in which noise exposure for such activities becomes unacceptable from an amenity point of view.

### Planning Maps

The amendments to the Planning Maps introduce the 65dBA and 55dBA contours for Rangiora Airfield, amend the Take Off and Approach obstacle limitation surface paths to reflect the current runway lengths and amend the Rangiora Airfield landholding.

As there is currently an absence of objectives and policies relating to the Rangiora Airfield in the existing Waimakariri District Plan. The introduction of these new and amended objectives, policies and rules will provide key recognition of the Rangiora Airfield in the local planning framework, which is the fundamental reason for the PPC and associated Notice of Requirement for the designation of the land for Airfield purposes.

The new provisions in association with the Notice of Requirement seek to set out a clear direction around what activities are anticipated and intended to occur on the Rangiora Airfield site and surrounding properties. They also establish a position of the ongoing use of the Airfield for ‘airport purposes’ and control development and specific activities within the proposed Airfield designation and surrounding properties.

#### 6.5.2 Evaluation of the Relevant Existing Waimakariri District Plan Provisions

The second part of this section relates to the relevance of existing objectives of the District Plan and whether they would remain if the PPC was to take effect. The objectives, and for context their associated policies, of relevance to the PPC have been identified and discussed below.

**Chapter 14 Rural Zone**

The total area subject to the PPC is within the Rural Zone of the District Plan. The Rural Zone seeks to maintain rural character and amenity through the objective and policy framework, including restricting minimum lot sizes to 4 hectares, recognising the important role the Rural Zone has for agricultural, pastoral farming and horticultural activities and maintaining the environmental qualities and natural features of the rural environment.

The existing relevant objective and policies for the Rural Zone which are applicable to the Rangiora Airfield and this PPC are extracted and discussed below.

**Objective 14.1.1**

Maintain and enhance both rural production and the rural character of the Rural Zones, which is characterised by:

- a) The dominant effect of paddocks, trees, natural features and agricultural, pastoral or horticultural activities;
- b) Separation between dwellinghouses to maintain privacy and a sense of openness;
- c) A dwellinghouse clustered with ancillary buildings and structures on the same site;
- d) Farm buildings and structures close to lot boundaries, including roads;
- e) Generally quiet – but with some significant intermittent and/or seasonal noise from farming activities;
f) Clean air – but with some significant short term and/or seasonal smells associated with farm activities; and
g) Limited signage in the Rural zone.

**Policy 14.1.1.1**
Avoid subdivision and/or dwellinghouse development that results in any loss of rural character or is likely to constrain lawfully established farming activities.

**Policy 14.1.1.2**
Maintain the continued domination of the Rural Zones by intensive and extensive agricultural, pastoral and horticultural land use activities.

**Policy 14.1.1.3**
Maintain and enhance the environmental qualities such as natural features, air and noise levels, including limited signage and rural retail activities that contribute to the distinctive character of the Rural Zones, consistent with a rural working environment.

The Plan seeks to avoid higher density developments and encourage agricultural and horticultural activities in the Rural Zone to maintain the character and amenity of the rural environment.

The PPC aligns with these provisions with its key objective being to reduce conflict between the Rangiora Airfield operations and noise sensitive activities in the surrounding rural environment. A restriction on activity intensification and retention of open space is considered to be consistent with the above objective and policies for maintaining rural amenity. The PPC will continue to enable the surrounding rural land to be used for rural purposes, however additional rules will ensure that rural dwellinghouse activities within the identified noise contours would not compromise the safe and efficient ongoing operation of Rangiora Airfield.

Notwithstanding the above, it is necessary to introduce specific provisions associated with Rangiora Airfield into Chapter 14. These proposed provisions align with those which are specific to Christchurch International Airport.

**Chapter 11 Utilities and Traffic Management**

Specific to this plan change Chapter 11 addresses Utilities within the District and in particular the management of the effects of utilities on the environment. This is considered relevant to the assessment of the PPC, which seeks to support the ongoing operation of the Rangiora Airfield, which forms part of the local utility network.

The relevant objective and policy of the Utilities and Traffic Management Chapter applicable to the PPC are discussed below.

**Objective 11.2.1**
Adverse effects on the environment caused by the provision, use, maintenance and upgrading of utilities are avoided, remedied or mitigated.

**Policy 11.2.1.1**
Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse environmental effects caused by the provision, use, maintenance and upgrading of utilities by:

...  
* k. avoiding in the receiving environment the noise created by aircraft approaching Christchurch International Airport; and  
* l. avoiding land uses under airfield approach paths that could adversely affect the safety of airfield operations.

Policy 11.2.1.1 presently addresses the noise in the receiving environment stemming from aircraft approaching Christchurch International Airport. The Explanation notes that these effects can be:
— avoided to some degree by requiring that noise sensitive activities be discouraged from locating within areas identified as likely to be affected by such noise ..., and

— partially mitigated by a requirement for noise insulation of buildings or activities ...

For consistency the PPC includes a similar clause to k. above (and associated amendments to the Explanation) which seeks to avoid noise sensitive activities within the introduced 55 dBA Ldn contour thus restricting the establishment of conflicting land uses within areas known to be affected by Rangiora Airfield operations. This policy framework is not however designed to preclude rural activities which are not considered noise sensitive.

The amendments proposed to the Take-off Climb and Approach obstacle limitation surfaces are considered to be consistent with the safety thrust of clause l. above.

**Chapter 12 Health, safety and wellbeing**

Chapter 12 addresses Health, Safety and Wellbeing and the relevant objective and policies for which are applicable to the Rangiora Airfield and this PPC are extracted and discussed below.

**Objective 12.1.1**

Maintain the amenity values and a quality of environment appropriate for different parts of the District which protects the health, safety and wellbeing of present and future generations, and ensure that any potential adverse environmental effects from buildings and structures, signs, glare, noise and hazardous substances are avoided or mitigated.

**Policy 12.1.1.10**

Control noise to a level that is not unreasonable, measured against the character and circumstances of the zone.

**Policy 12.1.1.11**

Avoid noise adversely affecting the amenity values and health and safety of people on neighbouring sites or zones.

**Policy 12.1.1.12**

Avoid the noise effect from aircraft and avoid or mitigate the noise effect from road traffic in the receiving environment.

As previously referred to, Rangiora Airfield is identified as ‘strategic infrastructure’ in the CRPS, providing important aviation facilities for recreational, agriculture and training operations. However, it is accepted that aircraft noise can have an adverse effect on the quality of the noise environment for properties adjacent to the airfield. Notwithstanding this, it is impractical to limit the noise to the boundary of the airfield while maintaining effective and efficient aviation operations. The PPC therefore seeks to ensure that Rangiora Airfield can continue to operate whilst also ensuring that the amenity values and quality of life for people living around the airfield are safeguarded through the use of noise contours.

The proposed noise contours have been prepared based on data obtained from existing operations of, and the projection of future operations for, the Rangiora Airfield based on modelling undertaken in accordance with NZS 6805. The contours establish clear boundaries of the future extent of potential adverse effects for noise sensitive activities. Under the PPC, the operators of the Airfield would also have a statutory responsibility to manage airfield operations such that noise levels are contained within the levels sets by the contours. The PPC therefore increases certainty as to the anticipated noise levels based on the contour lines.

The proposed contour lines will therefore provide protection against potential reverse sensitivity effects on the operation of the airfield in the future. Therefore, it is considered that the PPC is consistent with the overall intent of these provisions. Amendments are proposed to update the Explanation to Policy 12.1.1.12 to align it with the PPC.
Conclusion

Overall it is concluded that the existing objectives would remain if the amending proposal was to take effect.

6.6 Section 32(1)(c)

- Details corresponding to the scale and significance of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the proposal

The following assesses the scale and significance of the various environmental (noise, visual and landscape, traffic and safety), economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the PPC.

6.6.1 Environmental - Noise

The intent of the PPC, in association with the NoR to designate for airport purposes, is to preserve and protect the ongoing operation of the Rangiora Airfield, and avoid the potential for land use conflicts to occur. A key land use conflict consideration is the management of aircraft noise associated with the existing and future operations of the Rangiora Airfield.

The New Zealand Standard 6805:1992 “Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning” (NZS6805:1992) establishes maximum acceptable levels of aircraft noise exposure for land surrounding airports. Its purpose is to protect the health and amenity of the community, while recognising and protecting the efficient operation of airports.

NZS6805:1992 supports the inclusion of rules within District Plans prohibiting, regulating or allowing activities in areas which are exposed to certain levels of aircraft noise. The level of aircraft noise exposure will determine the control boundary which applies. NZS6805:1992 establishes the Air Noise Boundary (ANB) where noise sensitive activity should be prohibited as being 65dBA \( L_{dn} \) and that regulation of noise sensitive activity within the 55dBA \( L_{dn} \) noise contour (Outer Control Boundary (OCB)) should occur.

An analysis of the noise generated from the airfield operations has been undertaken by Marshall Day and their report is attached in Appendix 3. The Noise Assessment identifies the location of the 55dBA \( L_{dn} \) and 65dBA \( L_{dn} \) noise contours for the Rangiora Airfield based on data from existing airfield operations coupled with a projection of future operations. The identified noise contours have formed the basis for the extent of the proposed airport purposes designation which accompanies this PPC, as well as the changes sought through this PPC. While there are no noise contours at present Figure 4 below shows the comparison between contours based on the existing level of aircraft movement and the proposed contours projections of future operations:
The PPC aims to mitigate the noise impacts of the ongoing operation of the Rangiora Airfield by requiring that aircraft movements do not exceed 65 dBA Ldn outside the 65 dBA Ldn contour thus providing an assurance as to the future noise levels that can be anticipated, and by preventing the establishment of noise sensitive activities within the 55dBA Ldn contour. The inclusion of noise attenuation requirements for new rural dwellinghouses or alterations to existing dwellinghouses within the 55dBA Ldn will protect such activities on land surrounding the airfield from adverse indoor acoustic impacts. However, greater protection for outdoor activities cannot be provided.

An aircraft noise assessment undertaken by Marshall Day (contained in Appendix 3) included the following assumptions in establishing noise contours for Rangiora Airfield:

The 2016 noise contours have been calculated based on:

- A total of 39,992 annual aircraft movements, of which 14% are helicopter movements (based on October, November and December 2016 AIMM data);
- The existing runway configurations
- Input data, as provided by WDC (via AIMM) including:
  - Aircraft type;
  - Time of day (day 0700-2200 or night 2200 – 0700);
  - Departure or arrival;
  - Recorded aircraft movements for 2016;
  - Runway usage; and
• Flight tracks.

The future contours, which form part of the Plan Change assume that land on the south side of the Airfield that is currently vacant will be developed, and that based on the available area, the existing number of hangers will be doubled.

An additional 20% of aircraft movements has been allowed to account for monthly variability, making an estimated increase of 120% in total movements. Future noise contours for 20XX have therefore been calculated based on the following:

• A total of 87,982 annual aircraft movements, of which 14% are helicopter movements;
• No change to the anticipated fleet mix;
• The threshold of vector R28 would in time be extended to increase its potential usefulness;
• No change to 2016 vectors splits;
• No night-time use of the airfield; and
• No significant change to flight tracks.

The proposed noise control boundaries would, if such increased movements occurred, represent a change in aircraft noise levels compared with the current noise exposure. The effect of this change on the surrounding areas would result in an increase in average noise exposure, of slightly over 3 dB at all nearby dwellinghouses which the assessment describes as being just detectable.

The assessment recommends for activities within the proposed contours that:

• New Activities Sensitive to Aircraft Noise (ASAN) located within the OCB, should be prohibited, unless there is a strong existing expectation of residential development, such as associated with a rural use;
• New ASANs located within the ANB should be prohibited;
• Alterations and additions to existing ASANs located within the OCB in all zones should be fitted with appropriate sound insulation; and
• Where sound insulation is required a ventilation system (or systems) should be provided.

The assessment recommends for airport noise management that:

• On land not designated airport purposes (i.e. any land not owned by the airport), noise from aircraft operations should be managed so as not to exceed a Day/Night Level of 65 dB Ldn (fixed wing and helicopters) outside the proposed ANB and 55 dB Ldn (fixed wing and helicopters) outside the proposed OCB;
• Noise monitoring should be undertaken to verify that noise levels are not exceeding the requirements set out above. If the calculated noise level exceeds 64 dB at any point on the ANB, then infield monitoring is required for a minimum of one month (at one measurement location) to demonstrate compliance with the noise limit of the ANB; and
• Exemptions to these noise rules should be provided for:
  - Aircraft operating in an emergency for medical or national / civil defence reasons;
  - Air shows;
  - Military operations;
- Aircraft using the airfield as a necessary alternative to an airfield elsewhere;
- Aircraft taxiing;
- Aircraft engine testing; and
- All helicopter operators be made aware of the Helicopter Association International’s “Fly Neighbourly” program and should avoid, where possible flying over or close to residential areas.

The above recommendations have generally been incorporated in the PPC or some limited cases will be addressed directly through the airfield users. However, no requirement at this stage has been made in the PPC for ventilation to be required in conjunction with sound insulation.

Overall the scale and significance of noise effects anticipated by the proposed Plan Change (the proposal) is relatively confined. There is already aircraft noise within the receiving environment created by the existing airfield operations (represented by the existing contours in Figure 4 above) and the extent of the additional area which may potentially receive noise above 55dBA i.e. that between the existing and proposed contours, is not extensive with approximately 50% being within the Ashley River margins. Further, the associated provisions do not limit the ability for dwellinghouses associated with rural activities at 4ha or above to be established but rather require they be appropriately insulated (along with additions and expansions to existing dwellinghouses). The insulation requirements are not significantly greater than modern construction materials currently provide for. It is also noted that flying is limited to daylight hours due to there being no airfield lighting (and a restriction on such lighting within the NoR) and that this is reflected in the proposed contours. (Note: there are a very small number of flights outside the daytime hours of 7am – 10pm primarily in the summer period prior to 7am)

The provisions to restrict noise sensitive activities therefore generally align with existing provisions associated with non-rural activities.

6.6.2 Environmental - Visual and Landscape Effects

The PPC seeks to provide a policy framework to support the associated designation of the Rangiora Airfield. While no specific public works are proposed, the designation of the airfield and the PPC will deliver a planning framework for its ongoing operation, and the future expansion of existing facilities. As detailed in the NoR no specific building works are proposed at this time, so the visual impact of future airport related activities cannot be accessed in detail. However, based on the types of activities which operate at the Rangiora Airfield, structures will be single or two-storey industrial/airfield style buildings, with limited visual impact.

The location of the site directly to the south of the Ashley River, requires consideration of the on-going airfield operations on the Ashley River landscape. It is noted that dense vegetation is located along both the northern and the southern banks of the river, which is of a scale and density which provides significant visual screening of the existing airfield improvements. Further, the Ashley River and its surrounding vegetation provides physical separation between the airfield and land use activities on the northern side of the river.

On this basis in conjunction with the ability to consider specific projects under the s176A (of the RMA) mechanism for considering any submitted Outline Plan of Works, it is considered that the scale and significance of visual and landscape effects associated with the PPC will be minimal.
6.6.3 Environmental - Traffic Effects

The PPC and the associated designation do not include any proposal for specific public works or intensification of use of the existing Rangiora Airfield operations. However, both the PPC and designation seek to provide long-term protection for the ongoing operation of the airfield and possible future expansion. As above, section 176A(3)(d) provides recourse to further consider the traffic implications of any specific project if necessary.

The noise contours prepared by Marshall Day which are proposed to be adopted through the PPC and the designation include assumptions for the future expansion of airfield operations, and therefore there is the potential for additional vehicle movements to and from the airfield in the future.

Vehicle access is primarily from Oxford Road along Merton Road into the airfield. This route does not require any turns once vehicles are on Merton Road. Traffic counts undertaken by Waimakariri District Council in August 2015 indicate an average daily traffic rate of 362 vehicles along Merton Road, with a peak rate of 51 vehicles per hour (count taken approximately 1,000m north of Oxford Road). Merton Road has been designed for a maximum vehicle capacity of 1,700 per hour in each directly, and therefore there is significant surplus capacity in the existing road network servicing Rangiora Airfield.

It is clear from the existing traffic generation, and the surplus capacity in the support road network, that even if the future expansion enabled by the PPC and associated designation were to occur the scale and significance of any increased traffic effects would only be a minimal on the operation of the local road network.

6.6.4 Environmental - Safety

The Rangiora Airfield does not conduct air transport operations or support aircrafts over 5,700kg Maximum Certified Take-Off Weigh (MCTOW), and therefore Runway End Safety Areas (RESA)\(^2\) are not required. Notwithstanding this, it is considered that the adoption of the NoR for the airfield designation will help ensure sufficient clearance is provided at the end of each runway.

The take-off and landing slopes have been updated to reflect current requirements and will restrict the development of structures on adjoining properties. These amendments are however considered to have a minimal effect on the surrounding properties as they reduce the areas concerned from that currently shown in the operative District Plan, and result in substantial positives in terms of health and wellbeing in ensuring that the areas immediately beyond the runways do not contain obstacles which would form a hazard to take-off or landing of aircraft.

6.6.5 Economic Effects

A report assessing the economic effects of the PCC (and NoR) has been undertaken by Mike Copeland and included in Appendix 5. The report concludes that:

- The Rangiora Airfield provides significant social and economic benefits to residents and businesses of the Waimakariri District and the wider Canterbury region. These benefits are expected to grow in importance in the future;

---

\(^2\) The requirement for Runway End Safety Areas (RESA) to be provided are outlined in the Civil Aviation Authority of New Zealand (CCA) Advisory Circular 139-6
• The Council’s NoR and PPC are expected to provide a range of economic benefits to the District and wider Canterbury region;
• From a District perspective, the economic costs associated with the NoR and PPC are negligible; and
• The net economic benefits of the Council’s NoR and PPC will be significant.

It is noted that the prohibition of dwellinghouse development within 65dBA contour will not impact on any landowner’s ability to create a 4ha subdivision and position a dwelling platform outside that contour.

Overall therefore the scale and significance of economic effects of the PPC can be seen as considerable in the context of Waimakariri District.

6.6.6 Social and Cultural Effects

The PPC seeks to ensure that the District Plan provides a suitable planning policy framework to reflect the ‘strategic infrastructure’ value of the airfield within the Canterbury region.

By supporting aviation clubs, hobbyists and local helicopter operators, the airfield provides a social and cultural contribution to the local and regional community. The PPC provides the necessary amendments to the District Plan provisions to ensure that the ongoing operation of the airfield is protected, as well as its social and cultural contribution to the wider community.

It is noted that the introduction of noise contours which apply to land outside of the Rangiora Airfield landholdings will impose additional limitations on the activities which can occur on this land. However, the design of the NoR and the PPC have aimed to minimise the restrictions imposed on privately owned land, and in some cases provide opportunities for the effects of the airport operations to be mitigated through design and construction, rather than introducing prohibition of activities.

Accordingly, it is considered that the scale and significance of the PPC in terms of social and cultural effects will overall be moderately positive.

6.7 Section 32 (4A)

- If the proposal is a proposed policy statement, plan, or change prepared in accordance with any of the processes provided for in Schedule 1, the evaluation report must—
  (a) summarise all advice concerning the proposal received from iwi authorities under the relevant provisions of Schedule 1; and
  (b) summarise the response to the advice, including any provisions of the proposal that are intended to give effect to the advice.

A copy of the PPC and the NoR was provided to Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd along with an explanatory letter informing what was proposed, and to provide a basis for direct consultation, including the opportunity to meet with relevant staff.

The PPC and NoR were discussed by the Kaitiaki Committee for Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga at a meeting on Friday 15th June 2018). The response from the Committee was that they did not have any concerns with the proposed Plan Change/ designation process and therefore did not wish to provide any feedback.

As a result of the above no further changes to the provisions have been made.
6.8 Section 32 Conclusion

Based on the analysis of the Proposal outlined in this section, it is concluded that:

▪ The objectives of the Proposed Plan Change are the most appropriate way in achieving the purpose of the Act, and giving effect to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.

▪ The proposed provisions of the Proposed Plan Change in terms of efficiency and effectiveness are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives having considered other reasonably practicable options.

▪ The benefits of the Proposed Plan Change in terms of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects outweigh the costs and in conjunction with the Notice of Requirement will provide opportunities for economic and employment growth.

▪ There is sufficient information that demonstrates that there are no significant risks around proceeding with the Proposed Plan Change.

▪ The Proposed Plan Change and the associated designation are the best means of protecting the ongoing Airfield operations, with minimal impact on other surrounding properties.

▪ Proposed Plan Change will provide clarity around intentions for the future use and development of the Airfield and surrounding area.

▪ The existing objectives and associated policies will remain if the Proposed Plan Change takes effect.

▪ Advice from Iwi authorities is that they did not have any concerns with the proposed Plan Change (or designation).
7 Consultation/Notification

A draft of the Proposed Plan Change and Notice of Requirement for the associated designation of the airfield was provided to relevant stakeholders as part of a Consultation Plan undertaken in accordance with the relevant provisions of Schedule 1 of the RMA.

The Consultation Plan included letters being sent out to statutory and other consultees accompanied by the draft Plan Change and Notice of Requirement. The holding of specific meetings with Environment Canterbury, Christchurch International Airport and local Iwi. Wider meetings with key stakeholder groups - Airfield Users and Residences affected by the noise contours and the general public meeting.

7.1 Consultation Parties

The consultation process included the following stakeholder groups:

- The Minister for the Environment;
- Civil Aviation Authority;
- Environment Canterbury;
- Adjoining local authorities;
- Christchurch International Airport Limited;
- Local rūnanga, Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga;
- Affected Landowners including:
  - Landowners and occupiers within the proposed 65dBA noise contour, which will be affected by the proposed designation;
  - Landowners and occupiers within the proposed 55dBA noise contour; and
  - Landowners and occupiers within the revised take off climb and approach obstacle limitation surfaces;
- Tenants and users of the Airfield; and
- The general public via an advertised public meeting.

7.2 Consultation Response

The following responses to the consultation exercise were made:

- Environment Canterbury (ECan) indicated there were no concerns in relation to the designation of ECan owned land from ECan as landowner. They also confirmed that the report accurately assessed the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) and that the proposed plan change was consistent with the CRPS which recognises the Rangiora Airfield as regionally significant infrastructure and provides planning mechanisms to support the ongoing use of this facility whilst managing the potential for reverse sensitivity effects.

- Christchurch City Council noted the positivity in Assessment of Economic Effects associated with PPC and NoR with regards the more efficient use of Christchurch International Airport’s resources. They did not seek to undertake any further consultation prior to lodgement of the documentation.
• The Kaitiaki Committee for Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga did not have any concerns with the proposed Plan Change/ designation process and therefore did not wish to provide any feedback.

• Discussions were held with Rhys Boswell from Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL) regarding the nature and detail on the Plan Change. There were no matter of concern for CIAL identified at this point in time.

• At the public meeting local residents asked a number of questions about the PPC and NoR which were addressed at the meetings. The questions and answers have been documented in a report to the Council. One outcome from the public meetings has been the inclusion of an addition condition within the NoR to address the non-provision of lighting on the runways to ensure that flying during non-daylight hours does not occur as follows:

  There shall be no imbedded runway lighting
8 Conclusion

The Proposed Plan Change has been prepared to provide recognition and support for the ongoing operation of the Rangiora Airfield. The changes include new and amended objectives, policies and associated rules, as well as changes to the District Plan Planning Maps.

The changes are proposed in co-ordination with the proposed designation of the Rangiora Airfield and surrounding lands within the projected 65 dBA noise contour for airport purposes. The Plan Change and NoR for a Designation will align the District Plan with the Regional Policy Statement which recognises the Rangiora Airfield as being both “Strategic Infrastructure” and “Regionally Significant Infrastructure”.

The PPC has been prepared in accordance with the relevant provisions of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991. The proposed changes are accompanied by a comprehensive Evaluation Report prepared in accordance with Section 32 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

The overall purpose of the PPC is to:

- Provide strategic recognition of the economic, social and cultural contribution of Rangiora Airfield, and ensure that aviation clubs and businesses which locate at the airfield will not be at risk from development surrounding the airfield;
- Safeguard the operations of the Rangiora Airfield and to minimise impacts of surrounding land uses on its continued operation;
- Introduce noise contours for the Rangiora Airfield. The noise contours have a dual purpose; to provide protection for the airfield in relation to noise sensitive uses beyond the airfield boundary, as well as providing a definable monitoring requirement for managing airport noise; and
- Provide greater clarity within the district plan of the operational requirements of Rangiora Airfield, and provide notice of its location to surrounding landowners.

The assessment and evaluation outlined in this report demonstrates that the PPC is founded on sound resource management principles and satisfies all of the requirements for changes to District Plan as set out in the RMA. In particular,

- The PPC will continue to provide for the integrated management of the effects of the use and development of Rangiora Airfield and the surrounding area;
- The PPC is efficient and effective when measured against the requirements of Section 32 of the RMA;
- The changes proposed are consistent with the existing objective and policy framework in the District Plan;
- The PPC will enable people and communities to better provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing;
- The PPC will ensure that the overriding purpose of the RMA to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources will continue to be achieved.

Consultation has been undertaken with statutory consultees, parties affected by the noise contours and take off climb and approach obstacle limitation surfaces, airfield tenants and users and the general public. All these parties have been advised of the both the PPC and the NoR and in the case of the NoR a condition has been added restricting runway lighting as a result.
It is considered that the Proposed Plan Change will give effect to the Regional Policy Statement, is appropriate in achieving the set objectives, will maintain the established objective and policy framework of the District Plan and overall will ensure that the overriding purpose of the RMA to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources is achieved. On this basis, it is concluded that the purpose of the Act under this Section 5 would be better achieved by the Plan Change proceeding.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Marshall Day Acoustics (MDA) has been engaged by Waimakariri District Council (WDC) to develop both a current and future set of aircraft noise contours for Rangiora Airfield.

Airport noise contours (and the subsequent noise control boundaries) provide the basis for the implementation of New Zealand Standard NZS 6805 in the District Plan. This report describes the methodology used and provides the current (2016) and future (20XX) 55 dB $L_{dn}$ and 65 dB $L_{dn}$ noise contours.

We recommend that the proposed Outer Control Boundary and Air Noise Boundary, based on the future contour set (20XX) and as shown in Appendix E.2, be implemented.

We also recommend the introduction of District Plan noise rules relating to land use planning controls and noise associated with Rangiora Airport that reflect the future (20XX) noise control boundaries and to incorporate the recommendations of NZS 6805.

With the implementation of the proposed noise control boundaries and associated land use planning controls, the noise effects arising from the plan change are considered reasonable.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

Marshall Day Acoustics (MDA) has been engaged by Waimakariri District Council (WDC) to develop both a current and future set of aircraft noise contours for Rangiora Airfield.

Airport noise contours (and the subsequent noise control boundaries) provide the basis for the implementation of New Zealand Standard NZS 6805 in a District Plan.

This report describes the methodology used and provides the current and future 55 dB L_{dn} and 65 dB L_{dn} noise contours.

A glossary of relevant acoustical terms is provided in Appendix A.

2.0 RANGIORA AIRFIELD DESCRIPTION

Rangiora Airfield has three grass runways and a helicopter pad located on approximately 49 ha of land. There are no runway lights or navigation aids and the runway surface is not suited to heavy aircraft. Currently the airfield supports around 40,000 movements per year, comprising general aviation aircraft, microlights, helicopters, gliders and gyros. There are no commercial passenger flights from the airfield and limited commercial helicopter operations. There are approximately 90 hangars, with little opportunity for further development of hangars on the north side of the airfield. The dominant vectors used are R07 (53%) and R25 (32%), with the helicopter pad accounting for a further 13%. All other vectors combined account for the remaining 7% of movements.

The importance of Rangiora Airfield as a piece of strategically, and regionally, significant infrastructure has been described by others. It is proposed that Rangiora Airfield be future-proofed by seeking a Designation and Plan Change for the site and surrounding area under the Resource Management Act. Residential and noise sensitive activities would be prohibited within the 65 dB L_{dn} noise contour. Between the 65 and 55 dB L_{dn} noise contours, residential activities associated with a permitted rural use would remain permitted, subject to appropriate sound insulation being provided, while noise sensitive activities (as defined in the District Plan) would be restricted.

3.0 NEW ZEALAND STANDARD 6805:1992

New Zealand Standard NZS 6805:1992 “Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning” provides a recommended approach for territorial authorities when dealing with airports and land affected by airport noise. The recommended process aims to manage the adverse effects of airport noise by controlling the use of land around airports, and by ensuring the airport does not exceed the future noise contours used for the planning process. A summary of NZS 6805 is provided in Appendix B.

The Standard recommends two boundaries, the Air Noise Boundary (ANB), set at 65 dB L_{dn}, and the Outer Control Boundary (OCB), set at 55 dB L_{dn}.

In addition, New Zealand Standard NZS 6807:1994 “Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas” (NZS 6807) has been developed specifically to deal with noise from helicopter landing areas.

NZS 6807 is similar to NZS 6805 in that it recommends controlling noise and the use of land around helicopter landing areas by establishing a ‘helinoise boundary’, defining an area of land within which, no new incompatible land uses are recommended unless adverse effects are mitigated.

---

1 Based on AIMM data from September 2016 to May 2017.
2 Plan Change documentation.
3 As provided for in Table 31.2 of the Waimakariri District Plan.
NZS 6807 recommends that where an area is subject to planning measures in accordance with NZS 6805 as well as in accordance with NZS 6807, the position of the OCB should consider the position of the helinoise boundary.

Based on the limited number of helicopter movements at Rangiora, it is our experience that helicopter noise emissions would not be particularly significant and therefore for compliance monitoring purposes the pragmatic approach would be to adopt the 55 dB $L_{dn}$ contour from fixed wing and helicopter movements as the OCB.

Therefore, for Rangiora Airfield, the proposed noise control boundaries to be implemented in the District Plan are the:

- 65 dB $L_{dn}$ ANB; and
- 55 dB $L_{dn}$ OCB.

When establishing the location of noise boundaries, an allowance for the expected growth of the airport is made. NZS 6805 recommends a minimum 10-year projection of future aircraft operations. MDA typically recommends 20 – 30 year forecasts are used, as has been implemented at other New Zealand airports and airfields. The noise contours to be incorporated into the District Plan are based on predicted future aircraft movements as discussed below.

**4.0 INTEGRATED NOISE MODEL**

Several computer based noise modelling software programmes have been developed to predict aircraft noise near an airport or airfield. The most widely used of these (and the model referenced in NZS 6805) is the Integrated Noise Model (INM) developed by the US Federal Aviation Authority.

The INM calculation procedures use an energy averaging technique to calculate the noise exposure in terms of $L_{dn}$. The noise level is calculated at many grid points by summing the ‘noise energy’ from each aircraft movement during a ‘typical’ day’s operation. The ‘noise energy’ is calculated using the hourly $L_{Aeq}$ value, night-weighted by +10 dB and then averaged over 24 hours to give the daily $L_{dn}$ value at each grid point. The grid points with equal noise level are then joined graphically to give a plot of $L_{dn}$ noise contours.

The latest version of INM is v7d (Version 7d). All aircraft noise emission contours, presented in this report, have been produced using INM v7d.

To be able to provide a comprehensive assessment of noise effects it is necessary to understand current airport noise emissions in relation to noise emissions being sought via a plan change process. To this end current airport noise emissions are also presented in the following section.

**4.1 2016 Aircraft Activity**

The aircraft activity for 2016 has been provided by WDC, via the AIMM platform, and is summarised in Table C1 of Appendix C.

It is understood that the level of aircraft activity at the airport has been increasing in recent years, which has been reflected in an increase in the number of hangars built on the Airfield. We understand that the current capacity for new hangars to be constructed has largely been exhausted, unless airfield land to the south side of the Airfield (off Priors Road) is developed for additional hangars. Therefore, the potential for additional flights (and any increase in aircraft noise) is constrained, other than from training aircraft visiting from other Canterbury airfields.

The 2016 noise contours have been calculated based on the following:

- A total of 39,992 annual aircraft movements, of which 14% are helicopter movements (based on October, November and December 2016 AIMM data);
- The existing runway configurations (refer aerodrome chart in Appendix D)
• Input data, as provided by WDC (via AIMM) including:
  • Aircraft type;
  • Time of day (day 0700-2200 or night 2200 – 0700);
  • Departure or arrival;
  • Recorded aircraft movements for 2016 (Appendix C);
  • Runway usage (Appendix C); and
  • Flight tracks as depicted in Appendix D and Appendix E (noise contour outputs).

4.2 20XX Future Aircraft Activity

The main forecasting of future aircraft activity for 20XX was estimated by MDA on behalf of the WDC. We have assumed that land on the south side of the Airfield that is currently vacant will be developed, and that based on the available area, the existing number of hangers will be doubled. An additional 20% of aircraft movements has been allowed to account for monthly variability, making an estimated increase of 120% in total movements.

Future noise contours for 20XX have therefore been calculated based on the following:

• A total of 87,982 annual aircraft movements, of which 14% are helicopter movements;
• No change to the anticipated fleet mix;
• The threshold of vector R28 would in time be extended to increase its potential usefulness⁴;
• No change to 2016 vectors splits;
• No night-time use of the airfield; and
• No significant change to flight tracks as depicted in Appendix E.

5.0 CALCULATED NOISE CONTOURS

5.1 2016 Noise Contours

Noise contours representative of the current situation have been calculated to allow an assessment of current noise exposure in the community to occur. This also enables a comparison to be made between the current noise exposure and that which would be allowed under the proposed revised noise control boundaries.

The predicted current noise contours are shown Appendix E.1.

A distinctive feature of the contour is a convex bulge in both the 65 dB Ldn and 55 dB Ldn noise contours on the northern side of the main runway (07/25). This bulge results from helicopter activity at the jet fuel pump.

5.2 20XX Future Noise Contours

The predicted 20XX future noise contours are shown in Appendix E.2.

The noise contours normally used for the ANB and OCB under NZS 6805 are the 65 dB Ldn and 55 dB Ldn contours respectively.

⁴ As vectors R10 and R28 combined make up less than 1.5% of total movements, extending the threshold has very little impact on the extent of the noise contour.
These noise contours are also referred to throughout this report as the ‘20XX 55 dB L_{dn} contour’ and the ‘20XX 65 dB L_{dn} contour’ respectively and include combined fixed wing aircraft (all types) and helicopter movements.

The predicted 20XX 55 dB L_{dn} contour is more extensive than the 2016 contours, particularly to the west and east on extended runway centreline, and to the north (near the helicopter refuelling area) and south (near a slight extension in the threshold of runway 28).

6.0 ASSESSMENT OF NOISE EFFECTS

NZS 6805 inherently envisages some level of growth in noise emissions from the airport by adopting a minimum 10-year planning period and by recognising the need to be able to operate an airport efficiently. Further, the Standard advocates the implementation of practical land use and airport management techniques to promote and conserve the health of people living near airports.

As a result, there is a requirement to determine what level of airport growth is reasonable, when considered in conjunction with the requirement to ensure a satisfactory living environment for existing and future residents. To facilitate this, and in terms of the RMA, an effects assessment is necessary, as detailed below.

The effects of the proposed noise control boundaries on the surrounding community have been assessed by considering the change in noise level resulting from growth and the predicted level of annoyance.

6.1 Existing Noise Environment

Noise level measurements of both the existing noise environment without aircraft and the airport’s noise emissions were carried out between Monday 7 March 2016 and Monday 11 March 2016. The measurements involved automated noise data logging approximately 100m east of the threshold of runway 25.

In terms of the noise environment near the airport, at times when no aircraft are operating, during the daytime, measured noise levels show that the area is typical of a rural environment, with residual noise levels of approximately 30 - 40 dB L_{eq} during non-adverse weather conditions. Night-time noise levels have not been considered as Rangiora is a VFR airfield with no significant night-time activity.

Existing dwellings within the 55 dB L_{dn} contour receive between 55 and 57 dB L_{dn}. This suggests the area would otherwise be typical of a general rural environment but at this location is affected to a moderate extent by aircraft operations. This is typical in such proximity to a local airport in New Zealand.

6.2 Change in Noise Level

The proposed 20XX airport noise control boundaries would, if such increased movements occurred, represent a change in aircraft noise levels compared with the current noise exposure. The effect of this change on the surrounding areas has been assessed.

Two airport operating scenarios have been examined:

- ‘Current’ - The level of actual activity in 2016 (considered representative of current activity)
- ‘Proposed’ - The proposed future 20XX noise control boundaries (Appendix E.2)

The future growth of air traffic would result in a change in average noise exposure, as described by the L_{dn} noise metric, of slightly over 3 dB at all nearby dwellings.

---

5 AIMM records typically note 0-2 ‘night-time’ movements per month
We have assumed only the 120% increase in total traffic, with the split between aircraft type and vectors remaining constant. Allowance has been made to extend the length of runway 10/28 by displacing the threshold of 28 as far as practicable to the south-east.

The subjective response to a change in noise level is widely variable from individual to individual and is also different for a change that occurs immediately, compared with a change that occurs slowly over many years.

However, to give an indication of the meaning of the changes in noise level presented below, the following general response to an immediate change in noise is typical:

- A change in noise level of 10 dB sounds subjectively about twice or half as loud, respectively;
- A change in noise level of 5 to 8 dB is regarded as noticeable;
- A change in noise level of 3 to 4 dB is just detectable;
- A change in noise level of 1 to 2 dB is not discernible.

6.3 Annoyance Effects

Individual responses to a certain level of aircraft noise vary greatly. Many studies have been carried out overseas have attempted to determine the overall relationship of response to noise of a residential community. Much of this was considered when NZS 6805 was developed.

A dose response relationship specific to aircraft noise has been developed by Miedema and Ouldshoorn\(^6\), as shown in Figure 1 below. This relationship is similar to other relationships developed by Bradley\(^7\) and another study by Miedema and Vos\(^8\). The Miedema and Ouldshoorn relationship has been adopted by the European Commission position paper in 2002\(^9\) and is generally regarded as the latest research in this area.

Figure 1: Miedema & Ouldshoorn Dose-Response Relationship


The above dose response relationship indicates that for aircraft noise environments of 65 dB L_{dn} 28% of the population are likely to be highly annoyed. This is one of the reasons that NZS 6805 recommends prohibition of noise sensitive activity inside the ANB. For aircraft noise environments of 55 dB L_{dn} 11% of the population are likely to be highly annoyed by the noise.

It is noted that annoyance effects are not confined to noise levels more than 55 dB L_{dn}. Although the 55 dB L_{dn} contour forms the basis of the OCB, and the outer extent to which land use planning and airport noise controls are proposed, there may be some annoyance effects for a small percentage of people in areas outside the OCB. This is because aircraft movements outside of the OCB would still be audible.

6.4 Mitigation of Effects

NZS 6805 recommends that the mitigation of aircraft noise effects be achieved through a combination of:

- Aircraft noise management measures;
- Restriction on development of noise sensitive activities; and
- Sound insulation treatment measures.

This is the approach adopted elsewhere in New Zealand and it is considered appropriate for Rangiora Airport. Sections 8.0 and 9.0 outline recommended provisions where appropriate.

It is noted that, while sound insulation provides an acceptable internal noise environment, it does not completely mitigate noise effects, particularly for outdoor environments or when windows and doors are open.

7.0 LAND USE PLANNING RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Inside the Outer Control Boundary

In keeping with the provisions of NZS 6805, MDA recommends that new ‘Activities Sensitive to Aircraft Noise’ (ASANs) inside the OCB be prohibited where practicable to do so.

NZS 6805 recommends that noise sensitive activity is prohibited between the OCB and the ANB unless a district plan permits it subject to appropriate sound insulation requirements (inside the ANB the Standard recommends that noise sensitive activity is prohibited). This approach recognises that not all effects of aircraft noise can be mitigated by insulating buildings, particularly for residential activity.
People generally have a desire and an expectation to be able to spend time in the garden, entertain guests outdoors and leave doors and windows open. In these situations, the level of aircraft noise exposure cannot be practicably mitigated. If new residential activity is to be permitted between the OCB and the ANB it can be expected that some residents would be annoyed by aircraft noise outdoors.

MDA supports the NZS 6805 approach to prohibit new noise sensitive activity inside the OCB as a desirable starting point but acknowledges that other factors such as historical land use development, landowners’ expectations of property rights and regional pressures on developable land can modify land use restrictions that would otherwise be imposed by a territorial authority because of moderate noise effects.

For Rangiora, the proposed OCB covers rural zoned land only, none of which is currently shown on District Plan Maps as being earmarked for Future Urban Development (FUD).

It is understood that there is no existing expectation for urban residential development of Rural zoned land which lies within the proposed OCB. Accordingly, it is recommended that:

- Any new ASANs (or residential activity) inside the proposed OCB should be prohibited unless strongly associated with a genuine rural land use; and
- Any alterations or additions to existing ASANs (or residential dwellings) in all zones within the proposed OCB should be subject to sound insulation measures to ensure an acceptable internal noise environment is achieved.

Historically in most cases sound insulation standards for noise sensitive uses around airports have been specified as an internal noise criterion. Buildings must be built to achieve the target internal noise level based on the future external noise exposure defined by the airport noise contours.

If this approach is implemented, then the following design criterion is recommended:

- Internal noise level of 40 dB L_{dn} in all habitable rooms

To facilitate appropriate designs, a noise contour map showing 1 decibel L_{dn} contours and an aircraft noise design spectrum would need to be developed and made publicly available.

7.2 Inside the Air Noise Boundary

NZS 6805 recommends that noise sensitive activity is prohibited inside the ANB.

Noise environments greater than 65 dB L_{dn} are not suitable for residential activity. Sound insulation measures can improve internal noise environments but do not fully mitigate the effects for residential activity, particularly in outdoor living areas or where residents wish to open windows and doors.

NZS 6805 recommends that land use controls to prohibit new noise sensitive activities should be imposed within the ANB. This approach is recommended for Rangiora Airport.

There are no existing ASANs inside the proposed ANB and therefore sound insulation controls for alterations or additions to existing ASANS would not be required.

7.3 Ventilation Systems

In most situations, the required sound insulation standard cannot be achieved with doors or windows open. As almost all houses in New Zealand rely on open windows to provide ventilation, alternative methods such as mechanical systems are necessary to achieve minimum ventilation standards. Alternative ventilation can typically be achieved using moderately inexpensive ducted fan systems in ceiling spaces, which bring air from the outside into habitable rooms.

It is recommended that alternative ventilation is a specified requirement for noise sensitive activities located inside the noise control boundaries. Such a system should also be designed to comply with
an acceptable level of ventilation noise inside the dwelling. Typical limits are 30 - 35 dB $L_{Aeq}$ in bedrooms, and 35 - 40 dB $L_{Aeq}$ inside other habitable rooms.

Where ventilation systems are required, they should also meet suitable performance standards (refer Table H1 and example Table H2, Appendix H, as implemented elsewhere in New Zealand).

We note that MDA are not experts in ventilation system requirements, and third-party advice would be required regarding Table H2 in Appendix H.

### 7.4 Summary of Recommendations

We recommend that:

- New Activities Sensitive to Aircraft Noise (ASAN) located within the Outer Control Boundary (OCB), should be prohibited, unless there is a strong existing expectation of residential development, such as associated with a rural use;
- New ASANs located within the Air Noise Boundary (ANB) should be prohibited;
- Alterations and additions to existing ASANs located within the Outer Control Boundary (OCB) in all zones should be fitted with appropriate sound insulation (Section 7.1); and
- Where sound insulation is required a ventilation system (or systems) should be provided. Noise from such a system should not exceed a reasonable level (see Section 7.3).

### 8.0 AIRPORT NOISE CONTROL RECOMMENDATIONS

#### 8.1 Airport Noise Management

We recommend that:

- On any land not designated airport purposes (i.e. any land not owned by the airport), noise from aircraft operations should be managed so as not to exceed a Day/Night Level of 65 dB $L_{dn}$ (fixed wing and helicopters) outside the proposed Air Noise Boundary (ANB) and 55 dB $L_{dn}$ (fixed wing and helicopters) outside the proposed Outer Control Boundary (OCB);
- Noise monitoring should be undertaken to verify that noise levels are not exceeding the requirements set out above. It is recommended that if the calculated noise level exceeds 64 dB at any point on the ANB, then infield monitoring is required for a minimum of one month (at one measurement location) to demonstrate compliance with the noise limit of the ANB, as shown in Appendix E.2; and
- Exemptions to these noise rules should be provided for:
  - Aircraft operating in an emergency for medical or national / civil defence reasons;
  - Air shows;
  - Military operations;
  - Aircraft using the airfield as a necessary alternative to an airfield elsewhere;
  - Aircraft taxiing;
  - Aircraft engine testing; and
  - All helicopter operators be made aware of the Helicopter Association International’s “Fly Neighbourly” program and should avoid, where possible flying over or close to residential areas.

### 9.0 CONCLUSIONS

Marshall Day Acoustics has prepared noise contours from aircraft operations for Rangiora Airport. To provide for the airport’s future growth, we recommend that the District Plan introduce noise control boundaries around the airport.
We recommend that the proposed Outer Control Boundary and Air Noise Boundary, as shown in Appendix E.2, be implemented.

We also recommend the introduction of District Plan noise rules relating to land use planning controls and noise associated with Rangiara Airport that reflect the future 20XX noise control boundaries and to incorporate the recommendations of NZS 6805.

With the implementation of the proposed noise control boundaries and associated land use planning controls, the noise effects arising from the plan change are considered reasonable.
APPENDIX A  GLOSSARY OF TERMINOLOGY

**dB**

Decibel

The unit of sound level.

Expressed as a logarithmic ratio of sound pressure $P$ relative to a reference pressure of $P_r=20 \, \mu Pa$ i.e. $dB = 20 \times \log(P/P_r)$

**A-weighting**

The process by which noise levels are corrected to account for the non-linear frequency response of the human ear.

**$L_{Aeq(t)}$**

The equivalent continuous (time-averaged) A-weighted sound level. This is commonly referred to as the average noise level.

The suffix "t" represents the time period to which the noise level relates, e.g. (8 h) would represent a period of 8 hours, (15 min) would represent a period of 15 minutes and (2200-0700) would represent a measurement time between 10 pm and 7 am.

**$L_{Amax}$**

The A-weighted maximum noise level. The highest noise level which occurs during the measurement period.

**$L_{dn}$**

The day night noise level which is calculated from the 24 hour $L_{Aeq}$ with a 10 dB penalty applied to the night-time (2200-0700 hours) $L_{Aeq}$.

**SEL or $L_{AE}$**

Sound Exposure Level

The sound level of one second duration which has the same amount of energy as the actual noise event measured.

Usually used to measure the sound energy of a particular event, such as a train pass-by or an aircraft flyover.

**Noise**

A sound that is unwanted by, or distracting to, the receiver.

**Ambient**

The ambient noise level is the noise level measured in the absence of the intrusive noise or the noise requiring control. Ambient noise levels are frequently measured to determine the situation prior to the addition of a new noise source.

**ASAN**

Activity Sensitive to Aircraft Noise

Means any residential activity, boarding establishments, visitor accommodation, retirement villages, homes for elderly persons, day care facility, buildings used for overnight patient medical care, Marae or educational facilities (including all outdoor spaces associated with such an educational facility).

**NZS 6801:1991**

New Zealand Standard NZS 6801:1991 "Measurement of Sound"

**NZS 6801:2008**

New Zealand Standard NZS 6801:2008 "Measurement of Environmental Sound"

**NZS 6802:1991**

New Zealand Standard NZS 6802:1991 "Assessment of Environmental Sound".

**NZS 6802:2008**

New Zealand Standard NZS 6802:2008 "Assessment of Environmental Noise".

**NZS 6805:1992**

New Zealand Standard NZS 6805:1992 "Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning"

**NZS 6807:1994**

New Zealand Standard NZS 6807:1994 "Noise Management and Land Use Planning for Helicopter Landing Areas"
APPENDIX B  SUMMARY OF NZS 6805:1992

In 1991 the Standards Association of New Zealand published New Zealand Standards NZS 6805:1992 “Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning” (Standard) with a view to providing a consistent approach to noise planning around New Zealand Airports.

The Standard has two major aims:

(i) To establish compatible land use planning around an airport

(ii) To set noise limits for the management of aircraft noise at airports

B1 - Noise Boundaries

The Standard recommends two noise boundaries to achieve its aims. This involves fixing an Outer Control Boundary (OCB) and a smaller, much closer Air Noise Boundary (ANB) around the airport.

The Standard recommends that inside the ANB, new noise sensitive uses (including residential) should be prohibited. Between the ANB and the OCB new noise sensitive uses should also be prohibited unless provided with sound insulation. The ANB is also nominated as the location for future noise monitoring of compliance with a 65 dB $L_{dn}$ limit.

The Standard is based on the Day/Night Sound Level ($L_{dn}$) which uses the cumulative ‘noise energy’ that is produced by all flights during a typical day with a 10 dB penalty applied to night flights (see Appendix A for an explanation of terminology). $L_{dn}$ is used extensively overseas for airport noise assessment and it has been found to correlate well with community response to aircraft noise.

When establishing the location of the Noise Boundaries, an allowance for the expected growth of the airport can be made and NZS 6805 recommends a minimum 10-year projection should be made of future aircraft operations. MDA typically recommends 20 – 30 year forecasts are used, as has been implemented at other New Zealand airports.

The $L_{dn}$ contours for the airport can be calculated using a computer programme called the Integrated Noise Model (INM).

The location of the ANB is then based upon the projected 65 dB $L_{dn}$ contour and the OCB on the projected 55 dB $L_{dn}$. NZS 6805 also recommends that, where appropriate, night time single event noise levels should be considered in the location of the ANB.

B2 - Land Use Planning and Controls

Land Use Planning can be an effective way to minimise population exposure to noise around airports. Aircraft technology and flight management, although an important component in abating noise, will not be sufficient alone to eliminate or adequately control aircraft noise. Uncontrolled development of noise sensitive uses around an airport can unnecessarily expose additional people to high levels of noise and can constrict, by public pressure as a response to noise, the operation of the airport.

NZS 6805 lays out recommended criteria for Land Use Planning around airports. In summary, Tables 1 and 2 of the Standard recommend the following land use controls:

Inside the ANB:

(i) New noise sensitive uses (including residential) should be prohibited

(ii) Existing residential buildings and subsequent alterations should have appropriate sound insulation

Between ANB and OCB:

(i) New noise sensitive uses (including residential) should be prohibited unless a District Plan permits such use subject to appropriate sound insulation

(ii) Alterations or additions to existing noise sensitive uses (including residential) should include appropriate sound insulation
The standard also requires that the effects of individual aircraft movements at night be considered when setting land use controls but does not offer a method of control or limits of acceptability. The Sound Exposure Level (SEL) 95 dBA contour for the noisiest aircraft operating at night has been widely used at New Zealand Airports as a method of controlling potentially significant sleep disturbance effects.

**B3 - Airport Noise Management**

In addition to land use controls, noise controls can be used to manage the level of noise impact around airports. These controls can take the form of preferential runway usage, noise abatement flight tracks, curfews, noise emission limits and others. NZS 6805 proposes maximum noise emission limits for the airport. This procedure is consistent with the general approach to noise control in New Zealand, in that it is left to the operator to best decide how to manage its activities to comply with an agreed level of noise.

The Standard proposes that the Day/Night Sound Level (L_{dn}) produced by the Airport should not exceed 65 dB L_{dn} at or outside the ANB (or 65 dB L_{dn} contour). A measurement would involve monitoring the hourly noise levels over a period of typically 3 months and obtaining the L_{dn} by averaging the daytime and weighted night-time noise levels.

The location of the 65 and 55 dB L_{dn} contours determines the extent of the noise emission from the airport and thus the extent to which the airports future operations are constrained. Therefore, when calculating the contours and locating the ANB and OCB, it is vital that the future expansion of the airport be considered.
## APPENDIX C  2016 AIMM DATA USED IN INM MODEL

### C1  Aircraft Movements by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft Type</th>
<th>Oct-16</th>
<th>Oct%</th>
<th>Nov-16</th>
<th>Nov%</th>
<th>Dec-16</th>
<th>Dec%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Aviation (light aircraft)</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>1446</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>1751</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(includes unknown and amateur built)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microlight Aircraft (includes gyrocopters and gliders)</td>
<td>1279</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>1281</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helicopter</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3559</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2990</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3449</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C2  Aircraft Movements by Vector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Runway usage:</th>
<th>Oct-16</th>
<th>Oct%</th>
<th>Nov-16</th>
<th>Nov%</th>
<th>Dec-16</th>
<th>Dec%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R04</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R07</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>1322</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R25</td>
<td>1323</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pad</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not defined</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3559</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2990</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3449</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. INTRODUCTION

Background

1.1 The Rangiora Airfield is located on Mertons Road, approximately 3 kilometres northwest of Rangiora township. It is owned and operated by the Waimakariri District Council (the Council) and is predominantly used for light aircraft movements for recreational, training and agricultural purposes. Council owned facilities on the airfield land are limited to fences and minor roads but private sector interests own 90 hangars as well as other aircraft related facilities on the airfield’s land leased from the Council.

1.2 There are currently around 37,000² aircraft movements per annum at the airfield. The number of movements per annum has grown in recent years as small aircraft movements from Christchurch International Airport (CIA) have migrated to Rangiora as a consequence of the growth in larger aircraft movements at CIA. The continuation of this trend and population and economic growth within the Waimakariri District and Greater Christchurch are expected to contribute to ongoing future growth in aircraft movements at the Rangiora airfield.

1.3 To safeguard the existing level of operations and to provide for their future growth, the Council wishes to:

(a) Notify a requirement for a designation (NoR) for the whole of the airfield site owned by the Council, as well as the adjoining privately and Crown owned land within the 65dBA noise contour. The purposes of the designation are:

(i) For the land owned by the Council to be recognised for providing efficient and effective airport facilities and operations; and

(ii) For development on the balance of the land within the identified 65dBA noise contour to be restricted so as to protect the efficient and effective airport operations. For this land the

---

¹ Up to 5,700 kg.
² The figure is derived from AIMM data over an 8 months period during 2016/2017 (‘Aimm’ (Automated Intelligent Movement Management), is an Intelligent Airspace and Movement Monitoring and reporting system)
purpose is more constrained and does not extend the airport activities or associated works onto this land.

(b) Proposing a Plan Change (the PPC) which will:

(i) Require any new, alterations to, or additions to rural dwelling houses within the 55dBA noise contour to be insulated from aircraft noise;

(ii) Restrict noise sensitive activities within the 55dBA noise contour; and

(iii) Prohibit dwellings and other noise sensitive activities within the 65dBA noise contour.

Note: Noise sensitive activities are defined in the District Plan to cover residential activities other than those in conjunction with rural activities that comply with the rules of the plan; education activities including pre-school places or premises; travellers’ accommodation, and hospitals, healthcare facilities and elderly persons housing or complexes.

Report Objective

1.4 The objective of this report is to assess the economic effects of the NoR and PPC sought by the Council. The report will form part of the Assessment of Environmental Effects to be lodged in relation to both the NoR and PPC applications.

Report Format

1.5 This report is divided into 5 parts (in addition to this introductory section). These are:

(a) A consideration of the relevance of economic effects under the Resource Management Act (RMA);

(b) A description of the economic significance of the Rangiora Airfield;

(c) An assessment of the economic benefits from the NoR and PPC;

3 The land is zoned rural and subdivision into 4 hectare lots is permitted in the District Plan.
2. ECONOMICS AND THE RMA

Community Economic Wellbeing

2.1 Economic considerations are intertwined with the concept of the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, which is embodied in the RMA. In particular, Part 2 section 5(2) refers to enabling “people and communities to provide for their ... economic ... well being” as a part of the meaning of “sustainable management”, the promotion of which is the purpose of the RMA.

2.2 As well as indicating the relevance of economic effects in considerations under the RMA, this section also refers to “people and communities” (emphasis added), which highlights that in assessing the impacts of a proposal it is the impacts on the community and not just the applicant or particular individuals or organisations, that must be taken into account. This is underpinned by the definition of “environment” which also extends to include people and communities.

2.3 Safeguarding the future operations of the Rangiora Airfield enables the residents and businesses of the Waimakariri District and wider Canterbury region to provide for their social and economic wellbeing.

Economic Efficiency

2.4 Part 2 section 7(b) of the RMA notes that in achieving the purpose of the Act, all persons “shall have particular regard to ... the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources” which include the economic concept of efficiency. Economic efficiency can be defined as:

“the effectiveness of resource allocation in the economy as a whole such that outputs of goods and services fully reflect consumer preferences for these goods.

---

4 See, for example, in Marlborough Ridge Ltd v Marlborough District Council [1998] NZRMA 73, the Court noted that all aspects of efficiency are “economic” by definition because economics is about the use of resources generally.
and services as well as individual goods and services being produced at minimum cost through appropriate mixes of factor inputs”. 5

2.5 More generally economic efficiency can be considered in terms of:

- Maximising the value of outputs divided by the cost of inputs;
- Maximising the value of outputs for a given cost of inputs;
- Minimising the cost of inputs for a given value of outputs;
- Improving the utilisation of existing assets; and
- Minimising waste.

2.6 Providing for the continued operations of the Rangiora Airfield activities is consistent with the efficient use of resources, especially in regard to the ongoing use of significant existing assets, enabling the future growth of businesses and employment located at the airfield and enabling the future growth in recreational use of the airfield.

Viewpoint

2.7 An essential first step in carrying out an evaluation of the positive and negative economic effects of the NoR and PPC is to define the appropriate viewpoint that is to be adopted. This helps to define which economic effects are relevant to the analysis. Typically a district (or city) or wider regional viewpoint is adopted and sometimes even a nationwide viewpoint might be considered appropriate.

2.8 The Rangiora Airfield is located in the Waimakariri District and is owned and operated by the Council. The NoR and PPC will in the main impact on the District’s businesses and residents. Therefore in this report the economic effects are considered from the viewpoint of the Waimakariri District. However the airfield’s operations impact on businesses and residents located elsewhere within the Canterbury region and in fact the Rangiora Airfield is identified as ‘regionally significant infrastructure’ and ‘strategic infrastructure for Greater Christchurch’ within the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS). Therefore the wider Canterbury regional viewpoint is also relevant.

3. THE ECONOMIC SIGNIFICANCE OF RANGIORA AIRFIELD

3.1 As noted above, the Rangiora Airfield is included in the list of ‘strategic infrastructure for Greater Christchurch’ in the CRPS. The other examples of strategic infrastructure included in the CRPS are strategic transport networks, CIA, Port of Lyttelton, bulk fuel supply infrastructure including terminals, wharf lines and pipelines, defence facilities including Burnham Military Camp and West Melton Military Training Area, strategic telecommunications facilities, the electricity transmission network and other strategic network utilities. By definition infrastructure included in the CRPS as ‘strategic infrastructure’, including the Rangiora Airfield is considered as ‘regionally significant infrastructure’ for the entire Canterbury region.

3.2 Currently there are 8 businesses located at the airfield employing an estimated 30 persons. The businesses are involved in pilot training, fertiliser spreading and agricultural spraying, helicopter transportation of persons and freight (including fire fighting), aircraft parts retailing, and aircraft engineering and maintenance services. The airfield is home to 3 aero clubs – the Canterbury Aero Club, the Canterbury Recreational Aircraft Club and the Air New Zealand Sports and Social Club Southern. The first 2 of these clubs offer pilot training services, while all 3 provide recreational flying opportunities for their members, who primarily reside within Waimakariri District or elsewhere within Greater Christchurch. The Canterbury Aero Club currently has one fulltime instructor based at the airfield, whilst the Canterbury Recreational Aircraft Club has 3 part time instructors for micro-light aircraft based there.

3.3 The Council has 96 lots at the airfield, all of which are leased. Some of the lots have been combined to enable larger hangars to be built. There are 12 lots at the airfield still to be built on and in the 2016 calendar year there were 5 building consents issued for new structures. The existing 90 hangars house 120 aircraft that are permanently based at the Rangiora airfield. Other facilities belonging to

---

6 The businesses are: Way to Go Heli Services Limited (providing commercial, agricultural and aerial transport services as well as helicopter pilot training), Aerowork (a subsidiary of Ravensdown specialising in aerial applications such as fertiliser spreading and agricultural spraying), Aircraft Logistics Support (suppliers of aircraft parts and accessories), Rangiora Aircraft Engineering (providers of aircraft repair and maintenance services), Heli Skills Limited (providers of helicopter maintenance services and parts), North Canterbury Flight Training (pilot training), Canterbury Aero Club (pilot training) and Canterbury Recreational Aircraft Club (pilot training).

7 Source: Enterprise North Canterbury.
private sector interests at the airfield include club rooms, two refuelling outlets for Avgas and Jet A1, fuel storage and aircraft servicing and maintenance facilities. It is estimated that approximately $10 million has been invested by private sector interests in hangars and other facilities at the airport.\(^8\)

3.4 Because of the availability of fuel at the airfield, it is used by private plane owners based at locations within the general vicinity of Rangiora and who do not have their own refuelling facilities. It is also used by small planes on route between centres north and south of Rangiora for refuelling — e.g. planes flying between North Island centres and Queenstown.

3.5 Aircraft movements\(^9\) over the period September 2016\(^10\) to April 2017 averaged 3,098 per month which if pro-rated provides for annual movements of around 37,176 per annum. The proposed NoR/PPC process has assumed that the existing annual movements are therefore around 37,000. It is noted that recently, there has been an increase in flight movements at the airfield as small aircraft movements have transferred from CIA to accommodate the growth in larger aircraft movements. This trend is expected to continue in the future and, together with general population and economic growth within the District and Greater Christchurch\(^11\), will contribute to an approximate doubling in aircraft movements at the Rangiora Airfield within the next 20 years.\(^12\)

4. ECONOMIC BENEFITS FROM THE NOR AND PPC

4.1 The NoR and PPC proposed by the Council will provide a range of economic benefits, including:

(a) The retention and increase in the local expenditure, incomes and employment associated with the aviation related businesses currently located at the airfield and persons using the airfield. This will benefit not

\(^8\) Source: Enterprise North Canterbury.
\(^9\) An aircraft movement is one takeoff or landing.
\(^10\) Accurate aircraft movements prior to September 2016 are not available. An electronic aircraft movement monitoring and billing system has been in use since September 2016.
\(^11\) Population growth in the Waimakariri District over the period 2016 to 2043 is forecast to grow at an average annual rate of 1.1% per annum. For Greater Christchurch (Waimakariri and Selwyn Districts plus Christchurch City) population is forecast to grow at an average annual rate of 0.8% per annum. (Source: Statistics New Zealand, NZ Stat, sub-national ‘medium’ population projections.)
\(^12\) Source: Marshall Day Noise Assessment
only the businesses and employees based at the airfield but also other
local businesses supplying goods and services to the airfield based
businesses and their employees and users of the airfield;

(b) The efficient ongoing utilisation of Council and private sector investment
in the airfield, hangars and other buildings and facilities at the airfield;

(c) Increased certainty for existing and new users of the airfield encouraging
new investment, employment and incomes in the District;

(d) The retention of, and increase in, local expenditure associated with
recreational flying activities at the airfield. Should local residents (and
others within Greater Christchurch) be required to use other airfields
outside the District their associated expenditure would not be retained
within the local economy;

(e) The continued availability of the airfield for emergency uses – e.g.
logistics following the Kaikoura earthquake and fire fighting;

(f) The more efficient use of CIA’s runway capacity – should Rangiora
Airfield no longer be available for use by smaller planes or not be able to
increase aircraft movements in the future there is likely to be increased
congestion at CIA with more aircraft movements competing for its
available capacity;

(g) A reduction in the risk and social and economic costs involving aircraft
movements at the airfield. The NoR and PPC propose to manage land
use activities within the 55 and 65 dBA noise contours which pose a risk
to ongoing or increasing aircraft movements at the airfield; and

(h) A reduction in RMA process costs – the NoR and PPC are expected to
reduce reverse sensitivity issues and therefore reduce Council’s and
private land owners’ future costs in contested resource consent or plan
change applications.
4.2 These economic benefits are consistent with "the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources" (Part 2, section 7(b) of the RMA) as well as enabling "people and communities to provide for their economic and social wellbeing" (Part 2, section 5(2) of the RMA).

5. POTENTIAL ECONOMIC COSTS OF THE NOR AND PPC

5.1 The NoR and PPC sought by the Council will not result in a "scorched earth" outcome for land owners within the 65 dBA and 55 dBA noise contours – i.e. existing rural and associated residential use of the land within the contours are permitted with no requirement for existing structures to be removed or remediated. Proposed controls are only in relation to new rural residential buildings or extensions and alterations (where they are subject to acoustic insulation requirements within the 55dBA contour) or noise sensitive activities.

5.2 Within the 65 dBA noise contour new dwellings will not be permitted. However within the District Plan the land is zoned rural with subdivision into 4 hectare lots permitted. On privately owned land it will remain possible to subdivide the land into 4 hectare lots (if necessary), and provide a footprint for a dwelling outside the 65 dBA noise contour.13 The publically owned land within the 65 dBA noise contour (the airfield owned by the Council and the Ashley River riparian area within the 100 metre setback from the river and owned by the Crown) is not appropriate for residential development.

5.3 Whilst the NoR and PPC will potentially impose some additional costs on new or existing residential development associated with rural activities and constrain certain activities within the 65 dBA noise contour, from a district-wide perspective there is little if any economic cost in terms of the overall extent of restrictions. The latest assessment of the availability of suitably zoned land for new development within the District does not identify any shortages. Within the District there is currently 426 hectares of vacant residential land estimated to yield 4,259 residential lots. There is also 107.5 hectares of vacant business land.14 Therefore land owners elsewhere within the District will benefit to the extent that their land is

13 Source: Planz Consultants.

14 For both residential and business development the land available exceeds expected uptake for at least 5 years. Source: Non-Financial Performance Measures 2nd Quarter of 2016/17 Financial Year; Report to Audit and Risk Committee, Waimakariri District Council; 14 February, 2017.
developed (or developed sooner) in preference to land within the proposed noise contours around the airfield. From a District perspective any net economic costs relate only to the additional costs of development and not lost development opportunities.

6. CONCLUSIONS

6.1 Enabling people and communities to provide for their social and economic wellbeing and having regard to the efficient use and development of resources are relevant considerations under the RMA.

6.2 The Rangiora Airfield provides significant social and economic benefits to residents and businesses of the Waimakariri District and the wider Canterbury region. These benefits are expected to grow in importance in the future.

6.3 The Council’s NoR and PPC are expected to provide a range of economic benefits to the District and wider Canterbury region.

6.4 From a District perspective, the economic costs associated with the NoR and PPC are negligible.

6.5 The net economic benefits of the Council’s NoR and PPC will be significant.
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Waimakariri District Council gives notice of its requirement for a designation in respect of airfield land use for the safe and efficient operation of the Rangiora Airfield.

The land to which the requirement applies is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Legal Description</th>
<th>CT Reference</th>
<th>Land Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>217B Merton Road*</td>
<td>Lot 1 DP 320694</td>
<td>439710</td>
<td>6.9205ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217 Merton Road*</td>
<td>Lot 1 DP 24674</td>
<td>439710</td>
<td>20.4872ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219 Merton Road*</td>
<td>RS 38634</td>
<td>CB795/5</td>
<td>9.0037ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217A Merton Road*</td>
<td>Lot 2 DP 320694</td>
<td>439710</td>
<td>0.7195ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 Priors Road*</td>
<td>Lot 2 DP 410643</td>
<td>439710</td>
<td>4.0000ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 Priors Road*</td>
<td>Lot 3 DP 410643</td>
<td>439710</td>
<td>4.0000ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 Priors Road*</td>
<td>Lot 4 DP 410643</td>
<td>439710</td>
<td>4.0000ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of 207 Merton Road</td>
<td>Lot 1 DP 410643</td>
<td>439708</td>
<td>8.0000ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of 172 Priors Road</td>
<td>Lot 5 DP 410643</td>
<td>439709</td>
<td>43.9546ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of Ashley River</td>
<td>Pt RES 3101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riparian Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of 218 Merton Road</td>
<td>Lot 2 DP 426606</td>
<td>504776</td>
<td>4.5200ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of</td>
<td>Pt RS 33396</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1553ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of</td>
<td>Closed Road SO 5157</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of</td>
<td>RES 4988</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.74ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes land owned by the Waimakariri District Council as part of Rangiora Airfield

The nature of the proposed work is:

1. Include a Designation for the Rangiora Airfield which will support Airport Purposes
2. Limit noise sensitive development within the 65dBA noise contour.

Details of the proposed designation and conditions for the designation are provided in Section 6 of this Report.

The effects that the public work will have on the environment, and the ways in which any adverse effects will be mitigated, are:

Refer to Section 7 of this Report.
Alternative sites, routes, and methods have been considered to the following extent:

Refer to Section 7.4 of this Report.

The public work and designation are reasonably necessary for achieving the objectives of the territorial authority because:

Refer to Section 4 of this Report.

The following consultation has been undertaken with parties that are likely to be affected:

Refer to Section 0 of this Report.

Waimakariri District Council attaches the following information required to be included in this notice by the district plan, regional plan, or any regulations made under the Resource Management Act 1991:

- Notice of Requirement Report
- Proposed Noise Contours

Signature on behalf of
Waimakariri District Council

25 July 2018
1 Introduction

Waimakariri District Council has requiring authority status under Section 166 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the RMA) and it may, under s168A (1), give notice of its requirement for a designation -

(a) for a public work within its district and for which it has financial responsibility; or

(b) in respect of any land, water, subsoil, or airspace where a restriction is necessary for the safe or efficient functioning or operation of a public work.

A “public work” is defined under the RMA as having “the same meaning as in the Public Works Act 1981”. The definition in the Public Works Act is:

“(a) every Government work or local work that the Crown or any local authority is authorised to construct, establish, manage, operate or maintain, and every use of land for any Government work or local work which the Crown or any local authority is authorised to construct, undertake, establish, manage, operate or maintain by or under this or any other Act; and include anything required directly or indirectly for any such Government work or local work or use:

...”

The proposed designation is required to enable the efficient and effective on-going operation of the existing Rangiora Airfield, which is owned by Waimakariri District Council, for airport purposes and to limit noise sensitive development and manage activities which pose a risk to aircraft movements within the proposed 65dBA noise contour to ensure the safe and continued functioning of the airfield. In this regard both sub-clauses (a) and (b) above are in play in terms of this Notice of Requirement.

The Rangiora Airfield is located on Mertons Road, approximately four kilometres northwest of Rangiora town centre.

This Notice of Requirement (NoR) seeks to designate the whole of the airfield site as well as the adjoining privately owned land within the 65dBA noise contour.

The purpose of the proposed designation comprises two parts:

(i) For the land owned by Waimakariri District Council to be recognised for providing for efficient and effective airport facilities and operations;

(ii) For the balance of private/public land within the identified 65dBA, the purpose is more constrained, and seeks only to protect the safe and continued use of the airfield operations. The designation in these areas does not extend to airport activities or associated works onto this land.

This Notice of Requirement is accompanied by a Proposed Plan Change (PPC). The PPC primarily seeks to introduce noise contours and associated objectives, policies and rules to ensure development in the vicinity of the airfield does not affect its ongoing and future operations.

2 Objectives of the Requiring Authority

The RMA makes provision for requiring authorities to designate land in the District Plan to carry out its functions and provide for existing and future needs. The Council is a requiring authority pursuant to s.166 of the RMA.
The objectives of the Waimakariri District Council in preparing this NoR are:

- Safeguard the operations of the Rangiora Airfield and to minimise the impacts of surrounding noise sensitive land uses on the continued operation.
- Provide recognition of the social, economic and cultural contribution of Rangiora Airfield, and ensure that aviation clubs and businesses which locate at the airfield will not be at risk from development surrounding the airfield.
- Provide greater clarity within the district plan of the operational requirements of Rangiora Airfield, and provide notice of its location to surrounding landowners.
- Give effect to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement which recognises Rangiora Airfield as ‘regionally significant infrastructure’.

3 Site Description

3.1 Notice of Requirement Site

This Notice of Requirement (NoR) applies to the Rangiora Airfield land and the surrounding private and public land which is in the identified 65dBA noise contour.

The land associated with the Rangiora Airfield itself which is owned by the Council is referred to as “the Site” in this report, and illustrated as the area within the solid black line in Figure 1 below. The additional privately or publicly owned area outside the Site but within the 65dBA noise contour is shown within the dotted lines.

Figure 1 – The Site and area with the 65dBA noise contour for the purpose of this Notice of Requirement
The purpose of the designation is differentiated between land held in the ownership of Waimakariri District Council for the airfield, and the privately owned land surrounding the airfield which is affected by the 65dBA noise contour. The purpose of the designation is summarised in Table 1 below.

Table 1 – Purpose of Designation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicable Land</th>
<th>Purpose of Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Airfield Landholdings (owned by Waimakariri District Council)</td>
<td>Airport purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding Land with 65dBA noise contour (not owned by Waimakariri District Council)</td>
<td>Restriction to avoid noise sensitive activities, and manage activities which pose a risk to aircraft movements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Rangiora Airfield is owned by the Waimakariri District Council (WDC), and operated by the WDC with assistance from the Rangiora Airfield Advisory Committee.

The Rangiora Airfield is located on the southern side of the Ashley River, at the northern end of Merton Road. At its closest point the airfield is located approximately 1.7km north-west of the Rangiora township urban limits. The site has frontages to Merton Road and Priors Road. Both roads are classified as local roads under the District Plan. Merton Road provides primary access to the Rangiora Airfield and surrounding rural residential properties. Priors Road is an unsealed local road in this location providing access to rural properties.

The northern site boundary is approximately 130m from the Ashley River bank at its closest point. The Rangiora Airfield land in the ownership of Waimakariri District Council is outlined on below.

The Rangiora Airfield is generally flat and largely covered in pastoral grassland, with a small shelterbelt located along the Priors Road boundary. Three grass runways which occupy the southern two-thirds of the site are capable of handling regular light aircraft operations such as microlights, agricultural aircraft, general aviation aircraft, light twin engine aircraft and DC3s. There are currently no buildings located south of the main runway (known as runways 07/25).

On the north side of the main runway, the site contains several buildings, including aircraft hangars, workshops, offices, aircraft related stores, and clubrooms. All the buildings on site are used for activities that are directly related to the airfield.
The Rangiora Airfield site is an irregularly shaped parcel of land, held in seven separate titles as described below and as detailed on the Certificates of Titles attached in Appendix 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Legal Description</th>
<th>CT Reference</th>
<th>Land Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>217B Merton Road</td>
<td>Lot 1 DP 320694</td>
<td>439710</td>
<td>6.9205ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217 Merton Road</td>
<td>Lot 1 DP 24674</td>
<td>439710</td>
<td>20.4872ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219 Merton Road</td>
<td>RS 38634</td>
<td>CB795/5</td>
<td>9.0037ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217A Merton Road</td>
<td>Lot 2 DP 320694</td>
<td>439710</td>
<td>0.7195ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 Priors Road</td>
<td>Lot 2 DP 410643</td>
<td>439710</td>
<td>4.0000ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 Priors Road</td>
<td>Lot 3 DP 410643</td>
<td>439710</td>
<td>4.0000ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 Priors Road</td>
<td>Lot 4 DP 410643</td>
<td>439710</td>
<td>4.0000ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The land beyond the Rangiora Airfield which is identified as being affected by the 65dBA includes part of the following properties:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registered Title</th>
<th>Registered Owner</th>
<th>Total Land Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1 DP 410643</td>
<td>Neil William Smith</td>
<td>8ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 5 DP 410643</td>
<td>Neil William Smith</td>
<td>43.9ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2 DP 426606</td>
<td>Amy Karen Boyce Graham John Boyce</td>
<td>4.52ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley River Riparian Area</td>
<td>Crown Land</td>
<td>954.26ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All the land which the NoR relates to is zoned Rural on Planning Maps 33, 34 and 110A. There are no other notations or special features identified on the planning maps other than the airfields take off climb and approach obstacle limitation surfaces which are shown on Planning Map 145 and are to be amended as part of the accompanying Plan Change.

The predominant use of the airfield is for recreational, agricultural and training operations. The airfield supports approximately 40,000 aircraft movements per year, comprising aeroplanes, microlight planes, helicopters, gliders, and gyroplanes. Based on recent data collected, operations peak in daylight saving months with an average of approximately 3,177 aircraft movements over the month, with these peaking on weekends. There are no commercial aeroplane flights from the airfield, however there are limited commercial helicopter operations from the airfield.

3.2 Surrounding Environment

The surrounding environment is zoned Rural and is characterised by relatively flat rural pastureland, with large trees, shelterbelts and paddocks and are generally occupied by farming activities and rural-lifestyle blocks. Two stands of pine trees are located immediately to the east and south-east of the site.

The Rangiora Holiday Park and Racecourse are located further to the east of the site, with Rangiora Township located beyond these facilities to the east and south-east, with the closest residential zoning to the site located 1.6km to the south-east. Additionally, there is a block of low density residential zoned land (Fernside) approximately two kilometres to the south of the site, in the block bound by Swannanoa Road, Johns Road and Mt Thomas Road.

To the east of the site is rural pasturelands with several four-hectare properties, each containing a residential dwellinghouse. Many of these properties are likely to operate as rural-residential lifestyle blocks. The properties to the south and west of the airfield are generally larger ranging from 8 ha to +40 ha, however generally are undeveloped and used for rural purposes.

The Ashley River is located directly to the north of the site. The river forms a broad braid in the location, with extensive trees and vegetation separating the airfield from the closest river braid. The land to the north of the Ashley River is predominantly flat pastureland.

4 Proposed Public Work

The purpose of the designation is to provide for the existing and future use of the Rangiora Airfield site for airport activities. The NoR seeks to designate all the airfield land for airport purposes in order to provide for activities associated with airfield operations. In addition land beyond the airfield and within the 65dBA noise contour is designated in order to restrict noise sensitive activities, and manage activities which pose a risk to aircraft movements.
The Rangiora Airfield currently has approximately 90 hangars\(^1\). In addition to the hangars, other activities, structures and works on the Airfield site include:

- Three grassed runways;
- Rangiora Aero Club facilities
- Minor maintenance facilities;
- Two re-fuelling spots for Avgas and Jet A1;
- A helicopter training area;
- Aircraft operations;
- Aircraft servicing and storage;
- Fuel storage;
- Club rooms; and
- Ancillary aviation related uses of buildings, including training of staff and other interested parties.

The airfield does not have runway lights, and therefore operating hours are restricted to daylight hours.

The land beyond the airfield within the 65dBA noise contour is either pastoral in nature or within the Ashley River Riparian Area. There are no dwellinghouses within the 65dBA noise contour.

5 Outline Plan Process

Section 176A of the RMA requires that an Outline Plan of the public work on the designated land must be submitted by the requiring authority to the territorial authority (being the same body in this instance). This in turn allows the territorial authority to request any changes before construction is commenced.

No further works are proposed to be undertaken on the airfield at this time. However, an Outline Plan will be prepared in accordance with Section 176A(3) prior to any future public works being undertaken in accordance with the requested designation.

6 Restrictions to be applied to the Designation

6.1 Proposed Designations

This NoR seeks to designate the Rangiora Airfield landholdings, and all the land within the 65dBA noise contour. The purpose of the designation will differ for that area owned by Rangiora Airfield to distinguish between:

(i) the land owned by the Waimakariri District Council to provide an Airport operational and enabling purpose; and

---

\(^1\) Source: Waimakariri District Council Website/Rangiora Airfield Information
(ii) the land outside the Council’s ownership where the focus will be on restricting activities which are sensitive to airport activities, or could result in increased risk to airport and flight safety.

This approach will to some extent restrict existing permitted activities on the land outside the ownership of the Rangiora Airfield.

This NoR proposes the following designation purposes be adopted for the Site:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Airfield Land (marked ‘A’ on the Designation Map)</td>
<td>Airport purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65dBA noise contour land outside Rangiora Airfield (marked Noise Sensitive Activities and Aircraft Risk on the Designation Map)</td>
<td>Controls on undertaking the following activities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Avoidance of Noise sensitive activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Management of activities which would pose a risk to aircraft movements including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) Activities which could increase the risk of birdstrike, including but not limited to cropping (excluding pasture renewal), orchards and waterbodies; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Release a substance which would impair visibility or otherwise interfere with aircraft operations, including the creation of smoke, dust and steam.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As part of this NoR proposal, Planning Map 145 (shown in Appendix 2) will need to be amended to reflect the designation of the land for Airport Purposes and that land outside the airfield subject to the noise sensitive activities and aircraft risk designation within the 65dBA noise contour.

### 6.2 Conditions

As part of the designation it is proposed to include three conditions that will apply within the Rangiora Airfield Land to reflect rules currently within the District Plan. The conditions proposed for any structure are:

- 100 metre setback from the centreline of the stopbank of the Ashley River/Rakahuri
- 10 metre road boundary setback
- 3 metre internal boundary setback

A further condition relating to the non-provision of lighting on the runways is proposed to ensure that flying during non-daylight hours does not occur as follows:

- There shall be no imbedded runway lighting

These are discussed further later in the report.
7 Assessment of Effects on the Environment

7.1 Overview

The Council seeks under Section 168A of the RMA to designate:

(i) the Site in order to future proof the existing and future operation of the Rangiora Airfield for ‘airport purposes’; and

(ii) the surrounding land within the 65dBA noise contour to control noise sensitive activities and manage activities which would pose a risk to aircraft movements.

Section 168A(3) prescribes that a territorial authority assessing a notice of requirement must consider, subject to Part 2, the effects on the environment of allowing the requirement having particular regard to:

(a) Relevant provisions of plans and policy statements;

(b) Whether adequate consideration has been given to alternative sites or methods if:
   (i) the requiring authority does not have an interest in the land sufficient for undertaking the work; or
   (ii) it is likely that the work will have a significant adverse effect on the environment;

(c) Whether the designation is reasonably necessary for achieving the objectives of the requiring authority for which the designation is sought; and

(d) Any other matters considered reasonably necessary order to make a decision on the requirement.

Each of these requirements is considered in the following subsections of this report.

7.2 Resource Management Act 1991

In considering an application for an NoR, the territorial authority is required to determine whether the purpose of the RMA will be met by the proposed designation, and that any adverse effects of the designation are avoided, remedied or mitigated appropriately.

An assessment of the effects on the environment of the proposed designation is contained in Section 7.6 of this report. The key findings of the assessment of environmental effects is that:

- The designation provides for a more enabling planning framework for the future use of the Rangiora Airfield Land for aviation purposes.

- No immediate additional traffic effects will result from the designation and the existing surrounding road network has significant unutilised capacity. Further, any future expansion of airfield related activities would be subject to assessment through the Outline Development Plan process.

- The designation positively contributes economically, socially and culturally through supporting local aviation-related clubs and businesses.

- The designation will improve airfield safety and limit potential reverse sensitivity effects on the airfield albeit that there is some restriction on land use in those areas outside of the airfield itself.
7.3 Section 168A(3)(a) Relevant Provisions of Plans and Policy Statements

Regard is to be had to:

any relevant provisions of:

(i) A national policy statement;
(ii) A New Zealand coastal policy statement;
(iii) A regional policy statement or proposed regional policy statement;
(iv) A plan or proposed plan.

There are no national policy statements that are of relevance to the proposal and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement is not applicable. Therefore the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, the Land and Water Regional Plan and the Waimakariri District Plan are the relevant planning documents, subject to Part II of the RMA. These are addressed below in the following subsections of this report.

7.3.1 Canterbury Regional Policy Statement

The Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (“CRPS”) sets the overall strategic direction for growth and development within the region by identifying relevant issues for which objectives and policies are detailed. The Rangiora Airfield lies within the “Greater Christchurch” area as shown on Map A of the CRPS.

The CRPS contains the following definition of ‘strategic infrastructure’ for “Greater Christchurch”:

Strategic infrastructure means those necessary facilities, services and installations which are of greater than local importance, and can include infrastructure that is nationally significant. The following are examples of strategic infrastructure:

- Strategic transport networks
- Christchurch International Airport
- Rangiora Airfield
- Port of Lyttelton
- Bulk fuel supply infrastructure including terminals, wharf lines and pipelines
- Defence facilities including Burnham Military Camp and West Melton Military Training Area
- Strategic telecommunications facilities
- The electricity transmission network
- Other strategic network utilities

(Emphasis added)

In addition, the CRPS includes the following definition of ‘regionally significant infrastructure’ for the entire region which the CRPS relates:

Regionally significant infrastructure is:

- Strategic land transport network and arterial roads
- Timaru Airport
- Port of Timaru
- Commercial maritime facilities at Kaikōura
- Telecommunication facilities
▪ National, regional and local renewable electricity generation activities of any scale
▪ The electricity transmission network
▪ Sewage collection, treatment and disposal networks
▪ Community land drainage infrastructure
▪ Community potable water systems
▪ Established community-scale irrigation and stockwater infrastructure
▪ Transport hubs
▪ Bulk fuel supply infrastructure including terminals, wharf lines and pipelines.
▪ Electricity distribution network
▪ Infrastructure defined as ‘strategic infrastructure’ in this regional policy statement.

Note: For the avoidance of doubt, this infrastructure is also referred to as ‘infrastructure that is regionally significant’.

(Emphasis added)

Based on the application of these definitions within the CRPS, the Rangiora Airfield is both ‘significant infrastructure’ and ‘regionally significant infrastructure’. It is therefore necessary to consider the requested designation against the relevant objectives and policies for both ‘significant infrastructure’ and ‘regionally significant infrastructure’ in the CRPS.

A summary of how the designation of the Site and land with the 65dBA noise contour will directly contribute to achieving the relevant objectives and policies of the CRPS is outlined in Table 2 below.

Table 2 - Contribution of the Proposed Designation to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement Objectives and Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives and Policies</th>
<th>Contribution of Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 5.2.1 – Location, design and function of development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Enables people and communities, including future generations, to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being and health and safety; and which:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Avoids adverse effects on significant natural and physical resources including regionally significant infrastructure, and where avoidance is impracticable, remedies or mitigates those effects on those resources and infrastructure;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides appropriate recognition of the airfield’s activities, and requires activities in the surrounding environment to be located and developed in a manner which will avoid adverse effects on these activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The social, economic, and cultural well-being, health and safety of current and future communities within the surrounding environment are not compromised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 6.2.1 – Recovery Framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery, rebuilding and development are enabled within Greater Christchurch through a land use and infrastructure framework that:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Integrates strategic and other infrastructure and services with land use development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The designation will clearly identify the strategic importance of the Rangiora Airfield and provide a planning framework which identifies and acknowledges this ongoing activity on the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objectives and Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(11) Optimise use of existing infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 6.2.4 – Integration of transport infrastructure and land use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritises the planning of transport infrastructure so that it maximises integration with the priority areas and new settlement patterns and facilitates the movement of people and goods and provision of services in Greater Christchurch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 6.3.5 Integration of land use and infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Only providing for new development that does not affect the efficient operation, use, development, appropriate upgrading and safety of existing strategic infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Managing the effects of land use activities on infrastructure, including avoiding activities that have the potential to limit the efficient and effective, provision, operation, maintenance or upgrade of strategic infrastructure and freight hubs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7.3.2 Land and Water Regional Plan

The Land and Water Regional Plan (“LWRP”) identifies the resource management outcomes or goals for managing land and water resources in Canterbury to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (“RMA”). It identifies the policies and rules needed to achieve the objectives, and provides direction in terms of the processing resource consent applications.

Of particular relevance to the Rangiora Airfield is the management of stormwater and hazardous materials. In this regard the following policies are of relevance.

Policy 4.13 seeks to ensure that the effects of any potential discharge of any contaminants that may affected surface or groundwater bodies are managed.

Policy 4.24 seeks to manage the discharge of hazardous substances into water, or onto land where it may enter water.
Policy 4.25 seeks to ensure that activities involving the use, storage or discharge of hazardous substances will be appropriately managed to protect land and water from contamination (Note – refuelling is defined as a Hazardous activity in the LWRP).

At this stage no new public works are proposed as part of this NoR and therefore the designation of the Site will not result in any changes to the existing stormwater management systems or modification to the current handling of hazardous materials onsite. Accordingly, the NoR will not result in any new environmental impacts managed by the Land and Water Regional Plan.

It is noted however that regional consents maybe be required in conjunction with any Outline Plan applications in the future. It is important to emphasise that confirmation of the NoR does not negate the need for future activities to comply with any Regional rules or alternatively seek the necessary regional consents.

7.3.3 Waimakariri District Plan

The Site and surrounding land within the proposed 65dBA contour is zoned Rural in the Waimakariri District Plan. The majority of the Rangiora Airfield landholding is also identified as the “Rangiora Aerodrome” in the Plan however this doesn’t encompass all the current airfield landholding. The Waimakariri District Plan defines ‘heliports, helipads and/or airports as defined by the Airport Authorities Act 1966’ as being a ‘utility’, and therefore the Rangiora Airfield falls within the definition of a utility in the District Plan. A summary of how the designation for the Site will directly contribute to achieving the relevant objectives and policies of the Waimakariri District Plan is outlined in Table 3 below.

Table 3 – Contribution of the Proposed Designation to the Waimakariri District Plan Objectives and Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives and Policies</th>
<th>Contribution of Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilities and Traffic Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 11.2.1</td>
<td>The designation of the airfield, coupled with the adoption of the noise contours contained in the Plan Change which accompanies this NoR, will protect the safe operation of the airfield from land uses on surrounding sites which are incompatible with the airfield.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverse effects on the environment caused by the provision, use, maintenance and upgrading of utilities are avoided, remedied or mitigate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.2.1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse environmental effects caused by the provision, use, maintenance and upgrading of utilities by:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Avoiding land uses under airfield approach paths that could adversely affect the safety of airfield operations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Safety and Wellbeing</strong></td>
<td>While the designation itself does not impose noise controls, the Plan Change which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 12.1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain the amenity values and a quality of environment appropriate for different parts of the District which protects the health, safety and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives and Policies</th>
<th>Contribution of Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wellbeing of present and future generations, and ensure that any potential adverse</td>
<td>accompanies this NoR seeks to introduce noise contours and associated noise attenuation controls and limits to prevent unreasonable levels of noise on the surrounding rural area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental effects from buildings and structures, signs, glare, noise and</td>
<td>It’s noted that the District Plan recognises that aircraft can only be controlled in relation to the use of airports and that mitigation of the noise effect in the receiving environment involves consideration of the appropriateness of residential development in some areas, and the extent to which building design can reduce the noise, eg insulation, setbacks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hazardous substances are avoided or mitigated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 12.1.1.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control noise to a level that is not unreasonable, measured against the character</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and circumstances of the zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 12.1.1.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid the noise effect from aircraft and avoid or mitigate the noise effect from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>road traffic in the receiving environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural Zones</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 14.1.1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain and enhance both rural production and the rural character of the Rural Zone,</td>
<td>The proposed designation will recognise the existing Rangiora Airfield operations, which are part of the receiving environment. The extent of the designation beyond the airfield, which is relatively small, will not impact on the maintenance of rural production as the areas concerned are used for grazing purposes. It may however restrict the enhancement of rural production for safety reasons depending on the use anticipated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which is characterised by:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) the dominant effect of paddocks, trees, natural features, and agricultural,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pastoral or horticultural activities; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) generally quiet – but with some significant intermittent and/or seasonal noise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from farming activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 14.1.1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain the continued domination of the Rural Zones by intensive and extensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural, pastoral and horticultural land use activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 14.1.1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain and enhance the environmental qualities such as natural features, air and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noise levels, including limited signage and rural retail activities that contribute to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the distinctive character of the Rural Zones, consistent with a rural working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 14.3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit the increase in the number of people in the Rural Zones who may suffer noise</td>
<td>This present objective and policy refer specifically to Christchurch International Airport however the PPC proposes to add similar provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nuisance from over flying aircraft using Christchurch International Airport.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 14.3.1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objectives and Policies | Contribution of Designation
--- | ---
Avoid intensive subdivision and the development of noise sensitive uses in the Rural Zone within the 50dBA Ldn noise contour relating to Christchurch International Airport as shown on District Plan Map 138. | 

7.3.4 Other relevant statutes

*National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants on Soil to Protect Human Health (NES)*

The National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health (NES) controls soil disturbance on land where an activity on the Hazardous Activities and Industries List (HAIL) is being carried out, has been carried out, or is more likely than not to have been carried out.

The designation site is identified as an F1 – Airports HAIL site. The designation of the site does not affect the application of the NES, however any future works on the site will be required to be considered against the NES requirements. This may result in certain works on the site requiring consents from the district council in terms of the NES.

7.4 Section 168A(3)(b) Alternative Sites, Routes or Methods

Section 168A(3)(b) of the RMA requires the territorial authority to have particular regard to:

(b) whether adequate consideration has been given to alternative sites, routes or methods of undertaking the work if—

(i) The requiring authority does not have an interest in the land sufficient for undertaking the work; or

(ii) It is likely that the work will have a significant adverse effect on the environment;

The two limbs of Section 168A(3)(b) are disjunctive and therefore only one test must be met. In this case it is considered that the Council has sufficient interest in the land for undertaking the proposed designation. Further, it is considered that the privately (or publicly) owned adjoining land within the 65dBA Ldn noise contour are affected by the current operations of the Rangiora Airport to a sufficient extent, i.e. the need to avoid noise sensitive activities in this area and manage activities which pose a risk to aircraft movements, to support their inclusion in the designation. Nevertheless, the proposed restrictions on activities to occur on this land within the 65dBA Ldn noise contour still support a wide range of rural uses and therefore enable the continued use of these lands.

Notwithstanding the above, as is discussed below, the effects of the designation on the environment are considered to be minor as they relate to existing and on-going airfield activity and therefore the RMA does not require an assessment of alternatives.

Nevertheless, for completeness the following consideration of alternatives has been undertaken in making the decision to designate the subject site:

7.4.1 Alternative Sites
The existing airfield is well established and has been subject to a significant level of capital investment in the form of construction of the existing airstrip, hangars and other structures on the site. Further, the proximity of the airfield to the Christchurch International Airport provides strategic support through providing alternative facilities in the event of civil defence events and emergencies and managing light aircraft movements.

On this basis it is not considered an alternative site is a realistic option.

7.4.2 Alternative Routes or Methods

The designation of the Rangiora Airfield has been selected as the most suitable method for recognising and protecting the ongoing operations and expansion of the Airfield as it recognises the strategic importance of this infrastructure in the Canterbury region. It is noted the following airports, which vary in size, are all designated within the applicable district plans:

- Christchurch International Airport
- Wanaka Airport
- Wairoa Airfield
- Omarama Airfield
- Oamaru Airport
- Pukaki-Twizel Airfield

Designation is therefore a common method of providing a degree of certainty for airport related activities even for an airfield of Rangiora’s size.

However, there are three alternative methods available, which are considered below.

Alternative 1 – Plan Change only

A Plan Change seeking a change to the zoning could be sought for the airfield. However this pathway was not pursed for the following reasons:

- Would not entirely protect the airfield from development in the immediate surrounding environment which may impede on the efficient ongoing airfield operation;
- Does not provide the higher degree of recognition and control consistent with other airfields including Wairoa Airfield, Omarama Airfield, and Pukaki-Twizel Airfield which are designated in their relevant district plans;
- Would not manage as efficiently and effectively as a designation is able to those land uses in areas not owned by Rangiora Airfield, but which are required to be managed to promote safe aviation operations on the airfield; and
- Would require significant amendments to the District Plan including a specific one-off zone framework.

Alternative 2 – Resource Consent

A global resource consent based around a master plan could be sought for the airfield operations instead of a designation. This option was not pursued for the following reasons:

- Would necessitate identifying development areas upfront.
▪ Does not provide the higher degree of recognition and control consistent with other airfields including Wairoa Airfield, Omarama Airfield, and Pukaki-Twizel Airfield which are designated in their relevant district plans.

▪ Would likely lead to the need to seek ongoing amendments to any consent.

▪ Would not protect the airfield from development in the immediate surrounding environment i.e. within the 65dBA noise contour, which may impede the safe and efficient ongoing airfield operation.

▪ Would not protect the airfield from development in the surrounding environment which may impede on the efficient ongoing airfield operation.

**Alternative 3 – Do Nothing**

If the status quo is maintained, any future changes to the existing airfield operations will require individual resource consents. This method is considered unsuitable for Rangiora Airfield which is identified as ‘significant infrastructure’ in a regional context, and includes the following risk for the ongoing operation of the airfield:

▪ Does not provide recognition of the airfield and its operations which would continue to rely on ‘existing use rights’ which have not been confirmed and may be difficult to establish.

▪ Does not provide certainty for any future expansion of airfield operations.

▪ Would not protect the airfield from development in the surrounding environment which may impede on the efficient ongoing airfield operation.

▪ The existing rural zoning of the site does not promote aviation operations on the site, or protect the subject site against development which might compromise aviation.

On this basis, it is considered that the proposed designation of the site is the most suitable method of protecting the on-going operations and expansion of Rangiora Airfield.

### 7.5 Section 168A(3)(c) Is the Designation Reasonably Necessary to Achieve the Objectives of the requiring authority for which the designation is sought

The Waimakariri District Council’s objectives are to provide recognition for, and safeguard the operations of, the Rangiora Airfield alongside minimising the impacts of surrounding noise sensitive land uses on the airfield’s continued operation, providing notice via the District Plan of its location to surrounding landowners and giving effect to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.

The Site is currently zoned Rural under the Waimakariri District Plan with minimal statutory recognition or protection. Notwithstanding this, the airfield is recognised as ‘strategic infrastructure’ in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.

While it is not proposed to change the underlying zoning, through designating the Site the ongoing current airfield activities will be given statutory recognition and future such activities will be better enabled. Further, the designation is a means of giving effect\(^2\) to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in terms of the ‘strategic infrastructure’ status of the Airfield in that document.

\(^2\) s75(3)(c) of the RMA requires that a District Plan must give effect to a Regional Policy Statement
The proposed designation will extend beyond the airfield to include land identified to be affected by the 65dBA Ldn noise contour. This will restrict this land from supporting activities which could compromise the ongoing airfield operations. Such activities could include ‘noise sensitive activities’, water bodies hosting birds and the development of buildings or structures which could jeopardise the safe operation of the airfield in terms of building form and lighting.

Coupled with the policy amendments contained in the accompanying Proposed Plan Change, the proposed designation is considered ‘reasonably necessary’ to achieve the objectives of the Council and enable ongoing and potential future airfield operations from the Site.

7.6 Section 168A(3)(d) Any other Matters considered Reasonably Necessary

Based on the above assessment, the following environmental matters including general amenity effects have been reviewed in the context of the proposed designation of the Rangiora Airfield.

7.6.1 Noise

The Rangiora Airfield operates with three grass runways which are used by aviation clubs and businesses. The types of users of the airfield generally use light and small aircrafts, as well as helicopters. These aircrafts generate lower noise than larger commercial aircrafts, however still result in noise beyond the site, most acutely during take-off and landing.

Marshall Day Acoustics have prepared noise contours which are attached as Appendix 3. The noise contour map is based on data from existing airfield operations, and the projected future growth of the airfield operations with an additional 20% increase in aircraft movements being allowed to account for monthly variability, making an estimated increase of 120% in total movements. The future noise contours for 20XX have therefore been calculated based on the following:

- A total of 87,982 annual aircraft movements, of which 14% are helicopter movements;
- No change to the anticipated fleet mix;
- The threshold of vector R28 would in time be extended to increase its potential usefulness;
- No change to 2016 vector splits;
- No night-time use of the airfield; and
- No significant change to flight tracks.

The proposed designation and accompanying PPC address the potential impact of noise sensitive activities located on surrounding properties on the ongoing operations of Rangiora Airfield, through the identification of land where such activities are to be avoided, and situations where noise attenuation measures should be implemented.

It is acknowledged that increased aircraft movements may result in greater noise being experienced particularly outdoors, however this needs to be seen in the context that the airfield already exists and has done so for many years and that rural environments are often subject to greater levels of noise. It is also noted that an internal insulation standard for new and altered residential dwellings is a requirement of the PPC within the 55dBA contour.

The proposed designation of land within the 65dBA noise contour will continue to support rural land uses which are not considered to be sensitive to noise, however the potential receiving noise inside that contour is such that noise sensitive activities (including rural dwellinghouses)
would be affected to a significant degree and should therefore be restricted from locating within this area in order to both protect people’s health and ensure the continued operation of the airfield.

7.6.2 Visual effects

The existing improvements on the Rangiora Airfield site generally comprises single storey aircraft hangars, club rooms, aviation related support services and businesses, and three turf runways. The scale and design of the existing improvements are in the context of this area compatible and complementary to improvements in the surrounding rural area. Additionally, their location on the Ashley River side of the extensive Rangiora Airfield site minimises their visibility from surrounding properties.

Dense vegetation is located to the north of the site between the Rangiora Airfield and the Ashley River. In addition, dense vegetation is also established along the northern bank of the Ashley River. This vegetation provides a screen of the existing improvements on the site when viewed from the Ashley River and the rural area to the north of the Ashley River.

The proposed designation of the Rangiora Airfield does not include with it any proposed works via an Outline Plan. However, by designating the airfield for ‘airport purposes’ it will enable, via the Outline Plan process, further works to be considered, including buildings and including the area adjoining Priors Road.

In order to provide some context in terms of visual effects consideration has been given to the existing key amenity rules in the District Plan for the Rural zone.

Key rules are:

- Structure Coverage = 20%
- Road setback = 10m
- Internal setback = 3m
- Height = no limit

In terms of structure coverage the total area of the Site is 49.1ha. 20% is equal to 9.82ha. Of the total 49.1ha the runways and associated requirements governing building proximity to runways take up a significant portion of Site in the order of 30ha. The remaining area where building itself can take place is the existing built up area along the northern boundary and an area in the vicinity of Prior Road. In the circumstances of these split areas and taking into account the vast expanse of the runways it is not considered that a site coverage condition is either necessary or could be realistically imposed.

Setback rules provide for a degree of visual separation and it is considered that the road and internal setback rules are of relevance and should be included as conditions on the NoR. This particularly affects the Priors Road frontage where there are currently no buildings established. There is potential, subject to servicing issues being addressed, for some airport related development on this frontage. The type of buildings likely to develop on the airfield are not dissimilar to agricultural buildings such as sheds, barns and storage facilities and therefore it is considered that the 10m road setback, along with the internal setback, remain relevant in this context.

There is currently no height rule in the Rural zone and it is not considered necessary to impose one as a condition on the NoR. The reality is that there is unlikely to be a need for tall
buildings on the site and there are safety requirements in terms of building height and location around the airfield.

Notwithstanding the above, any new development coming forward in the form of an Outline Plan will be required to be prepared in accordance with Section 176A (3) which states:

*An outline plan must show—*

(a) the height, shape, and bulk of the public work, project, or work; and

(b) the location on the site of the public work, project, or work; and

(c) the likely finished contour of the site; and

(d) the vehicular access, circulation, and the provision for parking; and

(e) the landscaping proposed; and

(f) any other matters to avoid, remedy, or mitigate any adverse effects on the environment.

Further, subsection (4) it goes onto state that:

*Within 20 working days after receiving the outline plan, the territorial authority may request the requiring authority to make changes to the outline plan.*

It is therefore considered that with the conditions proposed and the requirements of the Outline Plan process any visual effects are able to be adequately addressed taking into account the context of the site.

### 7.6.3 Traffic Effects

The proposed designation of the Airfield does not include any additional development or intensification of use on the site as part of this NoR or the accompanying PPC. However the designation intends to secure the long-term use of the site for airfield uses, and the noise contours include assumptions that the use of the airport will expand in the future.

Accordingly, while traffic movements to and from the site are not anticipated to increase due to the proposed designation, they may well increase in the future as airfield related use in accordance with the designation grows. This will be dependent on the types and nature of those uses.

The primary vehicle access to the site is from Oxford Road via Merton Road. The most recent traffic counts taken by Waimakariri District Council in August 2015 on Merton Road (1,000m north of Oxford Road) indicated average daily traffic of 362 vehicles, with a peak of 51 vehicles per hour. With a maximum vehicle capacity of 1,700 per hour in each direction, Merton Road is currently operating well below capacity, and the proposed designation even allowing for a doubling of development is not likely to significantly affect the current traffic movements along this road to the point where its capacity will be reached. Further, the limitations of the airfield in terms of runway length and weight capacity and the proposed restriction on lighting mean that it could not in its current configuration cater for higher traffic generating activities such as passenger movements.

The assessment of any intensified use of the Rangiora Airfield will be subject to assessment as part of any future Outline Plan application, which would ensure that road infrastructure, for example on Priors Road, could support any resulting traffic generation.

### 7.6.4 Safety
The Airfield has been designed in accordance with, and is required to meet, the requirements of Civil Aviation Authority of New Zealand Advisory Circular AC139-7.

The Waimakariri District Plan includes Obstacle Limitation Surfaces height slopes for the Rangiora Airfield. However, as part of the designation of the Airfield and preparation of the accompanying Proposed Plan Change, the District Plan Planning Map 145 is proposed to be amended to include revised Obstacle Limitation Surfaces height slopes for the airfield based on the current runway lengths. This will ensure safe ongoing operations of the Rangiora Airfield.

The Rangiora Airport does not conduct air transport operations or support aircraft over 5,700kg Maximum Certified Take-Off Weigh (MCTOW), and therefore the requirement for Runway End Safety Areas (RESA) in accordance with Civil Aviation Authority of New Zealand (CCA) Advisory Circular 139-6 is not required.

Accordingly, the safety impact of the proposed designation is considered to be less than minor.

7.6.5 Lighting

The Rangiora Airfield does not have runway lighting, and is not proposed as part of this NoR to restrict the provision of imbedded runway lights. This will restrict the hours of operation of the airfield to daylight hours.

While individual aircrafts will have lights, and similarly, vehicles entering and exiting the site will have lights, the proposed restriction within the designation will ensure that there is no increase in the aircraft or vehicle traffic to or from the airfield at night.

Accordingly, the lighting impact of the proposed designation is considered to be less than minor.

7.6.6 Social, Economic and Cultural Effects

The designation of the Rangiora Airfield will provide recognition of the ‘strategic infrastructure’ value the airfield has within the Canterbury region.

The airfield contributes both socially, economically and culturally, providing aviation facilities for:

- Aviation clubs;
- Helicopter operators; and
- Local aviation businesses.

In addition, the economic benefits of the airfield include creating employment and industry in the region.

The proposed designation of the Airfield will support employment and industry in the region, through direct and support services. These economic benefits contribute to the social and cultural effects of the designation and associated Proposed Plan Change, and accordingly the impacts of the proposed designation in this regard are considered positive.

There is also potential economic dis-benefit to the landowners affected by the designation. While the areas concerned would not impact on landowner’s ability to create 4ha subdivisions with a dwelling platform outside the 65dBA contour, it will place some restrictions on land use
within the 65dBA contour such as open water storage and intensive cropping. None of these activities currently occur on any of the land affected by the proposed designation.

7.6.7 Natural Hazards

The Site is not identified as being susceptible to liquefaction, however some areas along the Priors Road frontage are shown as subject to medium flood hazard with a small area at the west end within the high flood hazard as shown below.

Figure 3 – Rangiora Airfield – Flood Hazard

It is considered that the type of buildings which will occur on the Site such as hangers are not likely to be significantly affected by flood hazards and further having them raised to a specified flood level could create difficulties in terms of their intended use. There may however be some buildings where it is appropriate to have a raised floor height and it is considered that this can be addressed through the Outline Plan process where necessary.

The Ashley River / Rakahuri itself presents a significant hazard and it is noted that the District Plan requires that any structure shall be setback 100m from the centreline of the stopbank in this location. It is therefore proposed to continue this requirement as a condition within the NoR.

8 Part 2

In considering an application for a NoR, the territorial authority is required to consider Part 2 of the RMA, which contains its purpose (s5) and principles (ss6-8). In order to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, being the Act’s purpose, it is necessary to consider (among other things) whether adverse effects on the environment may be avoided, remedied or mitigated.
As discussed in Section 6 Assessment of Effects on the Environment, the works (subject to an Outline Plan) and purpose enabled by the NoR will not create any significant adverse effects on the local environment. In particular, it is considered that the primary adverse effects associated with the proposed use of the site, being noise, visual or traffic effects will be minimal and/or can be addressed by conditions in the NoR or requirements associated with the accompanying PPC.

The proposed NoR will provide for the future needs of Airfield users and employees and in this respect, it will contribute to the community’s social, economic and cultural wellbeing.

Section 7 of the RMA requires particular regard be had to maintaining and enhancing amenity values. While it is acknowledged that the NoR will have some effect on the amenity of surrounding residents in terms of noise, visual and traffic; any significant adverse effects will be avoided through compliance with the conditions of the NoR and requirements of the PPC and the responsible day-to-day management of the Airfield.

Overall, the proposal is not considered to be contrary to Part 2 of the RMA.

9 Consultation / Notification

A draft Proposed Plan Change and draft Notice of Requirement for the associated designation of the airfield has included consultation with relevant stakeholders. The Consultation Strategy was prepared in accordance with the relevant provisions of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991. The key elements of the Consultation Strategy are outlined below.

9.1 Timing

Consultation commenced once Council indicated that the documents were aligned to their overall objectives for the Airfield. The draft NoR for the designation of the Rangiora Airfield and the associated draft PPC were presented to Council for endorsement to commence the community consultation process.

9.2 Consultation Parties

The consultation process included the following stakeholder groups:

- The Minister for the Environment;
- Civil Aviation Authority;
- Environment Canterbury;
- Adjoining local authorities;
- Christchurch International Airport Limited;
- Local rūnanga, Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga;
- Affected Landowners including:
  - Landowners and occupiers within the proposed 65dBA noise contour, which will be effected by the proposed designation;
  - Landowners and occupiers within the proposed 55dBA noise contour; and
  - Landowners and occupiers within the revised take off climb and approach obstacle limitation surfaces;
10 Conclusion

This Notice of Requirement (NoR) has been prepared to support the designation of the Rangiora Airfield, and surrounding land within the projected 65 dBA Noise Contour. The proposed designation will reflect the Airfields status as “Strategic Infrastructure” and “Regionally Significant Infrastructure” in the Regional Policy Statement. The proposed designation has been designed in two parts, firstly to better recognise and provide for airfield operations, and secondly to protect the safe ongoing operations of the Rangiora Airfield and restrict activities which may impact upon that continued operation. In addressing these two parts the NoR therefore proposes a two-tiered designation structure as detailed above.

The NoR has been prepared in accordance with Section 168A of the Resource Management Act 1991, and includes an assessment of the relevant plans and policies, and consideration of alternative sites and methods which could be utilised to achieve the objectives and outcomes of the NoR. Through this assessment it can be concluded that the proposed designation presents the best method of recognising the significance of the Rangiora Airfield, and protecting its ongoing operations in a safe manner while mitigating adverse effects on the surrounding properties.

Accordingly, it is considered that the designation outlined in this NoR is the most effective and efficient means of achieving the proposed outcome for the Rangiora Airfield.
APPENDIX 1:

Certificates of Title
Identifier 439710
Land Registration District Canterbury
Date Issued 03 December 2008

Prior References
82010 82011

Estate Fee Simple
Area 40.1272 hectares more or less
Legal Description Lot 2-4 Deposited Plan 410643 and Lot 1-2 Deposited Plan 320694 and Lot 1 Deposited Plan 24674

Proprietors Waimakariri District Council

Interests
Subject to Section 241(2) Resource Management Act 1991 (affects DP 410643)
8013674.5 Consent Notice pursuant to Section 221 Resource Management Act 1991 - 3.12.2008 at 9:06 am (affects lots 2,3,4 DP 410643)
8013674.6 Consent Notice pursuant to Section 221 Resource Management Act 1991 - 3.12.2008 at 9:06 am (affects lots 2,3,4 DP 410643)
NOTES

Amalgamation Condition
Lots 2, 3 and 4 hereon are to be transferred to the owner of Lot 1 DP 24674 and Lots 1 & 2 DP 320694 (CT 82110) and one computer freehold register be issued to include all parcels.

Lot to Vest
Lot 6 is to vest as road in the Wanaka District Council.
### Proprietors
The Rangiora County Council
Estate Fee Simple
Area 9.0037 hectares more or less

### Legal Description
Rural Section 38634

### Purpose
Aerodrome

### Estate
Fee Simple

### Area
9.0037 hectares more or less

### Legal Description
Rural Section 38634

### Purpose
Aerodrome

### Proprietors
The Rangiora County Council

### Interests
Subject to Section 59 Land Act 1948
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1. SUMMARY
1.1 This report is requesting the Council confirm the exchange of appointments between Councillors Atkinson and Gordon to the Rangiora Airfield Advisory Group.

2. RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report No. 180725083462.
(b) Retrospectively ratifies Councillor Gordon to replace Councillor Atkinson as the Council representative on the Rangiora Airfield Advisory Group.
(c) Notes that Councillor Williams will continue to also be the Council representative on the Rangiora Airfield Advisory Group.

3. BACKGROUND
3.1 At the 1 November 2016 Council meeting Councillors Atkinson and Williams were formally appointed as the Council’s representative on the Rangiora Airfield Advisory Group.

3.2 Due to other Council related commitments Councillor Atkinson has been unable to attend several of the airfield meetings and Councillor Gordon has attended in his place.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS
4.1. This report seeks to formalise the arrangement officially of Councillors Williams and Gordon being the Council representatives on the Rangiora Airfield Advisory Group.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS
5.1. Groups and Organisations
The Airfield Advisory Group are supportive of this proposal.
5.2. **Wider Community**
Not sought although there is an established relationship with the groups named and it is important that this continue.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**
There are no financial implications or risk.

6.2. **Community Implications**
There are no community implications as two councillors continue to be supportive of the Rangiora Airfield Advisory Group.

6.3. **Risk Management**
There are no financial implications or risk.

6.4. **Health and Safety**
Nil.

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**
Not applicable.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**
There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that effects our District.

Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR INFORMATION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: EXC-34-20 / 180723081898

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 7 August 2018

FROM: Jim Palmer, Chief Executive

SUBJECT: Health and Safety Report to Council August 2018

SIGNED BY: (for Reports to Council, Committees or Boards)

1. SUMMARY

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

Attachments:
1. Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties
2. July 2018 Health and Safety Dashboard Report

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 180723081898

2. BACKGROUND

3.1 The Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 requires that Officers must exercise due diligence to make sure that the organisation complies with its health and safety duties. Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties for WDC is outlined in Appendix 1.

3.2 An officer under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 is a person who occupies a specified position or who occupies a position that allows them to exercise a significant influence over the management of the business or undertaking. Councillors and Chief Executive are considered to be the Officers of WDC.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. There are three work-related accidents in this report, one of which is pending investigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Event description</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15/06/2018</td>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>Cut small toe on sharp tile in learn to swim pool.</td>
<td>Incident handled appropriately, no corrective action needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/07/2018</td>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>Hand strain from opening manhole. Injury was caused by attempting to lift a manhole lid without using</td>
<td>Email sent out by manager, including general reminder to adhere to the Safe Working in the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2. There was a near-miss where a contractor mowing grass at Northbrook ponds on a ride-on mower averted potential serious incident when part of the previously-covered underground tank partly collapsed. The tank was part of the old sewer treatment works that had been decommissioned in the 1990s. An investigation is ongoing into the extent of the tank, and what remedial work is required. The site has been cordoned off in the meantime.

3.3. In addition:

∑ The focus for this month’s Health and Safety Risk Register Action Plan meeting was adverse weather response. A team of staff have developed a briefing for all staff that are required to work in response to adverse weather events, to ensure that all safety requirements are considered.

∑ The Health and Safety team, with the assistance of a staff workgroup have revised and re-issued Emergency Response Procedures, and a series of training sessions will be held with Emergency Wardens and front-line staff in particular.

∑ The following training has been delivered during June/July:
  o Manual handling
  o Anti-skid driver safety
  o Asbestos policy and procedure
  o Safe work at heights
  o Confined space entry

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

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Groups and Organisations

N/A

4.2. Wider Community

N/A

5. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. Financial Implications

N/A
5.2. **Community Implications**

N/A

5.3. **Risk Management**

Risk Management is one of the key performance requirements of a functioning Health and Safety system, therefore an updated version of the Health and Safety Register Action Plan is a key aspect of this monthly report (see Attachment 2).

5.4. **Health and Safety**

Continuous improvement, monitoring, and reporting of Health and Safety activities are a key focus of the health and safety management system. Attachment 1 indicates the health and safety monitoring and improvement activities that are in progress at WDC.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Legislation**

6.2.1. The key legislation is the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015.

6.2.2. The Council has a number of Human Resources policies, including those related to Health and Safety at Work.

6.2.3. The Council has an obligation under the Local Government Act to be a good employer.

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

N/A

6.4. **Delegations**

N/A
### 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council reports to include Health and Safety advice as relevant</td>
<td>Monthly, as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audit Committee to receive minutes of Health and Safety Committee meetings</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Update on legislation and best practice changes to Audit Committee</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDERSTAND</strong></td>
<td>Induction of new Council through tour of District and ongoing site visits.</td>
<td>Start of each new term and as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H&amp;S Risk register to Audit Committee</td>
<td>Six monthly, or where major change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training on H&amp;S legislation and best practices updates</td>
<td>At least annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCO activities reported to the Audit Committee</td>
<td>At least annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td>LTP or Annual Plan to have a specific report on H&amp;S resources</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reports to Committees will outline H&amp;S issues and resourcing, as appropriate</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MONITOR</strong></td>
<td>Report to every Council meeting – standing agenda item to include Dashboard Update and any major developments</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risk register review by Audit Committee</td>
<td>Six monthly, or where major change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPLY</strong></td>
<td>Programme of H&amp;S internal work received by Audit Committee</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal Audit reports to Audit Committee</td>
<td>As completed</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 to Audit Committee</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VERIFY</strong></td>
<td>Receive any external audit results and remedial actions (if any) reported to Audit Committee</td>
<td>Two yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worksafe audits, if undertaken</td>
<td>As completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-assessment against Canterbury Safety Charter and/or SafePlus reported to the Audit Committee</td>
<td>As completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Progress against 2017/18 Workplan - July 2018 (**as at 23rd July 2018**)

### Major Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1: Improve Health and Safety systems, to align with organisational objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 1</strong>: Re-develop Safety Management System to ensure that all Policies align with SafePlus framework (see TRIM 180315027921), and all critical risk procedures are captured in Promapp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy structure has been drafted, and re-writing of policies has commenced. Policy structure has 3 key policies: Leadership &amp; Commitment, Risk Management and Worker Engagement. There will be several sub-policies under the ‘Risk Management’ main policy, to address critical risks (e.g. Asbestos Management, Drug and Alcohol, Driver Safety etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To date, the following number of health and safety procedures have been captured in Promapp: Published (finalised) = 19 Unpublished (in progress) = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additionally, the Water Unit are using Promapp to review and rewrite their Safe Working Procedures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 2: Maintain a fit-for-purpose internal health and safety auditing system to ensure that WDC is compliant with health and safety policies, procedures and legal requirements.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 3</strong>: Review and re-develop internal health and safety auditing system, aligned with SafePlus. (see TRIM 180315027921).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| H&S team is awaiting the SafePlus Online Self-Assessment tool from WorkSafe. This is due for finalisation and distribution mid-August 2018. From there the team will complete the following actions:  
∑ Assess the suitability of the tool (and determine any changes in approach – if required)  
∑ Confirm audit timing and approach (report to Management Team)  
∑ Arrange audit  
∑ Complete audit and submit findings to Management Team  
∑ Develop action plan and monitoring schedule  
∑ Review process and adjust if required |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 3: Ensure that all contractors are managed according to health and safety procedural requirements, and improve staff knowledge of those requirements.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 4</strong>: Contractor management process improvement project (carry-over).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated date for Contract Management training delivery = Late September / Early October (dependent on go-live of Promapp single sign-on). The Contract Management Process Improvement Group is currently working on ensuring contract management processes are completed in time for training delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the interim, Health and Safety Manager provides a H&amp;S Contract Management overview to all new staff at their induction, and has also provided an overview of current procedures to U&amp;R, Water Unit, Greenspace and Regeneration teams at a June workshop.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 4: Improve the Health and Wellbeing of staff, and create measures to ensure success.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 5</strong>: Wellbeing strategy development and implementation project (carry-over).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| A Wellbeing Committee has been established, and the wellbeing strategy is in draft form, ready for submission to Management Team for their approval in early August. Additionally, the Management Team will be approving:  
- Wellbeing calendar of events  
- Wellbeing presence on intranet  
- Wellbeing branding  
- Wellbeing communications plan. |
| Once each of those have been approved, the Wellbeing Committee will take ownership of the strategy, and will co-ordinate and communicate all wellbeing activities going forward. |

### LEGEND

- **On track**
- **Slightly behind schedule (less than one month)**
- **Behind schedule (greater than one month)**

In addition to the above workplan, there will be a particular focus on working with volunteers to manage their health and safety. This will include creating written agreements with high risk volunteers, and proactively engaging with all volunteers to ensure that health and safety expectations are aligned with all parties.
Incidents/Injuries - June 2018 (**as at 18th June 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Accident</th>
<th>Incident</th>
<th>Notifiable Injury/illness/Incident</th>
<th>Near Miss</th>
<th>Property Damage</th>
<th>Fatality</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Green: Accident
- Yellow: Incident
- Blue: Notifiable injury/illness/incident
- Orange: Near miss
- Red: Property Damage
- Pink: Fatality
- Red: Total
Lost Time Injuries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Injuries</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>total 74 hours (one pending)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Causes of LTIs are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Body stressing x2 (manual handling) (63hrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Falls, trips, slips x2 (one pending) (11hrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>total 0 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incidents/Injuries - July 2018 (**as at 23rd July 2018**)

June 2017 to Current: Worker Incident Reporting

June 2017 to Current: Worker - Cause of Incident
**LEAD INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Inspections Completed (Workplace Walkarounds)</th>
<th>Q2 2018</th>
<th>16 out of 16 areas completed and submitted. Hazards raised in Tech1 for any non-compliances.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training Delivered</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>People Trained: 460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Delivered</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>People Trained: TBC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Health and Safety Prequalified Contractor Dashboard (drawn from SiteWise database)**

**Hazards Reported 2017-18**

![Graph showing hazards reported from July to June 2017-18]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk rating</th>
<th>Risk type</th>
<th>Suggested Actions</th>
<th>Action Owner</th>
<th>Due date</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Contractor Health and Safety</td>
<td>*Train all contract managers in H&amp;S processes/requirements at time of induction.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Contractor Health and Safety</td>
<td>*Develop comprehensive contract administration/contract management training</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>30/06/2018</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>package to deliver to all staff managing contractors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Contractor Health and Safety</td>
<td>*Identify volunteer groups and leaseholders that engage</td>
<td>Managers &amp; Team Leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>contractors on behalf of WDC and train in contract H&amp;S management processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Contractor Health and Safety</td>
<td>*Complete development of Safety in Design procedures and</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>embed in design processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Vehicle Use &amp; Driver Safety</td>
<td>*Deliver driver training as per training strategy (Driver Safety / 4WD)</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Vehicle Use &amp; Driver Safety</td>
<td>*Identify any drivers that require further progressive driver training on</td>
<td>Managers &amp; Team Leaders</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>an as-needs basis and provide relevant training.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Vehicle Use &amp; Driver Safety</td>
<td>*Provide information and training regarding use of safety equipment such as fire</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>extinguishers in staff pool vehicles to all drivers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Vehicle Use &amp; Driver Safety</td>
<td>*Issue reminder to staff about winter driving season (re-send Driving in Waimakariri</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>brochure).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Volunteers conducting</td>
<td>*Undertake a review of operations to ensure that all activity and</td>
<td>Liz Ashton</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hazardous activities</td>
<td>training is being carried out as per internal H&amp;S processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Volunteers conducting</td>
<td>*Develop Memorandum of Understanding with NZRT12, which will define</td>
<td>Liz Ashton</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hazardous activities</td>
<td>accountability and expectations. May require some further operational and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>administrative support to implement the requirements. (TBC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Adverse weather</td>
<td>*Develop protocols for response to adverse weather events (especially at night),</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne, Kelly La</td>
<td>31/07/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and include in Safe Working in the Field Manual</td>
<td>Valley, Kalley Simpson, Chris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Include in Emergency Management Plan out-of-hours</td>
<td>Brown, Joanne McBride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>deployment in adverse weather.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Level</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Adverse weather</td>
<td><em>Create pre-prepared briefing/toolbox talk for all field staff - regarding specific hazards of an extreme weather event, and the required control measures. Briefing prior to deployment.</em></td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>31/07/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Adverse weather</td>
<td><em>Investigate use of monitoring and tracking systems for all field staff for use in extreme weather events.</em></td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>30/06/2018</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Adverse weather</td>
<td><em>Extend vehicle GPS tracking monitoring capability to the managers of all field staff.</em></td>
<td>Jill Brightwell/Liz Ashton</td>
<td>30/06/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Airfield operations</td>
<td><em>Develop of Airfield Safety Committee and appointment of Airfield Safety Co-ordinator to administer all actions from safety review.</em></td>
<td>Craig Sargison</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Airfield operations</td>
<td><em>Develop of Airfield Operations Manual, and adoption of the manual by Council as the key safety document for the Airfield operations.</em></td>
<td>Craig Sargison</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Airfield operations</td>
<td><em>Provide regular Airfield Operations report to Council</em></td>
<td>Craig Sargison</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Actions in **blue bold** are new (since the most recent Risk Register review).*
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report requests that the Rangiora Ashley Community Board recommends to Council that it amends the parking Bylaw 2007 as follows:

1. Adds a “No Parking” restriction on the north side of Oxford Road for a distance of 39m west of Charles Upham Drive

2. Adds the following following “No Parking” restrictions which have been marked on Oxford Road:
   - South side of Oxford Road, from the sump west of Acacia Avenue westward for 14.6m
   - South side of Oxford Road, from the sump east of Acacia Avenue eastward for 15.3m.
   - North side of Oxford Road from Charles Upham Drive eastward for 68.m

3. Adds a “No Parking restriction” on the north / east side of Charles Upham Drive from Oxford Road to the Charles Upham Village vehicle entrance (a distance of approximately 390m)

4. Adds a “No Parking” restriction on the south / west side of Charles Upham Drive at the pedestrian crossing point adjacent to the southern pedestrian access to the Charles Upham retirement village.

These measures are in response to safety concerns raised by residents of the Charles Upham retirement village, and formalise some parking restrictions which have been marked previously. Some other safety concerns which have been raised by the residents are likely to be addressed by the proposed urbanisation of Oxford Road and associated intersection improvements.

Attachments:
   i. R&M Moffatt Trust Preschool Decision (Trim 171208133511)
   ii. Draft Amended Parking Bylaw 2007 Second Schedule (TRIM No 180629072243)
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Rangiora Ashley Community Board recommends:

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180628071686.

(b) **Adopts** the attached Amended Second Schedule – Parking Restrictions to the Parking Bylaw 2007 (TRIM No 180629072243)

(c) **Notes** that other safety concerns at the Oxford Road, Acacia Avenue, Charles Upham Drive intersection are to be addressed in the Oxford Road urbanisation project

(d) **Notes** that further parking restrictions may be required on Oxford Road to accommodate right turn bays at the intersection

(e) **Notes** that further parking restrictions may be required on the roading network north of the Charles Upham village vehicle entrance. These will be added to the parking bylaw second schedule when this section of road is vested in Council.

3. **BACKGROUND**

**Current Situation**

3.1 Oxford Road is a Strategic Road in the District’s roading hierarchy. Acacia Avenue is a Local Road.

3.2 The length of Charles Upham Drive from Oxford Road to the entrance to the retirement village has only recently been vested in Council, and is a Collector Road. However it is unlikely to fully function as such until the connection to Huntingdon Drive is complete.

3.3 Oxford Road has priority over both Acacia Avenue and Charles Upham Drive at the intersection. Both side roads have Give Way controls at the intersection.

3.4 Recorded traffic volumes on Oxford Road east of Westpark Boulevard have reduced from 6,700 vehicles per day (Vpd) in November 2016 to 6,000 in August 2017. This reduction in recorded traffic volume could be attributable to the time of year of the counts were taken and to the sealing of River Road, which has enabled northbound through traffic to use Lehmans and River Roads rather than Oxford Road and West Belt. It is, however, anticipated that traffic volumes on this section of Oxford Road will increase as development of the Westpark subdivision continues.

3.5 A 2013 count recorded 880 vpd on Acacia Avenue. No counts have yet been recorded on Charles Upham Drive. Traffic Impact Assessments for the Plan Changes for the developments on Charles Upham Drive estimated that 1100 vpd would use this road once the developments were complete.

3.6 All three roads have 50km/h speed limits at the intersection. The speed limit on Oxford Road changes to 70km/h approximately 190m west of the intersection. Whilst no speed surveys have been done on Oxford Road, operating speeds at the intersection are likely to be higher than normally expected in 50km/h areas due to the proximity of the speed limit change.

3.7 No stopping lines have been marked on Oxford Road to the west and east of Acacia Avenue, and to the east of Charles Upham Drive. These restrictions have not yet been included in Council’s parking bylaw schedule.
3.8 A no stopping line has been marked on the eastern side of Charles Upham Drive from approximately 70m from the intersection with Oxford Road to the vehicle entrance of the Charles Upham Village. This parking restriction was marked by the developer prior to vesting the road in Council. It has therefore also not been included in Council's parking bylaw schedule.

3.9 A pedestrian crossing point has been provided across Charles Upham Drive adjacent to the southern pedestrian access to the Charles Upham Village.

**Future Developments**

3.10 There is a project underway to urbanise the northern side of Oxford Road from Charles Upham Drive to Westpark Boulevard. This is currently at the preliminary design stage. It is expected to include the following features:

- Kerb and channel and footpath on the northern side of Oxford Road;
- Upgrade to the Oxford Road, Acacia Avenue, Charles Upham Drive intersection. This is likely to consist of right turn bays for both Acacia Avenue and Charles Upham Drive;
- Provision of cycle facilities on Oxford Road to connect with the facilities at the Westpark subdivision; and
- Extension of the 50km/h speed limit to beyond Westpark Boulevard.

3.11 A resource consent was granted on 8th December 2017 for the development of a child care centre on the northwestern corner of the Oxford Road, Charles Upham Drive intersection (RC165328). The Consent decision is included as Attachment i. The consented development included an entrance on Charles Upham Drive, and an exit on Oxford Road.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

**Safety Concerns at the Oxford Road Acacia Avenue, Charles Upham Drive Intersection**

4.1 Residents of the Charles Upham retirement village have contacted Councillors and raised concerns about the following safety issues:

- Speed of traffic on Oxford Road at the intersection with Charles Upham Drive and Acacia Avenue;
- A risk of being hit from behind when turning right into Charles Upham Drive;
- Lack of a safe crossing point for pedestrians crossing Oxford Road near the intersection; and
- Vehicles parked on Oxford Road to the west of Charles Upham Drive can block visibility along Oxford Road for drivers turning out of Charles Upham Drive.

4.2 A meeting was held on site between staff, Councillors, and representatives of the Charles Upham village residents to discuss the residents’ concerns. The following were agreed at the meeting:

- Traffic calming and speed reduction measures would be incorporated in the design of the Oxford Road urbanisation project;
• An upgrade to the Oxford Road, Charles Upham Drive, Acacia Avenue intersection (including the expected incorporation of right turn bays) will be included in the Oxford Road urbanisation project;

• A pedestrian crossing facility on Oxford Road will be included in the urbanisation project;

• Feedback will be sought from the Charles Upham residents regarding the preliminary design of the urbanisation project prior to it proceeding to detailed design; and

• Measures to prohibit parking on the north side of Oxford Road immediately east of Charles Upham Drive would be implemented as quickly as possible.

4.3. A desk top review of sight distances for drivers turning out of Charles Upham Drive has been carried out. It is estimated that 45m sight distance is able to be achieved if a vehicle is legally parked on Oxford Road. This is significantly less than the 123m sight distance recommended in Austroads for a 60km/h speed environment.

4.4. The limit lines on Charles Upham Drive and Acacia Avenue are 3m and 4.5m forward of the adjacent kerb line respectively (see Figure 1). This may result in some drivers feeling a little exposed and vulnerable if they stop at the limit line. These drivers may stop short of the limit line. This may further compromise the effective sight distances at the intersection.

4.5. Furthermore, there is a potential of conflict between parked vehicles leaving the parking spaces and entering the Oxford Road, and turning vehicles arriving at the limit line.

4.6. The limit lines will be moved closer to the kerb lines when right turn bays and cycle facilities are provided on Oxford Road. Issues associated with the limit lines being forward of the kerb lines are therefore expected to be addressed at this stage. Parking will need to be prohibited adjacent to the intersection in order to accommodate right turn bays at the intersection.

4.7. It is therefore recommended that parking be prohibited on the north side of Oxford Road for a distance of 39m west of Charles Upham Drive. Parking prohibitions may need to be extended beyond this point in order to accommodate a right turn bay at this location. This will be confirmed once the design of the intersection upgrade and urbanisation is complete.
Other Parking Restrictions

4.8. As noted above, parking restrictions have been marked at the intersection and on Charles Upham Drive. These restrictions have not yet been included in the Parking Bylaw schedule. These restrictions are discussed below:

Oxford Road at Charles Upham Drive, Acacia Avenue Intersection

4.9. The following “No Parking” restrictions have been marked on Oxford Road:

- South side of Oxford Road, from the sump west of Acacia Avenue westward for 14.6m
- South side of Oxford Road, from the sump east of Acacia Avenue eastward for 15.3m.
- North side of Oxford Road from Charles Upham Drive eastward for 68.m

4.10. These restrictions are shown on Figure 2.

Charles Upham Drive East Side

4.12. “No Parking” is marked on the east side of Charles Upham Drive from 70m north of Oxford Road to the Charles Upham Village vehicle entrance (a distance of approximately 300m). This was marked by the developer of the village and subdivision prior to the road being vested in Council.

4.13. This was marked in response to increasing demand for on street parking as the village has developed. Some of that demand has been from construction workers working on the village development, and more recently working on the villas and apartments on the west side of Charles Upham Drive. However, it is considered that a significant parking demand is being generated by staff of the village. There is also likely to be a small increase in parking demand from the villas and apartments being constructed on the west side of Charles Upham Drive.

4.14. Charles Upham Drive has a 9m wide carriageway. This is wide enough for one parked vehicle, and one vehicle travelling in each direction. Significant parking demand is likely to result in vehicles parked on both sides of the road. This then does not leave room for vehicles travelling in opposite directions to pass. This is considered unsuitable a Collector Road.
4.15. There is likely to be an increase in parking demand at preschool drop off and pick up times once the preschool at the intersection of Oxford Road and Charles Upham Drive is operational. There is a potential increased risk when vehicles are parked on both sides of the road, there is insufficient room for vehicles to travel in both directions, and small children are crossing the road.

4.16. It is therefore recommended that the existing no parking markings be added to the Parking Bylaw Schedule, and that the “No Parking” be extended to Oxford Road.

4.17. Further parking restrictions are likely to be required on the roading network north of the retirement village vehicle entrance. These sections of road are not yet vested in Council, and/or still under construction. Further parking restrictions will be investigated when they are vested in Council.

Charles Upham Drive West Side at the Pedestrian Crossing Point

4.18. There is a pedestrian crossing point across Charles Upham Drive adjacent to the southern pedestrian access to the Charles Upham Village. This crossing point includes pedestrian cut downs and tactile pavers. Figure 3 shows the location of the pedestrian crossing point. This photograph was taken prior to the completion of the crossing point on the northern side of the road. There is now a path linking the pedestrian bridge with a new crossing point directly opposite the existing one.

![Pedestrian Crossing Point](image)

4.19. Vehicles parked on the road may block the pedestrian cut downs or limit visibility for pedestrians crossing the road.
4.20. Given the proximity to the pedestrian access of the retirement village, many of those crossing the road at this location may be frail and/or have restricted mobility. The current “No Parking” markings on the northern / eastern side of Charles Upham Drive provide clear visibility from, and access to, the crossing point on that side of the road. However, there is no such protection on the southern / western side of the road.

4.21. A kerb build out was considered on this side of the road to prevent parking, and enable pedestrians to have better visibility. However, it was felt that a build out on the inside of a curve such as this could pose a hazard, particularly to vehicles cutting the corner at night or other times of low traffic volumes and few vehicles parked on the road.

4.22. It is therefore recommended that parking is prohibited for 6m either side of the kerb cut down on the south western side of Charles Upham Road.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations Representatives of the Charles Upham Village residents have initiated this work through contact with Council elected representatives. A meeting has been held with the resident’s representatives and Council staff and elected representatives.

5.2. Wider Community Consultation with the wider community is not considered necessary for the following reasons:

- No stopping has already been installed on the 3 of the 4 corners of the Oxford Road intersection and would be anticipated at an intersection such as this;
- No stopping will be required at any case when the right turn bays are installed and the turning bays could not operate effectively without it;
- This is, and has been raised as, a safety issue;
- The proposed Preschool has provision for onsite parking and any parking along the Oxford Road kerb line would block visibility from the exit onto Oxford Road – hence will be required in the future anyway from a safety perspective;
- The adjoining property to the west of the site is accessed off Brick Kiln Lane which is 100m away and therefore the installation of the no stopping would have little effect on them;
- The property opposite has frontage to Acacia Avenue and access off this road as well. There is plenty of on street parking available for visitors in Acacia Avenue;
- During the consent process, the preschool indicated a willingness to limit parking to one side of Charles Upham Drive outside their property.

5.3.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications This proposal is estimated to cost $1,000. This is able to be met from the Minor Improvements budget.

6.2. Community Implications
6.3. Risk Management

6.4. 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.

7.2. Legislation

7.2.1. The Parking Bylaw was drafted under powers in the Local Government Act 1974 (section 684) and the Transport Act 1962 (section 72 (1)(k)). Amendments are similarly authorised. These matters are unchanged by the Local Government Act 2002.

“Transport Act 1962

72. Bylaws as to the use of roads—

Subject . . . to the provisions of this Act or of any other enactment in respect of any of the matters referred to in this subsection, any Minister of the Crown in respect of any roads under his control, or any local authority in respect of any roads under its control, may from time to time make bylaws for any of the following purposes:

[(k) Prohibiting or restricting, subject to the erection of the prescribed signs, the stopping, standing, or parking of vehicles on any road; limiting the stopping, standing, or parking of vehicles on any road to vehicles of any specified class or description; limiting the period of time that vehicles may park on any part of the road where parking is limited to such vehicles; and providing that a vehicle used for the time being for any specified purpose shall be deemed for the purposes of the bylaw to be of such class or description as is specified in the bylaw, notwithstanding that the vehicle may belong to any other class or description for any other purpose:]”

7.2.2. The Parking Bylaw clause 4 permits the Council, by resolution, to amend parking restrictions.

“4 The Council may from time to time by resolution impose parking standing or stopping restrictions on any road or other area controlled by the Council…”

7.3. Community Outcomes

There is a safe environment for all

- Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised. 1,2,3,4
- Crime, injury and harm from road crashes, gambling, and alcohol abuse are minimised. 1,3,4

Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable and sustainable

7.4. Delegations

7.4.1. The Board, under delegation S-DM 1042, has specific jurisdiction for:

“Approving traffic control and constraint measures on streets, including parking”
Our Reference: RC:165328 / 171203133495
Valuation Reference: 21657-155-10

8 December 2017

R & S Moffatt Trust Partnership
C/- Novo Group Ltd
PO Box 365
CHRISTCHURCH 8140

Dear Sir/Madam

AMENDED DECISION ON RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATION
R & S MOFFATT TRUST PARTNERSHIP – 1, 3 & 5 CHARLES UPHAM DRIVE
RANGIORA

Please find enclosed a copy of the amended decision reached by the Plan Implementation
Manager under delegated authority from the Council on the above application.

The purpose of this minor amendment is to amend the reasons for the decision. The
amendment is required because the first reason, being ‘Those considered to be potentially
adversely affected by the proposal have provided written affected party consent’ is incorrect
as the owners and occupiers of 79 Oxford Road, Mr and Mrs Zahner, did not provide written
consent to the proposal, and in fact made a submission in opposition to the proposal.

Mr Zahner has brought this error to my attention and has requested that the error be
corrected.

It is considered the matter raised is best dealt with as a minor amendment under s133A of

Yours faithfully

Garry Blay
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANNER

Encl

CC: Mr and Mrs Zahner
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of an application lodged by R & S Moffatt Trust Partnership for a resource consent under Section 88 of the aforementioned Act.

APPLICATION

The applicants sought a resource consent to establish and operate two retail activities, being a preschool (about 580m² plus 100m² first floor staff and meeting rooms) and café (net floor area 44m²), in a Residential 2 Zone.

The preschool will:

- cater for a maximum of 120 children (maximum of 24 children 0 to 2 years) with 16 FTE staff and a maximum of 18 staff on-site at any time;
- operate from 7.00am until 6.00pm Monday to Friday, excluding public holidays;
- include outdoor play areas and on-site car parking.

The café will:

- operate from 7.00am until 3.00pm Monday to Friday;
- require 2 to 3 staff.

The activity will consist of a 724m² gross floor area with 23 on-site car parks provided. Entry to the car park will be from Charles Upham Drive located to the east of the site. Exit from the car park will be onto Oxford Road.

The road boundaries of the site are to be landscaped or provided with a 1.8 metre high wooden acoustic fence (5 metre length along the northern boundary with Charles Upham Drive) or 1.2 (car park) to 1.5 (road boundary) metre high pool type fencing.

The internal western boundary will be provided with a 2.1 metre high wooden acoustic fence. Outdoor play areas will be located to the north and east of the building.

Signage will consist of a single free standing sign (overall height 2.5m, signage area 2.16m²) located at the Oxford Road/Charles Upham Drive intersection frontage.
DECISION

The Plan Implementation Manager, on the 28th November 2017, approved:

THAT pursuant to Section 104B of the Resource Management Act 1991 consent be granted to establish and operate a preschool facility and café within Lots 1, 2 and 3 of RC145670 (to become Lot 1 DP 512829) being a subdivision of Lot 2 DP 476951 and Pt RS 968 at 56 Oxford Road, Rangiora as a discretionary activity subject to the following conditions which are imposed under Section 108 of the Act:

1. Except where necessary to give effect to the following conditions, the activity shall be carried out in accordance with the attached approved application plans.

2. Standards

All stages of design and construction shall be in accordance with the Waimakariri District Council Engineering Code of Practice.

3. Stormwater

3.1 The Consent Holder shall design and install the car park stormwater reticulation incorporating the following parameters:

- The trapped portion of the sumps shall be sized to contain a volume equal to 25mm of rain falling on the contributing catchment surface area.

- Calculations shall be based on rainfall for the site location using rainfall figures from NIWAs HIRDS Version 3 plus a 16% allowance for climate change.

3.2 The Consent Holder shall prepare stormwater plans to be submitted to the Council for approval. The plans shall include car park levels, catchment areas, and flow calculations.

3.3 The Consent Holder shall install an oil/grit interceptor trap to treat the hardstand runoff from the sealed carpark and service areas.

4. Roading

4.1 The Consent Holder shall mark Oxford Road outside the site, and install temporary “safe hit” posts in accordance with Waimakariri District Council drawing 3861 (Issue A).

4.2 The Consent Holder shall design and plant the landscaping on the Oxford Road boundary to allow required visibility and sight distances to pedestrians or vehicles from the site exit, as outlined in the Waimakariri District Plan.

4.3 As the network utility provider, the Council Road Maintenance Contractor shall carry out all markings at the Consent Holder’s expense.
5. **Car Park**

5.1 The car park shall be formed, drained and sealed in accordance with the Waimakariri District Council Code of Practice.

5.2 The car park shall be installed generally in accordance with Waimakariri District Council Standard Plan 600 - 274 (Issue D).

6. **Access**

6.1 The Consent Holder shall form and seal the accesses to accord with Waimakariri District Council Standard Drawing 600-212A (Issue B).

6.2 Access widths at the kerb line shall not exceed 10 metres at Charles Upham Drive, and 7 metres at Oxford Road.

7. **Signage**

7.1 A single freestanding sign shall be located in the position shown on the attached approved application plan and shall not exceed 2.5 metres in overall height or 2.16m² in area on each side.

7.2 The freestanding sign shall not be illuminated.

8. **Landscaping**

8.1 Landscaping shall be carried out to a minimum standard of that shown on the approved application plans.

8.2 Except within areas required for visibility and sight distances to pedestrians or vehicles from the site exit onto Oxford Road (as per condition 4.2), landscaping shown on the attached approved application plan to the west of the car park and adjacent to the acoustic boundary fence shall have a minimum mature height of 2 metres.

8.3 Any dead or dying plants shall be replaced as soon as practicable.

9. **Lighting**

9.1 Any security lighting installed on the outside of the building, or within the site, shall be low level, downward and inward facing, and shall not spill onto neighbouring lots or any road.

10. **Number of children and staff**

10.1 The number of children on-site at any time shall not exceed 120, including a maximum of 24 under two years age.

10.2 The number of staff on-site at any time shall not exceed 21.
11. **Café**

11.1 The net floor area of the café shall not exceed 44m².

12. **Hours of operation**

12.1 Hours of operation of the preschool shall only be between 7.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Friday, excluding Public Holidays.

12.2 Hours of operation for the café shall only be between 7.00am and 3.00pm Monday to Friday.

13. **Fencing**

13.1 The acoustic fence located along the western boundary shall not exceed a maximum height of 2.1 metres.

13.2 The acoustic fence located along the northern Charles Upham Drive frontage shall not exceed a maximum height of 1.8 metres, and shall extend for a maximum of 5 metres from the western site boundary.

13.3 All acoustic fencing shall meet a minimum specification of 8 kg/m².

13.4 All other fencing shall be as indicated on the attached approved application plan.

14. **Noise**

14.1 The operation of the pre-school shall comply with the following noise controls that are to apply at the notional boundary of any dwelling house when measured and assessed in accordance with NZS 6801:1991 "Assessment of Environmental Sound":

   a) Daytime: 7am to 7pm Monday to Saturday, and 9am to 7pm Sundays and Public Holidays: 50dBA L10.

   b) Other times: 40dBA L10.

   c) Daily 10pm-7am the following day: 70dBA Lmax.

15. **Traffic Management**

The Consent Holder shall submit for approval a Traffic Management Plan detailing traffic control works (including sketch layout and control signs). This plan shall be submitted prior to work commencing on or in Oxford Road and Charles Upham Drive. Traffic Management shall be to Level 1, as described in the NZ Transport Agency Code of Practice for Temporary Traffic Management.

16. **Plans & Specifications**

The Consent Holder shall submit detailed design plans and specifications for the works including the car park, stormwater and servicing to the Council for approval. No works shall commence until formal approval is issued in writing.
17. **As Built Plans**

"As Built" plans setting out in detail the location of all services shall be provided to the Council immediately following completion of the works and shall be available at the time of inspection. Two sets of plans shall be provided at a scale of 1:200 or 1:250.

18. **Conditions Auditing**

The Council will audit compliance with the conditions of consent by both site inspections and checking of associated documentation to ensure the work is completed in accordance with the approved plans and specifications and to the Council’s standards.

The Council will undertake inspections and checking at the consent holder's cost. The consent holder, or their authorised agent, shall notify Council at least one working day prior to commencing various stages of the works. This is to enable audit inspections required by the consent to be performed.

The minimum level of inspection shall be as follows:

**Services**

- Inspection of stormwater piping and associated works.
- Prior to backfilling of service trenches.

**Roading**

- Upon completion of carriageway markings and installation of ‘safe hit’ posts.

**Access and Car Park**

- On completion of excavation to subgrade.
- Following compaction of base course prior to final surfacing.
- At the completion of the works.

Where repeat inspections are required because of faulty workmanship or work not being ready contrary to the receipt of a notification, such inspections will be carried out at cost for staff time and vehicle running costs for kilometres travelled.

19. **Works Conditions**

Works will not be considered to be completed until conditions 1 to 18 above have been met to the satisfaction of the Waimakariri District Council, at the expense of the applicant.

**ADVICE NOTES**
a) This consent does not provide approval under the Building Act or any relevant Regional Plan.

b) With regard to Condition 4.1 the markings will be modified and the safe hit posts removed in conjunction with the urbanisation of Oxford Road.

c) The requirements and conditions listed are a statement of the Council's minimum standards. Where the Consent Holder proposes higher standards or more aesthetically acceptable alternatives these shall be submitted to the Council for approval.

d) The minimum floor level of any dwelling erected on the lot should be set per condition 16 of RC145670 and the subsequent consent notice registered on the Certificates of Title for Lots 1 to 3.

e) The Traffic Management Plan forms can be sourced from the Waimakariri District Council Service Centres or on-line at:

http://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/services/roads-and-transport/traffic-management

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Pursuant to Section 113 of the Act the Council was satisfied that:

- While the identified affected party made a submission in opposition focused on traffic safety effects on Oxford Road and noise associated with vehicles using the exit onto Oxford Road, a noise report prepared by an appropriately qualified and experienced professional concluded noise would be within acceptable limits, and the Council’s Senior Traffic Engineer concluded the use of the entrance onto Oxford Road would not result in adverse effects to traffic safety or movement.

- The environmental effects will be no more than minor.

- Character and amenity will be maintained.

- Adverse traffic safety and movement effects will be avoided or mitigated to an extent where they are no more than minor.

- The proposal is not contrary to the Objectives and Policies of the District Plan.

DATED at Rangiora this 8th Day of December 2017

SIGNED by Garry Blay

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANNER
ADDITIONAL AP65 SUB BASECOURSE AS NECESSARY TO REACH FIRM SUBGRADE

CROSS SECTION A-A

EXISTING AC FOOTPATH

50mm COVER ALL ROUND

D 12 @ 150 crs BOTH WAYS, OR FIBRE REINFORCED BY APPROVAL

FIRM SUBGRADE

PROPERTY BOUNDARY

SURFACE SLOPING TOWARDS KERB AT MINIMUM OF 4%.

FOOTPATH

CONCRETE SURFACE

EXCAVATION LIMITS

KERB CHANNEL

0.6m

1.5m

WIDTH OF CROSSING

0.6m

1.5m

COMMERCIAL HEAVY DUTY CROSSING REINFORCING BEAM AS REQUIRED

A

A

FOOTPATH

SECTION B-B

uPVC KERB OUTLET (TYPICAL)

ISOMETRIC VIEW

NOTES

1. CONCRETE TO COMPLY WITH NZS 3109:1992
2. CONCRETE TO HAVE COMRESSIVE STRENGTH OF 20 Mpa @ 28 DAYS.
3. KERB LEVELS ON PLAN GIVEN TO KERB TOP.
4. OFFSETS GIVEN TO KERB FACE.

COMMERCIAL HEAVY DUTY CROSSING REINFORCING BEAM

WIDTH OF CROSSING BY APPROVAL OF COUNCIL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Land Use or Activity</th>
<th>Access Formation minimum Width (meters)</th>
<th>Minimum Legal Width (meters)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Zones</td>
<td>0 to 2 dwellinghouses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 to 6 dwellinghouses or any other land use</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Zones</td>
<td>Any land use</td>
<td>6m, or separate entry end exit carriageways of 3m each</td>
<td>8m or two separate carriageways of 5m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES**

1. Surfacing: Single coat hot bitumen and grade 4 chip or bitumen prime coat and 20mm asphaltic concrete.
2. Basecourse: Minimum of 100mm TNZ M/4 AP40
3. Subcourse: Minimum of 150mm TNZ M/5 AP65
RIGHTS OF OBJECTION

The applicant may within 15 working days after the decision being received by them, lodge an objection with the Council against one or more conditions of consent in accordance with Section 357 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Objections to development contributions are considered under the Local Government Act 2002. Objections must be made in accordance with the statutory guidelines in Section 199 and Schedule 13A of the Local Government Act 2002.

Any objection under the Resource Management Act 1991 or Local Government Act 2002 is required to be made by notice in writing to:

The Plan Implementation Manager
Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
RANGIORA 7440

If you are in any doubt as to the procedure to be followed, or any matter arising out of the same, it is strongly recommended that you seek professional advice.

LAPSING OF CONSENT

Attention is drawn to Section 125 of the Resource Management Act 1991 which provides that a resource consent shall lapse five years after the date of commencement (being the issue date of the consent) or after the expiry of such shorter or longer period as expressly provided for in the consent unless:

(a) The consent is given effect to; or

(b) An application is made to the consent authority to extend the period after which the consent lapses, and the consent authority decides to grant an extension after taking into account—

(i) whether substantial progress or effort has been, and continues to be, made towards giving effect to the consent; and

(ii) whether the applicant has obtained approval from persons who may be adversely affected by granting of the extension; and

(iii) the effect of the extension on the policies and objectives of any plan or proposed plan.

OTHER LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

Section 23 of the Resource Management Act 1991 provides that compliance with the Resource Management Act 1991 (e.g. by obtaining of an appropriate resource consent) does not remove the need to comply with all other applicable Acts, Regulations, Bylaws and rules of law.
## Second Schedule – Parking Restrictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Side of Street</th>
<th>Parking Restriction</th>
<th>Qualifying Remarks</th>
<th>Comments for consideration by and the information of the Council</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74c</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>Carpark south of Alfred St between Percival St and Victoria St</td>
<td>See TRIM 151001136999</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>P120 Monday to Friday</td>
<td>Includes land owned by Mandeville Properties but not the land owned by Rangiora Toyota. Item to be deleted - duplicated in items 29b and 44b.</td>
<td>3 November 2015 20 September 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74d</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>Oxford Rd</td>
<td>From Acacia Ave for 22.5m to the west</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>No Parking</td>
<td>To improve sight distance from intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74e</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>Oxford Rd</td>
<td>From Acacia Ave for 24.3m to the east</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>No Parking</td>
<td>To improve sight distance from intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74f</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>Oxford Rd</td>
<td>From Charles Upham Drive for 68.7m to the east</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>No Parking</td>
<td>To improve sight distance from intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74g</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>Oxford Rd</td>
<td>From Charles Upham Drive for 39m to the east</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>No Parking</td>
<td>To improve sight distance from intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74h</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>Charles Upham Drive</td>
<td>From Oxford Rd to Vehicle entrance to Charles Upham Village (approximately 390m)</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>No Parking</td>
<td>To limit parking to one side and enable clear 2 way traffic on roadway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74i</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>Charles Upham Drive</td>
<td>6m either side of pedestrian crossing point opposite southern pedestrian access to Charles Upham Village</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>No Parking</td>
<td>To provide improved sight distance at pedestrian crossing point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Parking Restriction Amendments

Amended August 2018 to Include Changes from Report 180628071686

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Side of Street</th>
<th>Parking Restriction</th>
<th>Qualifying Remarks</th>
<th>Comments for consideration by and the information of the Council</th>
<th>Amendment Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>&quot;Library and Council&quot; Carpark</td>
<td>See Diagram</td>
<td></td>
<td>Disabled Persons Parking only, 120 minutes</td>
<td>3 parks, Existing</td>
<td>180629072243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75a</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>Vickery St</td>
<td>Outside Vickery St Kindergarten</td>
<td></td>
<td>No parking along the Kindergarten frontage to be shown by a yellow line</td>
<td></td>
<td>180629072243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: SHW-13 /180710076344

REPORT TO: Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party

DATE OF MEETING: 19 July 2018

FROM: Kitty Waghorn Solid Waste Asset Manager

SUBJECT: Final Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018

SIGNED BY: (for Reports to Council, Committees or Boards)

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report presents the final Management & Minimisation Plan 2018, and requests that the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party (SHWWP) recommends that the Council adopts the final WMMP.

1.2 During 2016/17, the 2012 Waste Management & Minimisation Plan was reviewed and a new draft document was prepared for consultation. The outcomes from the Special Consultative Procedure led to the "Your Choice" kerbside collection service being included in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan for consultation.

1.3 With this kerbside collection service included in the recently adopted 2018-28 Long Term Plan, the Waste Management & Minimisation Plan has been amended and the final version is being presented for adoption.

Attachments:
   i. Waste Management & Minimisation Plan 2018 (Trim 180710076343)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party recommends:

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180710076344.

(b) Adopts the final Waste Management & Minimisation Plan 2018 (180710076343)

(c) Circulates a copy of this report to all Community Boards for their information.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1. The Waste Minimisation Act 2008 requires each territorial local authority to have a Waste Management & Minimisation Plan (WMMP), and to review this document at a frequency of "no more than six years". Staff undertook to review the 2012 WMMP in 2016/17 so that the outcomes from this review could be included in the Long Term Plan 2018-28.
3.2. The review determined that a substantial change was needed if the Council were to divert more materials away from landfill. The central issue within the draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan 2017, was consideration of a number of options for additional kerbside collection services, which would provide householders with a choice of services that would best serve their needs.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS


4.2. An extensive advertising campaign was carried out to publicise the kerbside collection options that were being considered, and submissions were sought. Over 2,600 submissions were received, with 61.7% in favour of Option C (4 service choices), 14.6% in favour of Option B (2 service choices) and 21.5% in favour of Option A (current service).

4.3. On 5 December 2017 the Council approved including Option C in the draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan 2017 as the preferred suite of kerbside collection services to be offered to those households currently receiving the Council’s recycling and refuse bag collection service, as recommended by the hearings panel.

4.4. The Long Term Plan (LTP) solid waste budgets, Solid Waste Activity Management Plan and solid waste section in the Infrastructure Strategy were prepared using the preferred kerbside collection methodology. The Consultation Document included the “Your Choice” kerbside collection service as one of four key projects.

4.5. Of the 371 submissions received about the “Your Choice” kerbside collection service during the LTP consultation period, 284 (76.5%) were in favour of this service. At their deliberations in late May, the Council approved inclusion of the “your choice” kerbside collection service in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan. The LTP was adopted on 20 June 2018.

4.6. The goals, objectives and policies in the WMMP have not changed, and remain as detailed in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Objectives:</th>
<th>Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Improving the Efficiency of Resource Use</td>
<td>1. Our community has opportunities for avoiding or reducing waste at source.</td>
<td>• Provide practical information and advice to all parts of the community (residential, businesses, industry) on how to minimise waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The Council works with other councils, central government, industry and other parties to improve product stewardship (i.e. aiming to reduce the environmental impact of the life cycle of products).</td>
<td>• Collaborate with other councils to collectively promote producer responsibilities and product stewardship in the District and Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Our community has opportunity to maximise the diversion of material for reuse, recycling or recovery.</td>
<td>• Promote and support product stewardship programmes operating in-district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. The range of diverted material will be improved and the quality of these materials enhanced.</td>
<td>• Improve opportunities for residential and commercial properties to divert reusable and recyclable material from the waste stream at source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensure that there is adequate infrastructure provided to manage diverted material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Use bylaws where appropriate to facilitate waste minimisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Set a baseline of the current quantity of materials diverted and monitor and measure the diverted materials to determine if there is an increase in diversion as a result of changes in the range and quality of diverted materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 2: Reducing Harmful Effects of Waste

1. Our community has access to services for effective and efficient management of waste that comply with current environmental and health practices.
   - Continue providing timely convenient and cost effective kerbside waste collection services to serviced areas and extend areas where needed
   - Ensure that cost-effective convenient facilities such as drop-off points, resource recovery park, transfer station facilities and hazardous and clean fill waste are available for residents to dispose of waste
   - Continue providing timely, convenient and cost effective management of litter in public spaces
   - Work with commercial service providers to ensure that adequate alternative services are available for disposal of waste when the council is not providing the service

2. The disposal of sewage treatment residuals complies with current environmental and health practices
   - Ensure the management of sewage treatment residuals is consistent with best practice

3. Our community is informed and educated regarding issues regarding hazardous waste and residual waste.
   - Provide practical information and advice to the community on how to minimise and dispose of hazardous and residual waste
   - Gather and report on information about waste streams in the District to ensure effective waste management

4.7. The 10-year targets associated with the new waste collection service and planned upgrades at Southbrook resource recovery park are to:
   - Reduce annual per capita waste to landfill from 294kg per capita in 2015/16 to 236kg per capita; and
   - Increase the annual per capita quantity of materials diverted from 170kg per capita in 2015/16 to 228kg per capita.

4.8. The Waste Management & Minimisation Plan has been updated and finalised, and is being presented to the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party today for adoption.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

Presentations were made to groups and organisations during the WMMP and LTP consultation processes.

5.2. Wider Community

The WMMP consultation documentation went out to all serviced properties (properties within the kerbside collection area) and over 1,300 submissions were received. Information was available on-line and there was a supporting campaign both on-line and on the ground with staff providing information stands at a range of locations and events.

The Long Term Plan Consultation Document included the “your choice” bin collection service as a theme, and there was considerable community engagement undertaken during the LTP consultation process. This resulted in 371 submissions being sent in about the kerbside collection service.
6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

There will be an impact on the rates for those households that choose to use the offered bin service(s). The amount of that effect will vary considerably depending on the service options chosen by the household. Furthermore, the effect on the household costs for waste services may be different than the effect on rates, for the same household. This has been well communicated during the WMMP and LTP consultation processes.

6.2. **Community Implications**

There is an expectation from many residents that this service will be provided, and a wish for it to be provided sooner rather than later.

6.3. **Risk Management**

The risks of offering a range of kerbside collection services have been discussed in previous reports. The Council's Solid Waste Activity Management Plan (AMP) contains risk assessments of solid waste services, and this will be reviewed during the term of the 2018 LTP.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

Continuing to offer bag collection services has some risk from the health and safety aspect. It is well documented that manual kerbside collections are riskier operations than automated wheelie bin collections, and in general, the industry is keen to move away from them. The principles of Safety in Design will be used for the upgrades proposed at Southbrook resource recovery park.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

This matter is a matter of significance in terms of the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy. We have undertaken a specific Special Consultative Procedure for the draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan, and included the preferred option from that SCP in the Long Term Plan consultation process.

7.2. **Legislation**

Waste Minimisation Act 2008

S42: Requires territorial authorities to promote effective and efficient waste management and minimisation within their districts.

S43: Specifies that a territorial authority must adopt a waste management and minimisation plan, and what the WMMP must provide for

S50: Specifies that WMMPs must be reviewed at intervals of not more than 6 years after the last review.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

* **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 Council has the delegated authority to adopt a Waste Management & Minimisation Plan.

Kitty Waghorn
Solid Waste Asset Manager
TRIM REF: 180710076344

FILE: SHW-13-05
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Part A

Foreword

This is the Council’s third Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (WMMP), the last one being adopted in 2012. The statutory review cycle for Waste Management Plans is 6 yearly, but this review has been carried out a little earlier than required so it can inform the Council’s next Long Term Plan (LTP), which among other things sets out the levels of service for its various activities that the Council proposes to provide in the following 10 year period.

The previous WMMP contained a commitment to investigate the feasibility of introducing a multiple bin kerbside collection system, and this was carried out in 2014 with community feedback on the results being sought in October of that year. Positive feedback from that process led to a firm proposal for the introduction of kerbside bin services to be included in the draft 2015-2025 Council LTP. However, the Council decided not to introduce bin services. The Council became concerned from the public submissions on the LTP, that the proposals as they stood would have increased rates, which could create financial difficulties for a sector of the community. At the time staff were asked to “go back to the drawing board” to investigate cost-effective ways/methods to further advance waste minimisation.

The draft WMMP therefore included new proposals for bin based kerbside collection services, but they allowed the flexibility for those that did not want to use the proposed new bin services to continue to use the same recycling bin as at present and to continue to buy Council bags and place them at the kerbside to deal with their refuse. This final document includes the “Your Choice” kerbside service that was included in the Council’s 2018-28 Long Term Plan (LTP). This service gives ratepayers the choice of using bags or bins for Council rubbish collection, and the choice of bins for a Council-provided mixed organics collection.

Of course a WMMP is about more than just kerbside services. It examines all waste issues that have been identified within the district, including how to further advance waste minimisation. It considers which waste management and minimisation issues need to be addressed, and if so, how they might best be dealt with. Details of those assessments are included in this plan and its accompanying document the Waste Assessment.

The Waimakariri District already performs well in its efforts at waste minimisation, with a waste to landfill per capita well below the average for other like districts. More can always be done though, and the WMMP identifies both those actions that Council proposes to keep doing, as well as new initiatives that are expected to improve the amount of waste diversion.

Most waste streams in the country contain large amounts of organic waste, and many Councils have faced or will face a decision as to whether make a step change in waste diversion by addressing organics. This WMMP provides an opportunity for the community to express its views about whether it wants to take that step at this particular time.

Feedback on this document will determine the decisions the Council will make about which actions and initiatives will go forward into the budget for the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan, which in turn will affect the amount of waste going to landfill. The choices to be made and their effects are clearly shown in the graph on page 28 of the Waste Assessment.
1 Introduction

Waimakariri District Council (the Council) has a statutory responsibility under section 42 of the Waste Minimisation Act 2008 (the Act) to “promote effective and efficient waste minimisation” within the Waimakariri District. In order to do this, the Council is required to adopt a Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (WMMP) under section 43 of the Act.

This WWMP is a guiding document which identifies Waimakariri’s vision, goals, objectives, targets and methods for achieving efficient and effective waste management and minimisation. It also provides information on how Council intends to fund the activities of the WMMP over the next six years.

In addition to the legislative framework in which this WMMP has been developed, it has also been developed in the context of the New Zealand Waste Strategy 2010 (NZWS) and its two goals of:

- Goal 1: reducing the harmful effects of waste
- Goal 2: improving the efficiency of resource use

The adopted waste targets are to:

- Reduce annual per capita waste to landfill to 236kg per capita over a 10-year period
- Increase the annual per capita quantity of materials diverted to 228kg per capita over a 10-year period

This WMMP should also be read in association with Councils Waste Assessment (WA). With the exception of the vision, goals, objectives and targets, those matters covered in detail in the WA are not repeated in full in this WMMP, but are summarised where appropriate. A copy of the WA is attached as Appendix A to this WMMP.

This WMMP covers solid waste generated in the Waimakariri District including biosolids generated from wastewater treatment. In developing the Plan to address solid waste in the District the Council has considered the waste minimisation hierarchy of reduce, reuse, recycle, recover, treatment and disposal.
2 Vision, goals, objectives, policies and targets

Working together, Council and the community can achieve more effective and efficient waste management and minimisation in the District. Council is proposing the following vision, goals, objectives and targets. Taken together these form the strategy for Council’s WMMP.

2.1 Vision for the future

Our vision for the future is:

“To value resources and eliminate waste and its harm to the environment”

2.2 Goals, objectives, policies and targets

Goals

The goals that we will use are those from the New Zealand Waste Strategy:

- Improving the efficiency of resource use
- Reducing harmful effects of waste

Our objectives and policies

Our objectives and policies to meet our goals are:

Table 1 Objectives and Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Objectives:</th>
<th>Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Improving the Efficiency of Resource Use</td>
<td>1. Our community has opportunities for avoiding or reducing waste at source.</td>
<td>• Provide practical information and advice to all parts of the community (residential, businesses, industry) on how to minimise waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The Council works with other councils, central government, industry and other parties to improve product stewardship (i.e. aiming to reduce the environmental impact of the life cycle of products).</td>
<td>• Collaborate with other councils to collectively promote producer responsibilities and product stewardship in the District and Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Our community has opportunity to maximise the diversion of material for reuse, recycling or recovery.</td>
<td>• Improve opportunities for residential and commercial properties to divert reusable and recyclable material from the waste stream at source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. The range of diverted material will be improved and the quality of these materials enhanced.</td>
<td>• Set a baseline of the current quantity of materials diverted and monitor and measure the diverted materials to determine if there is an increase in diversion as a result of changes in the range and quality of diverted materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Improve opportunities for residential and commercial properties to divert reusable and recyclable material from the waste stream at source
- Ensure that there is adequate infrastructure provided to manage diverted material
- Use bylaws where appropriate to facilitate waste minimisation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Objectives:</th>
<th>Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2: Reducing</td>
<td>1. Our community has access to services for effective and efficient</td>
<td>• Continue providing timely convenient and cost effective kerbside waste collection services to serviced areas and extend areas where needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmful Effects</td>
<td>management of waste that comply with current environmental and health</td>
<td>• Ensure that cost-effective convenient facilities such as drop-off points, resource recovery park, transfer station facilities and hazardous and clean fill waste are available for residents to dispose of waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Waste</td>
<td>practices.</td>
<td>• Continue providing timely, convenient and cost effective management of litter in public spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Work with commercial service providers to ensure that adequate alternative services are available for disposal of waste when the council is not providing the service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The disposal of sewage treatment residuals complies with current</td>
<td>• Ensure the management of sewage treatment residuals is consistent with best practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>environmental and health practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Our community is informed and educated regarding issues regarding</td>
<td>• Provide practical information and advice to the community on how to minimise and dispose of hazardous and residual waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hazardous waste and residual waste.</td>
<td>• Gather and report on information about waste streams in the District to ensure effective waste management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Our targets**

The **advanced** option for improved services and waste minimisation initiatives has been adopted after consultation of the draft WMMP and LTP. Under this option our targets are to:

- **Reduce annual per capita waste to landfill** from 294kg per capita in 2015/16 to **236kg per capita** over a 10-year period.
- **Increase the annual per capita quantity of materials diverted** from 170kg per capita in 2015/16 to **228kg per capita** over a 10-year period.
3 The waste situation

3.1 Overview of existing waste management and minimisation infrastructure and services

A summary of the current services provided by Council and non-Council providers is outlined below. For a detailed description of Council and non-Council solid waste services, refer to Part 1 and Appendix 1 of the attached Waste Assessment.

**Services provided by Council**

The main services and facilities include:

- Kerbside waste collection (user pays bags)
- Kerbside recycling collection (bins funded by a targeted rate)
- Drop off facilities at Kairaki Beach, Waikuku and Woodend Beach
- Oxford Transfer Station
- Southbrook Resource Recovery Park (RRP)
- Sutherlands Pit clean fill disposal site
- Hazardous waste drop off facilities
- Waste minimisation education
- Management of five closed landfills

Council does not operate its own landfill with residual waste being sent to the regional Kate Valley landfill facility in the Hurunui District.

Governance arrangements for regional waste minimisation lie with the Canterbury Waste Joint Committee where nine councils are represented, including Waimakariri.

All recyclable materials from kerbside collections are sent to the Eco Central Limited Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) in Christchurch.

**Non-council provided services and facilities**

Private companies meet the waste collection requirements of business and households beyond those supplied by Council and have approximately a two-thirds share of the domestic collection services market. These services are provided at an additional cost and include:

- Kerbside refuse collection (residential and business)
- Collection of divertible material – recyclables and green waste
- Collection of agricultural recycling and agrichemical containers
- Hazardous waste collection and disposal
3.2 Public health protection

The range of public and private waste services in the Waimakariri District and Canterbury region ensures public health will be adequately protected in the future. Waimakariri has access to a landfill that meets national legislative requirements for at least 20 years. The community has adequate access to council or privately-owned drop-off and collection services for refuse, hazardous waste and litter, but further waste minimisation is achievable as outlined in this Plan. This Plan proposes services for better waste minimisation.

The Canterbury District Health Board reviewed the Waste Assessment and draft WMMP and confirmed that they had no comments to add.

3.3 Summary of the volume and composition of waste and diverted materials

The Council is currently sending 16,580 tonnes of refuse to the Kate Valley Landfill. Around 2,450 tonnes is from the Council kerbside collection, 300 tonnes from litter bins, removal of fly-tipping, and other Council contracts, and the remainder includes private waste collections from commercial and residential properties (8,880 tonnes) and waste self-delivered by residential and commercial customers (4,950 tonnes). More detailed information about the Districts waste and its composition is provided in the Waste Assessment (Appendix A).

Due to commercial sensitivity, limited data is available on the type and volume of waste collected by private waste providers although it is recognised that some waste will be transported in (or out) of the district for reuse, recycling or disposal. At this stage, it is not possible to track waste that has been transported from outside the District to Councils facilities for disposal.

A summary of the per capita waste in the Waimakariri District, composition of Council domestic kerbside refuse bags and composition of general waste received at the Southbrook RRP is shown in Figure 1 and Figure 2 below.

Figure 2 shows that the total amount of waste going to landfill per capita per year has remained relatively static since 2011/2012 with only a minor increase noticeable in the 2013/2014 year. The quantity of recycled material overall has also remained relatively static since 2011/12 and the total amount of other diverted material also remained static over the same period.
Figure 1 Source and Destination of Waste and Diverted Materials managed by the Council

Figure 2 Composition of total waste per capita per year
Figure 3 shows that the highest proportion of waste material in kerbside refuse bags was organic making up over half of the waste collected at 58.9%. Other potentially divertible material includes plastics, paper, glass, metals, timber and textiles, totalling a further 28.3%. These waste streams represent significant opportunities to divert more waste from landfill.

The composition of the overall waste stream being disposed of to the Kate Valley landfill from Southbrook RRP was calculated by combining four separate waste streams that were assessed in the audit; kerbside rubbish bag collection from the Council; privately collected domestic kerbside bins; general waste and waste from the Oxford transfer station.
Figure 4 gives the waste composition breakdown of the general waste that is sent to landfill from the Southbrook RRP in 2017. Organic waste (garden and food waste) made up the largest proportion of the waste (37.2% of total). Timber was the second largest (18.0%), followed by plastics (10.6%), rubble (9.3%), paper (6.5% each) and textiles (6.0%). There remains a significant opportunity to divert more waste from landfill at Southbrook RRP.

**Sewage treatment residuals**

Screenings are removed from all of Council’s wastewater treatment plants and are taken to Christchurch City Council’s Bromley wastewater treatment plant for further treatment. Oxidation pond sludge is placed in geotextile tubes to dewater over a number of years. Once dried the sludge will be tested and disposed of in accordance with relevant environmental and health requirements. It is proposed that this practice will continue.

### 3.4 Forecast future demand

Population growth, and to a lesser extent economic growth, is expected to increase and total waste is expected to increase accordingly. Diversion services are required to limit the pressure on the landfill and other waste handling facilities to be able to manage the associated increase in demand for waste services. Council has adopted a growth scenario for the purposes of infrastructure planning between the medium and high growth scenarios from Statistics NZ, with a District expected population in 2048 of approximately 97,000.

![Figure 5 Projected Population](image)

### 3.5 Cost of the current level of service

Council provides its waste services and facilities at an annual cost of $6,200,000 (FY2015/16). Funding is predominantly provided through user charges (facility gate fees and rubbish bag sales; $4,900,000) and rates (general and targeted; $1,300,000). Solid waste accounts for approximately 8% of Council’s total operating costs and approximately 4% of Council’s rates funding. Due to growth, it is anticipated that the current level of service will cost $7,300,000 by 2017/18.

On average, ratepayers inside the serviced areas pay $86 per household per year in targeted rates from 2017/18, and households either purchase WDC-branded bags to use Council’s rubbish bag service or have a private wheelie bin service. Council bags cost $3.00 each (from 2017/18). The annual cost in 2017/18 for 52 bags plus the targeted rate for the recycling service would be $242.
The targeted rate was increased from $86 to $103 in 2018/19 owing to the effects of fluctuating global recycling markets.

Private wheelie bin services cost from $202 to $740 per year depending on the size of the wheelie bin requested and the frequency of collection. This cost is additional to the targeted rate for the recycling service.

In addition, households and commercial customers pay for waste disposal when using the Southbrook RRP or Oxford Transfer Station.

Table 2 Council services currently provided and their funding methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Service</th>
<th>Funding Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waste minimisation education, promotion, enforcement (e.g. by law), communication, monitoring and policy development</td>
<td>• National waste disposal levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sale of recyclables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• General rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerbside collection of waste</td>
<td>• Targeted rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• User charges (via refuse bag purchase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerbside collection of recyclables</td>
<td>• Targeted rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste disposal, Southbrook RRP and Oxford Transfer Station</td>
<td>• User charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• General rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sale of recyclables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversion at Southbrook RRP and Oxford Transfer Station and public drop off points</td>
<td>• General rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Local waste disposal charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of public litter bins</td>
<td>• General rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Policies, plans and regulation

There is a clear legislative and policy framework within which the Council provides waste services and facilities within its District. A summary of the framework and legislation is outlined below, however a full and complete list of the legislation, plans and regulations that create the waste framework within which this WMMP is based, is included in Appendix B.

While the Waste Minimisation Act sets out the legislative requirements regarding waste, the New Zealand Waste Strategy 2010 (NZWS) provides the Government’s strategic direction for waste management and minimisation in New Zealand. The goals of this WMMP replicate those from the NZWS.

Local, regional and national plans and policies affect the Council’s provision of waste and diverted material services. Primarily, they are requirements under the WMA and the Local Government Act 2002. Figure 6 below illustrates the statutory planning requirements that the Council is required to follow.

Figure 6 Statutory planning sequence

4.1 Key legislation

A summary of the key legislation affecting waste is listed below. A more detailed description of this legislation and a list of other related legislation is included in Appendix B:

- Waste Minimisation Act 2008
- Local Government Act 2002
- Resource Management Act 1991
- Climate Change Response Act 2002 (Emissions Trading)
- Litter Act 1979
- Health Act 1956
4.2 Other relevant documents

The Council and Environment Canterbury have a number of other strategic documents that are integral to waste management, including:

- Canterbury Hazardous Waste Management Strategy 2006
- Canterbury Regional Policy Statement
- Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan
- Proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan
- Waimakariri District Council Long Term Plan 2015-2025 (note the 2018-2028 Plan will be informed by this WMMP)
- Solid Waste and Waste Handling Licensing Bylaw 2016
- Waimakariri District Council Solid Waste Activity Management Plan 2018
5 Proposed methods for achieving effective and efficient waste management and minimisation

5.1 Council’s role

In undertaking this WMMP Council has considered what options are available for it to achieve effective and efficient waste management and minimisation to meet future demands for services and facilities.

The role of the Council includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service provision</th>
<th>Providing or facilitating the provision of waste management or waste minimisation service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Council further investigating demand and the cost effectiveness of services and options to meet demand, either alone or in collaboration with other councils or private sector parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation</td>
<td>The Council using a legal mechanism to facilitate or promote waste management and waste minimisation e.g. bylaws and District Plan rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leadership</td>
<td>Providing information and promoting awareness and involvement in waste management and waste minimisation activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Promoting actions to address waste reduction and waste management issues which are outside the Council’s direct control e.g. advocate for appropriate legislation, standards and guidelines to the Regional Council and the Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financier</td>
<td>Investing in initiatives that facilitate waste management and minimisation activities, e.g. grants and subsidies, developing a waste minimisation industry cluster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In providing waste management and minimisation services, the Council will aim to make existing services more cost effective and ensure that any increases to levels of services are both cost effective and affordable. The Council will, as far as practicably possible, make services accessible to the majority of the District.

5.2 Opting out of providing waste services

As an alternative to Council continuing to provide waste services and facilities, Council could decide to opt out of providing waste services all together. This would require the commercial sector to provide all waste services for the District.

In 2008, the Council sought the public’s view on Council withdrawing from collecting waste as part of the consultation on the WMMP. The feedback from the public was clear that they did not want that to happen, and Council has subsequently continued to provide waste services.

5.3 Identified district waste issues

Council has reviewed progress against the previous WMMP action plan and has identified waste issues that need to be addressed. The options considered to deal with these issues include education, regulation, and service provision. Options were assessed for alignment with the vision, goals and objectives, costs and ease of implementation before a preferred option was identified. Table 3 below provides a summary of the issues and Councils preferred option to deal with each issue.
Table 3 Summary of District specific issues and preferred option to respond to each issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Preferred option to respond to issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. | A high volume of domestic divertible material is going to landfill                      | • Provide information to customers on how to responsibly dispose of organic and recyclable waste, including using private waste collection services  
    |                                                                                         | • Provide separate organic bin and collection service                                              
    |                                                                                         | • Investigate the provision of additional recycling drop off points or facilities                  |
| 2. | Meeting differing needs of rural and urban households and businesses                    | • Refine and publish Council policy regarding extent of kerbside collection service, both the urban/rural boundary and residential/commercial extent of service |
| 3. | Lack of capacity at Southbrook Resource Recovery Park                                   | • Upgrade the Southbrook Resource Recovery Park including the recycling recovery area, refuse disposal pit re-use shop and education facility |
| 4. | Inappropriate farm waste / rural disposal practices result in damage to the environment | • Adopt a proactive and collaborative approach working with Environment Canterbury, the Canterbury Waste Joint Committee, Ministry for the Environment and private sector parties such as AgRecovery and Federated Farmers on farm waste management in addressing the potential for harm to the environment and adverse community health effects |
| 5. | High volume and increasing proportion of construction and demolition waste going to landfill | • Adopt a proactive and collaborative approach to work with the construction and demolition industry to change behaviours through education, promote waste separation, recycling of materials and beneficial reuse  
    |                                                                                         | • Support regional development of clean fill regulation                                              |
| 6. | The inappropriate disposal of e-waste and hazardous waste                               | • Ensure that residents are aware that household hazardous waste is rates funded and that e-waste disposal is partially subsidised |

A full description of these issues and a high-level assessment of all options is included in Part 3 of the WA which is attached as Appendix A.

5.4 Kerbside options

The Council considered eight options for its kerbside collection service, a key part of Council’s waste management service. The Council selected two preferred options from these original eight to consult on. For full information on the eight kerbside collection options, refer to Part 3 of the Waste Assessment in Appendix A.

Overall, Council wants to increase diversion but retain customer choice and this has been considered in selecting the preferred options to consult with the community on through the WMMP review.

The **enhanced** service option would:

- Introduce bins for waste
- Retain the choice to continue to use bags or private bins for waste
- Retain 240L recycling bins collected fortnightly
- Offer a range of bin sizes for waste (140L or 80L) and recycling (240L or 140L)
The **advanced** service option would:

- Introduce organics (food waste and green waste) bins
- Provide the choice to not use the organics service
- Introduce bins for waste
- Retain the choice to continue to use bags or private bins for waste
- Retain 240L recycling bins collected fortnightly
- Offer a range of bin sizes for waste (140L or 80L), recycling (240L, 140L or 80L) and organics (240L, 140L or 80L)
- Indicative annual household cost $86-$381 depending on service choice selected. Note that the base rate increased by $17 p.a. in 2018/19, which increases the indicative annual household cost to $103-$484.

It is intended that these services will be funded by the income received by those using the services. However, the Council’s market share will have to be estimated in advance and it may be necessary to part fund the services through the use of the landfill levy or rates.

The **advanced** service was the preferred option following consultation of the draft WMMP. This service, referred to as the “Your Choice” collection service, was included in the Councils draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan (LTP) consultation. This service was included in the adopted 2018-28 LTP in June 2018.

### 5.5 Southbrook RRP upgrade options

The Council has considered three options in relation to the Southbrook RRP, those options were:

- Status quo – no change to the Southbrook RRP
- Enhanced service option – increased width and depth of refuse tipping area; relocate and upsize re-use store and increase recycling activities
- Advanced service option – enhanced service plus introduce sort line for construction and demolition waste

The preferred option is the enhanced service option due to the high cost to implement the advanced option.
Part B
1 Action Plan

1.1 Action Plan

The proposed action plan shows how Council’s proposed actions address the key issues and how the activities will be funded.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>New/ existing</th>
<th>Implementation timeframe</th>
<th>Funding source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Our community has opportunities for avoiding or reducing waste at source</td>
<td>Circulate educational information to promote Council’s waste management and minimisation services</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Levy Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide educational programmes and support other programmes aimed at waste management and minimisation and sustainability e.g. boomerang bags and ‘no plastic straw’ campaign</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Levy Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish an educational facility for promotion of waste management and minimisation at the Southbrook RRP as part of the planned upgrade of the Southbrook RRP</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>By 2022/23</td>
<td>Levy Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support organisations leading litter clean-up and campaigns at raising awareness of waste minimisation, potentially by means of grants</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborate with other councils, to promote waste management and minimisation and waste acceptance criteria in a regionally and nationally consistent way</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Levy Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promote and support existing waste minimisation and resource efficiency initiatives targeting local industry</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Levy Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Council works with other councils, central government, industry and other parties to improve product stewardship</td>
<td>Advocate to government, possibly via a coordinated approach with other organisations, such as Canterbury Waste Joint Committee, Local Government New Zealand and WasteMINZ</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promote and support product stewardship programmes operating in-district</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Rates Levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>New/ existing</td>
<td>Implementation timeframe</td>
<td>Funding source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Our community has opportunity to maximise the diversion of material for reuse, recycling or recovery</td>
<td>Refine and publish Council’s policy regarding the extent of kerbside collection service, both the urban/rural boundaries and the residential/commercial extent of services.</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve RRP and Transfer Station facilities (Oxford TS and Southbrook RRP) to expand associated services for diverted material.</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Gate fees Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upgrade Southbrook RRP and Oxford TS facilities to increase capacity when required.</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>2018 to 2022</td>
<td>Gate fees Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optimise the separation of diverted material at the RRP and TS facilities through procurement processes and contractual agreements</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>2018/19 and ongoing</td>
<td>Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use financial incentives to encourage the separation of reusable and recyclable materials from the waste stream.</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Gate Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investigate the feasibility of providing recycling bins alongside litter bins in the District, and implement where appropriate.</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain existing drop-off points for diverted material in beach townships and investigate the feasibility of establishing recycling drop-off points at suitable locations for rural resident use, including trialing new locations.</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Rates Levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The range of diverted material will be improved and the quality of these materials enhanced</td>
<td>Continue monitoring the composition of waste going to landfill through SWAP studies and investigate further waste minimisation measures when warranted.</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Levy Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>New/ existing</td>
<td>Implementation timeframe</td>
<td>Funding source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Our community has access to services for effective and efficient management of waste that comply with current environmental and health practices</td>
<td>Continue to provide litter collection bins at certain locations throughout the District</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure that littering and illegal dumping in public places is managed effectively</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain existing RRP and Transfer Station facilities (Oxford TS and Southbrook RRP) and associated services for waste disposal, including domestic hazardous waste disposal.</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure all resource consent requirements for Council owned solid waste services, facilities and closed landfills are complied with</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The disposal of sewage treatment residuals complies with current environmental and health practices</td>
<td>Disposal of screenings from the Council’s wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) at Kate Valley landfill and dewatered sewage sludge at Christchurch City Council’s Bromley WWTP, or alternative facility or site if feasible.</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Our community is informed and educated about hazardous waste and residual waste</td>
<td>Carry out educational campaigns to raise awareness about littering, including larger scale illegal dumping, when warranted.</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Rates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Funding

2.1 Funding the plan

The action plan will be funded using the suite of tools available to Council in the delivery of solid waste services. The activities will be funded by:

- General rates
- Targeted rates
- Fees and charges (including gate fees, licensing fees, user pays)
- Subsidies and grants
- Debt (if required)

Through the action plan, it is expected that the cost for the provision of the services will increase from $7,300,000 in 2017/18 to $11,100,000 in 2022/23 when new services are fully introduced and facility upgrades are complete.

2.2 Waste minimisation levy funding expenditure

Council will continue to use the Waste Minimisation Levy funding income to fund waste education, investigations, trials, and to fund capital expenditure for diversion facility upgrades.

2.3 Grants

Section 47 of the Waste Minimisation Act gives councils the ability to give grants to a person, organisation or group to promote or achieve waste management and minimisation. Under this WMMP the Council will continue to give grants at its discretion and on any terms of condition it deems appropriate provided there is an allocated and approved budget for that activity.
3 Monitoring, evaluating and reporting progress

3.1 Monitoring and evaluation

The Council intends to monitor and report on progress regarding the WMMP and will develop and implement a clear, transparent monitoring and reporting system. Accurate information on how services provided by Council are performing is essential for monitoring the effectiveness of the Plan’s vision, objectives, goals and methods and planning for future demand.

Council’s current levels of service and performance measures are in the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan and are focussed on:

- The availability of transfer facilities
- Providing a kerbside waste and recycling collection service
- Reducing the amount of annual waste per capita
- Increasing the annual per capita quantity of materials diverted

Council will review its key performance indicators as part of the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan. Data will be gathered through community satisfaction surveys, Council records (Call Centre records, KPIs, etc.), contractors and Solid Waste Analysis Protocol Audits (SWAPs). Progress will be reported through Council publications, website and the annual report.

3.2 Reporting

The Council will report progress of the implementation and effectiveness of this WMMP through:

- Annual Reports
- Council’s website

The Council will also provide progress reports of expenditure of its waste levy funds to the Ministry for the Environment.
## Glossary

### Key Definitions and abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean fill/clean fill material</td>
<td>Inert materials disposed of, into or onto land, at a consented clean fill. Materials typically include construction and demolition waste such as concrete, uncontaminated soil and rock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial waste</td>
<td>Waste from premises used wholly or mainly for the purposes of trade or business, recreation or entertainment, excluding, mines, quarries and agricultural waste. May also include some household waste collected by commercial operators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverted material</td>
<td>Anything no longer required for its original purpose and, but for commercial or other waste minimisation activities, would be disposed of or discarded, and includes any materials that are recyclables, compostable, or can be recovered and/or re-used, as determined by the Council by resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous waste</td>
<td>Waste that is potentially harmful to human and/or environmental health. It typically has one or more of the following hazard properties: explosive, flammable, oxidising, corrosive, radioactive, toxic or ecotoxic, or it may react with air or water to have one of these properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household waste</td>
<td>Solid waste generated by households. Household waste does not include divertible waste, hazardous waste, commercial waste, prohibited waste, trade waste or liquid waste of any nature, or any material banned or prohibited under the Council’s solid waste bylaw.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic waste</td>
<td>Compostable materials that are organic in origin and appropriate to be used as feedstock for composting, and includes green waste and food waste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>The reprocessing of waste or diverted material to produce new materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Recovery Park (RRP)</td>
<td>A facility where solid waste materials such as residual waste, construction and demolition waste, recyclables, organics waste and household hazardous wastes are delivered for sorting or before taken away for treatment, processing, recycling or disposal, and which may also include a retail outlet for the re-sale of used goods and materials deposited at the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuse shops</td>
<td>Items that are salvaged or diverted from the waste stream undergo little or no modification and are sold at shops run by the community or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage treatment residuals</td>
<td>solid wastes generated through the process of wastewater treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Analysis Protocol (SWAP):</td>
<td>a study to determine the composition of waste as described by the Ministry for the Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Station (TS)</td>
<td>a facility where solid waste materials such as residual waste, construction and demolition waste, recyclables, organics waste and household hazardous wastes are delivered for consolidation before being taken away for treatment, processing, recycling or disposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>anything disposed of, or discarded, and:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• includes a type of waste that is defined by its composition or source (for example, organic waste, electronic waste, or construction and demolition waste), and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• to avoid doubt, includes any component or element of diverted material, if the component or element is disposed of or discarded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste disposal levy</td>
<td>a levy imposed under the Waste Minimisation Act 2008 on waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste minimisation</td>
<td>the reduction of waste and the reuse, recycling and recovery of waste and diverted material</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part C
Appendix A – Waste assessment
Appendix B – Legislative context

The New Zealand Waste Strategy 2010

The New Zealand Waste Strategy 2010 provides the Government’s strategic direction for waste management and minimisation in New Zealand. This strategy was released in 2010 and replaced the 2002 Waste Strategy. The New Zealand Waste Strategy has two goals. These are to:

- Reduce the harmful effects of waste
- Improve the efficiency of resource use

The strategy’s goals provide direction to central and local government, businesses (including the waste industry), and communities on where to focus their efforts to manage waste. The strategy’s flexible approach ensures waste management and minimisation activities are appropriate for local situations.

Under section 44 of the Waste Management Act 2008, in preparing their waste management and minimisation plan (WMMP) councils must have regard to the New Zealand Waste Strategy, or any government policy on waste management and minimisation that replaces the strategy. Guidance on how councils may achieve this is provided in section 4.4.3.

Waste Minimisation Act 2008

The purpose of the Waste Minimisation Act 2008 (WMA) is to encourage waste minimisation and a decrease in waste disposal to protect the environment from harm and obtain environmental, economic, social and cultural benefits.

The WMA introduced tools, including:

- Waste management and minimisation plan obligations for territorial authorities
- A waste disposal levy to fund waste minimisation initiatives at local and central government levels
- Product stewardship provisions

Part 4 of the WMA is dedicated to the responsibilities of a council. Councils “must promote effective and efficient waste management and minimisation within its district” (section 42). Part 4 requires councils to develop and adopt a WMMP. The development of a WMMP in the WMA is a requirement modified from Part 31 of the Local Government Act 1974, but with even greater emphasis on waste minimisation. To support the implementation of a WMMP, section 56 of the WMA also provides councils the ability to:

- Develop bylaws
- Regulate the deposit, collection and transportation of wastes
- Prescribe charges for waste facilities
- Control access to waste facilities
- Prohibit the removal of waste intended for recycling
**Waste disposal levy**

From 1 July 2009, the Waste Minimisation Act introduced a waste disposal levy on all waste disposed of at disposal facilities, currently $10 per tonne, to:

- Raise revenue for promoting and achieving waste minimisation
- Increase the cost of waste disposal, to recognise that disposal imposes costs on the environment, society, and the economy

Half of the levy money is given to territorial authorities on a population basis, and the remainder of the levy is available via a contestable fund. The portion returned to Council can only be spent to promote or achieve waste minimisation and in accordance with a council’s WMMP.

**Local Government Act 2002**

The Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) provides the general framework and powers under which New Zealand’s democratically elected and accountable local authorities operate. The LGA contains various provisions that may apply to councils when preparing their WMMPs, including consultation and bylaw provisions. For example, Part 6 of the LGA refers to planning and decision-making requirements to promote accountability between local authorities and their communities, and a long-term focus for the decisions and activities of the local authority. This part includes requirements for information to be included in the long-term plan (LTP), including summary information about the WMMP.

**Bylaws**

The Act enables councils to make bylaws. A bylaw can allow for licences to collect and transport waste from households, and require reporting on the quantity, composition, and destination of waste. The Council adopted the Solid Waste Handling Licensing Bylaw on 6 September 2016.

The purpose of the Bylaw is to:

- To prevent the contamination of recoverable resources and maximise the recovery of recyclable resources.
- Also ensure that waste is collected in a safe and efficient manner, and that waste does not cause a nuisance
- Regulate and monitor operators collecting, managing, storing and using waste within the district through a licensing process
- Protect, promote and maintain public health and safety
- Provide comprehensive data and information for planning and waste management and minimisation purposes

The Bylaw requires specified waste operators to hold a waste licence with the Council in order to operate within the District, and to report to the Council quarterly on the quantity of waste they handle.
Resource Management Act 1991

The Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) promotes sustainable management of natural and physical resources. Although it does not specifically define ‘waste’, the RMA addresses waste management and minimisation activity through controls on the environmental effects of waste management and minimisation activities and facilities through national, regional and local policy, standards, plans and consent procedures. In this role, the RMA exercises considerable influence over facilities for waste disposal and recycling, recovery, treatment and others in terms of the potential impacts of these facilities on the environment. Under section 30 of the RMA, regional councils are responsible for controlling the discharge of contaminants into or on to land, air or water. These responsibilities are addressed through regional planning and discharge consent requirements. Other regional council responsibilities that may be relevant to waste and recoverable materials facilities include:

- Managing the adverse effects of storing, using, disposing of and transporting hazardous wastes
- The dumping of wastes from ships, aircraft and offshore installations into the coastal marine area
- The allocation and use of water

Under section 31 of the RMA, Council responsibility includes controlling the effects of land-use activities that have the potential to create adverse effects on the natural and physical resources of their district. Facilities involved in the disposal, treatment or use of waste or recoverable materials may carry this potential. Permitted, controlled, discretionary, noncomplying and prohibited activities, and their controls, are specified in district planning documents, thereby defining further land-use-related resource consent requirements for waste-related facilities.

In addition, the RMA provides for the development of national policy statements and for the setting of national environmental standards (NES). There is currently one enacted NES that directly influences the management of waste in New Zealand – the Resource Management (NES for Air Quality) Regulations 2004. This NES requires certain landfills (e.g. those with a capacity of more than one million tonnes of waste) to collect landfill gases and either flare them or use them as fuel for generating electricity. Unless exemption criteria are met, the NES for Air Quality also prohibits the lighting of fires and burning of wastes at landfills, the burning of tyres, bitumen burning for road maintenance, burning coated wire or oil, and operating high-temperature hazardous waste incinerators. These prohibitions aim to protect air quality.

New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme

The Climate Change Response Act 2002 and associated regulations is the Government’s principal response to manage climate change. A key mechanism for this is the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (NZ ETS) The NZ ETS puts a price on greenhouse gas emissions, providing an incentive for people to reduce emissions and plant forests to absorb carbon dioxide.

Certain sectors are required to acquire and surrender emission units to account for their direct greenhouse gas emissions or the emissions associated with their products. Landfills that are subject to the waste disposal levy are required to surrender emission units to cover methane emissions generated from landfill. These disposal facilities are required to report the tonnages landfilled annually to calculate emissions.
Climate Change Response Act 2002 (Emissions Trading) and the Climate Change Amendment Act 2008

The Climate Change Response Act 2002, Climate Change (Waste) Regulations 2010 and Amendments to the Climate Change (Unique Emissions Factors) Regulations are implemented through the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS). The purpose of the ETS is to reduce the amount of greenhouse gases emitted in New Zealand. The waste sector is affected by the ETS, as those who operate landfills are required to participate in the scheme and report emissions.

Although the Council no longer operates a landfill within the District, there are implications for the Council from disposing of waste to the regional landfill.

The Climate Change Amendment Act 2008 provides for disposal facility regulations and the ETS.

Litter Act 1979

Under the Litter Act 1979 it is an offence for any person to deposit litter of any kind in a public place, or onto private land without the approval of the owner. The Litter Act is enforced by territorial authorities, who have the responsibility to monitor litter dumping, act on complaints, and deal with those responsible for litter dumping. Councils reserve the right to prosecute offenders via fines and infringement notices administered by a litter control warden or officer. The maximum fines for littering are $5,000 for a person and $20,000 for a corporation. Council powers under the Litter Act could be used to address illegal dumping issues that may be included in the scope of a council’s waste management and minimisation plan.

Health Act 1956

The Health Act 1956 places obligations on councils (if required by the Minister of Health) to provide sanitary works for the collection and disposal of refuse, for the purpose of public health protection (Part 2 – powers and duties of local authorities, section 25). The Act specifically identifies certain waste management practices as nuisances (section 29) and offensive trades (Third Schedule). The Health Act enables councils to raise loans for certain sanitary works and/or to receive government grants and subsidies, where available. Health Act provisions to remove refuse by local authorities have been repealed.

Other legislation

Other legislation that relates to waste management and/or reduction of harm, or improved resource efficiency from waste products includes:

- Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996
- Biosecurity Act 1993
- Radiation Protection Act 1965
- Ozone Layer Protection Act 1996
- Health and Safety in Employment Act 1992 (soon to be replaced by the outcome of the Health and Safety Reform Bill)
- Agricultural Chemicals and Veterinary Medicines Act 1997
Canterbury Hazardous Waste Management Strategy

The Canterbury Hazardous Waste Management Strategy has been developed as part of the commitment by local authorities in Canterbury to work together to achieve integrated and environmentally sound management of hazardous wastes. It is not a statutory document but seeks to provide guidance for local authority statutory plans, service delivery and regulation. While the Strategy is primarily designed to provide direction for local authorities, including Environment Canterbury, it also provides guidance for hazardous waste generators and those individuals or organisations involved in the waste management industry.

The vision for hazardous waste management in Canterbury is achieving zero hazardous waste by 2020.

The long-term objective is:

To eliminate the adverse effects of hazardous waste on the environment

The Council has adopted the Canterbury Hazardous Waste Management Strategy, and is committed to supporting its implementation programme. However, the Council currently has no provision to manage and appropriately dispose of hazardous wastes that are stored and used within the District beyond the provision of domestic hazardous waste disposal facilities. Instead commercial and rural hazardous waste management is achieved by industry taking responsibility for their own disposal, or by Canterbury Councils coordinating on specific materials.

Other waste related legislation

Other legislation relevant to waste management and minimisation includes:

- Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 (HSWA) is New Zealand’s workplace health and safety law. HSWA sets out the principles, duties and rights in relation to workplace health and safety
- Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 that provides regulations and standards related to hazardous substances
- Local Government (Rating) Act 2002
- Health Act 1956 and its provisions for local authorities to provide for collection and disposal of refuse and other offensive matter and for the licensing of offensive trades
- Freedom Camping Act 2011 which controls freedom camping on all land controlled or managed by a particular local authority

Regional policy statements, regional plans and strategies

Environment Canterbury Regional Council has a Regional Policy Statement and Regional Plan which contains rules relating to discharges to air, land and water, which are relevant for facilities (e.g. resource recovery parks, transfer stations, landfills) and waste processing (e.g. composting, biosolids processing).

The focus of regional waste strategies is co-operation between councils. Waimakariri District Council is a member of the Canterbury Waste Joint Committee.

International commitments

New Zealand is party to the following key international agreements:

- Montreal Protocol - to protect the ozone layer by phasing out the production of numerous substances
- Basel Convention - to reduce the movement of hazardous waste between nations
- Stockholm Convention - to eliminate or restrict the production and use of persistent organic pollutants
- Waigani Convention - bans export of hazardous or radioactive waste to Pacific Islands Forum countries
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE DISTRICT PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE MEETING HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 19 JUNE 2018 1.00PM.

PRESENT
Councillor D Gordon (Chair), Mayor D Ayers, Councillors N Atkinson, W Doody, J Meyer and S Stewart.

IN ATTENDANCE
Councillors P Williams, K Barnett and K Felstead.
J Palmer (Chief Executive), N Harrison (Manager Regulation), M Bacon (Team Leader Resource Consents) and E Stubbs (Minute Secretary).

1. APOLOGIES
There were no apologies

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
There were no conflicts of interest.

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee held on 17 April 2018

Moved N Atkinson seconded W Doody

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 17 April 2018.

CARRIED

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES
There were no matters arising.

5. DEPUTATION
There was no deputation.
6. REPORTS

6.1 Background to Notification Process – P Mulligan, 19 Jacksons Road, Ohoka – Matthew Bacon, (Planning Manager)

M Bacon spoke to the report first providing a brief background summary. The applicant owned an approximately 4 hectare site in Jacksons Road, Ohoka, split in the middle by a right of way. The original application for subdivision and land use consents was to split the land into two parcels, retain the existing dwelling and erect a new dwelling. M Bacon noted the attached legal opinions. Following the legal opinions, the applicant withdrew the request for subdivision consent and asked that processing of the required land use consent for the new dwelling and retention of the existing dwelling continue.

M Bacon explained that the parcel was part of a long right of way servicing 2-3 other lots. Some landowners were aware of the proposed development however did not feature in the notification assessment.

The recommendation from Stephanie Styles (Boffa Miskell) was full notification under s95A of the Resource Management Act 1991 based on effects on character and amenity. The recommendation had been reviewed by staff and was supported. There was the ability for future decision makers to review objectives and policies in context of the application.

Questions

W Doody asked if the house was for dwelling purposes or another business. M Bacon confirmed it was for a dwelling.

Moved W Doody seconded N Atkinson

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee

(a) Receives report No. 180529058960
(b) Notes the recommendation in the s95 assessment of Stephanie Styles as set out in report No. (180529059149)
(c) Determines that full notification of RC165110 (P Mulligan, 19 Jacksons Road, Ohoka) occurs under s95A of the Resource Management Act 1991.

CARRIED

Mayor Ayers commented that he agreed with the recommendation regarding impacts on other houses in the area. He noted that the composting resource consent application consent was not too far away, and in that part of the community there may be residents asking ‘what is going on here?’

D Gordon asked if there would be financial costs to the applicant and M Bacon advised there would be processing costs involved. N Harrison commented that the time the process had taken was unusual. In regard to the hearing path, the recommendation would be to hold the costs in house. It was a relatively straightforward consent matter.
7. PORTFOLIO UPDATES

7.1 District Planning Development - Councillor Neville Atkinson

N Atkinson noted with the Greater Christchurch Land Settlement Package there was $1 billion for transport on the table. The division was $600,000 for a public transport package. There was not a lot of detail at this stage, and there was a lot to work through.

7.2 Regulation and Civil Defence – Councillor John Meyer

No current updates.

7.3 Business, Promotion and Town Centres – Councillor Dan Gordon

D Gordon continued to meet regularly for updates with S Hart (Business and Centres Manager).

D Gordon advised that Service Level Agreements were being agreed with the Town Promotions Associations. Kaiapoi Promotions Association was traveling better and starting to make good progress. There was an upcoming ‘mix and mingle’. He attended the Rangiora Promotions Association AGM and noted that the Association was strongly performing and now organising seven major events. Oxford Promotions Association was travelling well and D Gordon noted the upcoming Oxford winter lights festival. The Rangiora Winter Festival was now known as the Waimakariri Winter Festival and would be a two week event.

8. QUESTIONS

Nil.

9. URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

Nil.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 1.11pm.

CONFIRMED

______________________
Chairperson

______________________
Date
180619067819 Utilities and Roading Committee Minutes
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WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE UTILITIES AND ROADING COMMITTEE HELD IN
THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 19 JUNE
2018 AT 3.00PM

PRESENT
Councillor S Stewart (Chairperson), Mayor D Ayers, Deputy Mayor K Felstead, Councillors
R Brine, J Meyer and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE
Councillors. W Doody and D Gordon,
Messrs J Palmer, (Chief Executive), K Simpson (3 Waters Manager), O Davies (Drainage
Asset Manager), C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager), G Stevenson (Development
Manager), K LaValley (Project Delivery Manager), Mrs J Fraser (Utilities Planner), A Smith
(Committee Advisor)

1 APOLOGIES
There were no apologies

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
No conflicts of interest were noted.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on
Tuesday 17 April 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 17 April 2018.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
There were no matters arising.

5 PRESENTATION
There were no presentations.
6 REPORT

6.1 Closure of Oxford Road Stock Water Race R3N-1 Closure Proposal – Janet Fraser (Utilities Planner) and Owen Davies (Drainage Asset Manager)

J Fraser and O Davies presented this report, which recommends that the Committee approve the closure of this stock water race R3N-1 on the south side of Oxford Road, Rangiora.

The main reasons for the proposed race closure is that there is no ongoing demand for stockwater for the properties using the service; it is not appropriate to provide stockwater in an urban setting and Ngai Tuahuriri would prefer to avoid mixing water from separate waterways and to prevent rural source contaminants to be entering the North Brook via the water race.

Consultation has been undertaken with the property owners who are paying the stock water race rate and those who have properties bordering the upper reaches of the North Brook west of West Belt on this proposed closure. Of nineteen responses received, 11 property owners supported the closure and eight property owners wanted the race to remain open. The affected parties include residents of Milesbrook Close, some of whom are concerned with loss of amenity value for their properties if the race was closed and this was their reason for objecting to the closure. K Simpson noted that during the summer months there is very little or no water flow in the race and Council staff do not believe that closing the race will have any adverse effect on amenity value of properties.

Councillor Williams asked if there was potential for a need for the stock water race at some time in the future. Mrs Fraser advised there is only three large rural properties who could potentially use this water course for stock water and of these, two supported the race closing. All the other properties are urban properties with no need for stock water.

Councillor Meyer mentioned the flood event of 2014 which impacted on this area and questioned what effects would there be in any future high rainfall event, with the closing of this stock water race. O Davies explained that the origin of the water in the flooding of 2014 was from rural land and advised that there is an upgrade proposed for Lehmans Road which will move water south.

Councillor Stewart asked of the residents who have planting along the water race, is there an overall plan on how the race will function after it is closed. O Davies said there hasn’t been a plan developed but Council staff will be able to offer advice to those residents on the suitability of any proposed planting, on a case by case basis.

Moved Councillor Stewart seconded Councillor Brine

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Receives report No.180516053605.

(b) Approves the closure of water race R3N-1 on Oxford Road, east of Lehmans Road.

(c) Notes that, following water race R3N-1 closure, Council staff will discuss maintenance arrangements and possible filling in of sections of the race on Oxford Road with the affected properties.
Notes that, following race R3N-1 closure, the Council will apply for an Archaeological Authority from Heritage New Zealand which would authorise earthworks to fill in sections of the race.

Circulates this report to the Rangiora Ashley Community Board for their information.

CARRIED

Councillor Stewart said ongoing maintenance will to be looked at in future plans on a case by case basis. This matter has been widely consulted on and supports the proposal to close this stock water race.

Mayor Ayers noted that this stock water race and its usefulness ends once it reaches the urban areas.

6.2 20 February 2018 Storm Event – Update on Service Requests – Kalley Simpson (3 Waters Manager)

K Simpson spoke to this report to update the committee on the status of the drainage service requests received during and following the 20 February 2018 storm event. A key point noted was of the 38 drainage assessment projects identified, six are completed, seven are currently underway, and eight have been scoped up but not commenced. Staff are actively working through all the issues that have been identified. At Waikuku Beach, Council staff have had meetings with residents and have been providing assistance to landowners who have drainage issues on their properties. Properties along Waikuku Beach Road are impacted by the low lying land. There have been up to ten different areas in Waikuku Beach that have been identified as experiencing drainage issues and staff are working on these. O Davies added that there is some maintenance work which Council staff could undertake in the near future, and some other issues relating to the higher water table that are going to take some time to resolve.

Of the projects completed, staff have agreed to provide information on the outcomes of these to the next meeting of the committee (August).

Following question from Councillor Barnett, K Simpson said it could be possible to provide information on the Council website on the current status of the drainage works, as in the table on pages 49 and 50 of the agenda. Staff will follow up with this matter.

Councillor Barnett noted that most the sites listed in the report refer to urban areas and asked if drainage work required in rural areas was being given consideration, (noting roads in the Cust district which become flooded and impassable during high rain events). Mr Simpson said there are monthly meetings with the contractors where this matter could be discussed.

Mayor Ayers said there are roads in the district that are subject to flooding during high rainfall events and suggested that residents could be advised of alternative routes they could use during these times.

Moved Councillor Meyer seconded Councillor Williams

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 180608063509.

(b) Notes that of the 38 drainage assessments identified from the 208 service requests, 6 have been completed, 7 are currently underway and 8 have been scoped but not commenced.
Circulates this report to the Council and the Community Boards for information.

CARRIED

Councillor Barnett expressed thanks to staff who have been dealing with drainage issues, with the district experiencing particularly high rainfalls this year.

Councillor Stewart noted that it is four months since this significant event and with drainage assessment work at some sites still to commence, questioned if there is enough staff resources to deal with the issues.

Councillor Meyer said that with the conditions that have been experienced, the staff have been working well.

6.3 Engineering Code of Practice – New Stormwater and Water Supply Drawings – Kalley Simpson (3 Waters Manager) and Gary Stevenson (Development Manager)

Messrs G Stevenson and K Simpson presented this report, which requests that the Utilities and Roading committee adopt new and revised stormwater and water supply standard drawings developed for the Engineering Code of Practice.

There will be no additional cost for people building a new house, applicants can get these drawings direct from the Council and utilise these without having to get another specific design. This simplifies the process for applicants.

Moved Mayor Ayers seconded Councillor Williams

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 180606062155[v2].

(b) Adopts the following new ECOP drawings for onsite stormwater attenuation:

\[ \sum \text{ Plan 600 Sheet 251 Issue B, Onsite Stormwater Tanks.} \]
\[ \sum \text{ Plan 600 Sheet 252 Issue A, Onsite Detention Swale / Pond.} \]

(c) Adopts the following revised ECOP drawings for onsite stormwater soakage:

\[ \sum \text{ Plan 600 Sheet 330A Issue C, Urban Soak Pit.} \]
\[ \sum \text{ Plan 600 Sheet 330B Issue B, Rural Soak Pit.} \]

(d) Adopts the following new ECOP drawings for onsite water supply tanks:

\[ \sum \text{ Plan 600 Sheet 403 Issue A, Private Water Tank (Restricted Scheme).} \]

(e) Notes that the Engineering Code of Practice is currently due for a full review, but specific updates are being undertaken on a case by case basis.

CARRIED

Councillor Brine has some reservations about the benefits of private soak pits during the winter months when ground water levels are high.
Councillors Atkinson questioned the benefits of swales in some subdivisions (noting water pools for long periods of time at Beachgrove development, on Beach Road, Kaiapoi).

Councillor Barnett also noted that some properties in other areas of the district also who had put in soak pits on their properties, which had not provided any benefit for drainage.

Mayor Ayers said the effectiveness of soak pits depends on the soil type, and noted that it was a requirement for houses built in The Oaks subdivision in Rangiora to include a soak pit and it appeared these were effective in assisting with the Council’s drainage system.

6.4 Water New Zealand – National Performance Review 2016/17 – Kalley Simpson (3 Waters Manager)

K Simpson presented this report presenting the Water New Zealand - 2016/17 National Performance Review to the Committee and highlights the Waimakariri District Councils performance. This review costs $4,000 but staff believe this is a beneficial tool for the Council, giving the opportunity to look at how other Councils run their 3 Waters business, how they perform and to be able to benchmark against each other. It is also identifies areas where there is room for improvement in service delivery. This is the third year that this Council has participated in the survey.

Moved Councillor Meyer seconded Councillor Williams

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 180607062770.

(b) Notes that the Waimakariri District Council performs relatively well in the key theme areas identified in the 2016/17 National Performance Review.

(c) Notes that the National Performance Review provides numerous performance metrics which can be used comparative purposes on specific matters with other councils.

CARRIED

6.5 Update on Nitrate Levels in Public Drinking Water Supplies – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)

C Roxburgh presented this report to provide information to the committee on nitrate levels measured in public water supply sources within the district. All the public water schemes have nitrate levels which are less than the maximum acceptable value (MAV) in the Drinking Water Standards of New Zealand and all but one are below 50% of the MAV. The Poyntzs Road scheme nitrate levels are approx. 80 – 90% of the MAV and a new source is required for this scheme because of this issue. This source is sampled every month to monitor nitrate levels. There has been an increase in levels in samples tested from July 2017 to January 2018, though the last two samples have since plateaued. Staff will monitor these levels closely. The Ohoka back up source also has nitrate levels above 50% of the MAV and it was stopped being used as the primary source in 2016. Staff will be sampling this source every three months to be confident that it is still within safe levels, should it be required to be used at short notice.

With the growing interest in nitrate levels in groundwater in the Canterbury region it is proposed that sampling of nitrate be increased to annual samples.
for all public water sources, rather than every five years (which is the requirement for sources where nitrate is less than 50% of the MAV). This will provide more accurate data trends, with many of the sources only 5 – 10 years old.

Moved Councillor Brine seconded Councillor Williams

**THAT** the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180601061125.

(b) **Notes** that all the nitrate levels in public water supplies on all Council managed public drinking-water schemes within the district are below the maximum acceptable value in the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand.

(c) **Notes** that the Poyntzs Road scheme has nitrate levels at approximately 80 – 90% of the maximum acceptable value, and that a new source is required for this scheme long term.

(d) **Notes** that staff are actively working with Environment Canterbury to understand any long terms risks to the district’s supplies and how these can be managed and mitigated.

CARRIED

7 **MATTER REFERRED FROM THE REGENERATION STEERING GROUP MEETING OF 11 JUNE 2018**

7.1 **Jones Street Repair Options (Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area) – Michelle Flanagan (Landscape Planner – District Regeneration)**

Duncan Roxburgh spoke to this report and provided some background information on the discussion undertaken at the steering group.

It has been determined that there needs to be some more work done by staff to determine the best option for drainage to be required in the Jones Street area. This will also need to work in with the Beswick drainage upgrades.

On this basis, staff have suggested that this report lie on the table until the next meeting of the committee, to allow time for this project to be assessed further.

Following a question from Councillor Barnett, Mr Roxburgh noted that Jones Street is to be the priority route for the new access road from green zone. Councillor Barnett questioned the use of $500,000 funds on this road now, when it will not be put to best use for another five years. Mr Palmer responded that there had been a strong steer from the Regeneration Steering Group that the community considered this was a priority and would be a sign of progress.

Councillor Atkinson noted that as this land now belongs the Council, the berm could be made much wider, and possibly build a pedestrian tunnel that people could use if wanted to access planned BMX track and sports grounds. Mr Palmer responded that widening the berm would encroach on proposed development of the sites either side of the street and a pedestrian tunnel would be at a cost. The water table is high here and would require drainage.

Moved Councillor Meyer seconded Councillor Brine

**THAT** this item lies on the table:
8 REPORTS FOR INFORMATION ONLY

8.1 Approval to Change Intersection Controls
(report no. 180423043958 to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting of 21 May 2018).

8.2 Approval to install cattle stops on Carleton Road
(report no. 180517054232 to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting of 7 June 2018).

Moved Councillor Stewart seconded Councillor Meyer

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Receives Items 8.1 – 8.2 for information

CARRIED

9 PORTFOLIO UPDATES

9.1 Roading – Councillor John Meyer

Councillor Meyer noted that some members had been for a site visit to Cones Road, commented on the improvement and believes the cost is worthwhile if it saves a life in future.

9.2 Drainage and Stockwater – Councillor Sandra Stewart

Councillor Stewart has attended the All Boards Drainage meeting, where there was a speaker who had used a high-tech drone for mapping of rivers. Council drainage staff may be interested in using this for projects.

A new round of Drainage Advisory Group meetings started last week at Ohoka. A comprehensive report was presented from the new Contractor on the work for the area. This was well received by members of the Group. The next Drainage Advisory Group meeting for this round is in Oxford this week.

A review of the Stockwater Bylaw is coming up in the near future.

9.3 Utilities (Water Supplies and Sewer) – Cr Paul Williams

Councillor Williams said a second source of water for the Oxford No. 1 water supply is almost 100% secured with the consent process.

Oxford No. 2 is now operational, with pumps one and two supplying the area and the third pump still to be connected.

9.4 Solid Waste – Cr Robbie Brine

The next Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party meeting is coming up on Thursday 21 June.
10 QUESTIONS

There were no questions.

11 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

There was no urgent general business.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 4.30pm.

CONFIRMED

__________________________________
Chairman

__________________________________
Date

BRIEFING

At the conclusion of the meeting, there was a briefing for the committee, on the following matters:

∑ Seal Extensions (Joanne McBride)
∑ Nitrate Assessment implications to Water Supplies in the Waimakariri District (joint presentation by Kalley Simpson, 3 Waters Manager WDC and Zeb Etheridge, Senior Scientist ECan)
**MINUTES OF YOUTH COUNCIL (YC) MEETING**
Held in the Committee Rooms, Rangiora Service Centre, WDC, High Street, Rangiora at 7pm Tuesday 26th June 2018

| 1. | **Present:**
|    | Sam Redman (WDC), Arabella Jarman (Co-chair), Andrew Besuyen (Co-chair), Olivia Silby, Jacob Harford, Ellie Tizzard, Stella Graydon, Kirstyn Barnett (WDC Councillor), Caitlin Tipping, Katie Lange, Benya Ickenroth, Dan Gordon (WDC Councillor) |

| 2. | **In Attendance:** Chris Brown (WDC), Mike O’Connell (WDC) |

| 3. | **Apologies:** David Ayers (WDC Mayor) |

| 4. | **Rangiora Skate Park**
|    | Chris Brown
|    | Chris Brown joined us, giving a brief rundown of the history of the Rangiora skate park and recent work done in the area. He explained that approximately $150,000 had been spent on the redesign and as a result there is not a huge budget left for putting into projects in the area.
|    | However he and his team would be happy to support any development plans or ideas that the Youth Council might want to put forward.
|    | There was some discussion around how the Youth Council should start such a process, with Chris advising that figuring out the goals, aims and the needs that could be fulfilled would be a good place to start.
|    | There was also some discussion about the Oxford skate park and what could be done in the area. |

**ACTIONS:**
- Sam to invite Grant Stephens (WDC landscape architect) to the next Youth Council meeting.
- An additional meeting to brainstorm some ideas was scheduled for 10th July at 6pm for those interested.

| 5. | **Public Spaces Policy**
|    | Mike O’Connell
|    | Mike presented the team with a short slideshow and explained what the Public Spaces Policy is and what it affects. In particular he emphasised shop signage, walkways, parks and skates/skateboards.
|    | Mike left the group with a copy of the policy document which the Youth Council committed to reading through and putting together a submission to the Public Spaces policy review before it closes on 30th July. |

**ACTIONS:**
- Sam to send link to policy submission page.
- Whole team to read through the policy summary on that page.
- Youth Council to make a submission on the policy.
### 6. Reports for Discussion

**Councillor Dan Gordon & Councillor Kirstyn Barnett:**

Informed the Youth Council about the current status of the Multisport facility on Coldstream Road, in particular that there was a pathway going in to improve accessibility to the area.

There was discussion around the opening of the new Woodend-Rangiora Cycleway which happened over the weekend.

Kirstyn brought up the "Big Splash" which she took part in.

Finally, Dan informed the Youth Council about the new seats and water fountain put in on Conway Lane by the Rotary Club.

**ACTIONS:**

### 8. Youth Development Strategy

Sam updated the team on the progress of the engagement process, advising that promotion was going well with approximately 340 responses made so far on the survey.

He also informed the team that the final school visit would be taking place that week at Kaiapoi High School at lunchtime.

There was discussion about how and when the Youth Council should meet to go over the data gathered during June and a date was set for a sub-group meeting for all those interested.

**ACTIONS:**

- Youth Development Strategy meeting set for 24\textsuperscript{th} July.

### 9. Team Building Weekend

The Youth Council were keen for a one day team-building weekend in Hanmer Springs, potentially using StrengthsFinder, and working on the YDS.

**ACTIONS:**

- Sam to investigate and talk to WaiYouth to see if they would like to join.

### 10. General Business

**Farewell to previous members**

A dinner at a local restaurant was suggested.

**Youth Grant**

Sam explained the new Youth Grant and how it works with the help of the Councillors. Arabella was nominated as the Youth Council representative to the Youth Grant committee with Caitlin as her deputy as she was unsure how her future workload might look.

**Hoodies**

Stella was happy to investigate pricing for WYC hoodies.

**Winterfest**

Sam explained Winterfest and mentioned some opportunities for Youth Council to get involved.

**ACTIONS:**

- Sam to create Facebook poll to decide.
- Sam to forward the nomination on to the right people.
- Stella to investigate and bring options back to Youth Council.
- Sam to send out Winterfest information.
Meeting closed at 8.30 pm

Next meeting on Tuesday 31 July 2018 in the Rakahuri Room, at the Rangiora Service Centre.

________________________________________  ______________________________
Chair                                           Date
MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE REGENERATION STEERING GROUP HELD IN THE RUATANIWHAA KAIAPOI CIVIC CENTRE ON MONDAY 2 JULY 2018 AT 4.00PM

PRESENT:
A Blackie, P Redmond, C Greengrass, M Pinkham.
C Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation), D Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager - District Regeneration).

IN ATTENDANCE:
M Flanagan, WDC.

1. APOLOGIES
An apology was received and sustained from N Atkinson, D Ayers, R Blair, C McKay, C McMillian, J Watson, J Meyer J Palmer and S Stewart for absence.
Moved: A Blackie Seconded: C Greengrass
CARRIED

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
Moved: P Redmond Seconded: M Pinkham
THAT the Regeneration Steering Group:
Confirms as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting held on Monday 11 June 2018.
CARRIED

3. MATTERS ARISING
D Roxborough noted that following from the last meeting he has spoken with project managers at the Coromandel District Council. They have done some pontoon projects recently and have more in the pipeline. That was really useful to get some information from them, lesson learned, what is happening in the market and some good information around the types of pontoon materials used and some feedback on some of the contractors.

4. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
There were on deputations or presentations.

5. TE KŌHAKA O TŪHAITARA TRUST UPDATE
There was no update from the Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust.

6. KAIAPOI TOWN CENTRE 2028 PLAN UPDATE
C Sargison noted that a report is going up to Council on Tuesday 3 July to adopt it for consultation.

7. REPORTS
There were no reports.
8. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT


D Roxborough referred to Clause 4.1 regarding the new Kaiapoi East access road link, Feldwick Drive. This work is due to be completed later in July. Beyond the new road opening, there is still some ongoing work to be done in Bracebridge Street for some kerb and channel repairs.

D Roxborough referred to Clause 4.3 in regard to the land divestment, and noted after speaking with LINZ, that the final settlement is now anticipated for the first parcels on land to come over around mid-August. LINZ are still working on some of the road stopping and amalgamations.

Moved: A Blackie
Seconded: P Redmond

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group

(a) Receives report No. 180621068831.

CARRIED

9. MINUTES FROM PCG MEETINGS

9.1 Kaiapoi River Marine Precinct Project Control Group (PCG) Meeting Minutes – Thursday 7 June 2018

Received for information.

9.2 District Regeneration Project Control Group (PCG) Meeting Minutes – Thursday 21 June 2018

Received for information.

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group receives the information in items 9.1 – 9.2.

Moved: A Blackie
Seconded: P Redmond

CARRIED

10. CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

11. GENERAL

A Blackie advised that Daniel Smith Industries are struggling to get their part of the construction completed and it looks as though they will be unable to do the dredging for the pontoons. A Blackie met with March Construction to look at an alternative solution for the interim dredging. March Construction were happy to help but they currently do not have a barge available as it is on a permanent loan at Lyttelton. A Blackie advised that it is unlikely the dredging will be able to be done before the stop bank is put back in and are struggling with the timeframes to get the dredging done before 1 August. If the dredging cannot be done in this time frame, this means that the pontoons will not be able to go in and this part of the project looks like it will be pushed out to December.
12. MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

There were not matters to be considered with the public excluded.

13. NEXT MEETING

The next scheduled meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group commences at 4.00pm on Monday 6 August 2018 at the Ruatanewa Centre, Kaiapoi.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS THE MEETING CLOSED AT 4.09PM.
Minutes: Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party Meeting held 19 July 2018 in Rakahuri Committee Room


**Apologies:** Clr. Paul Williams, Clr. John Meyer, apologies for lateness from Mayor David Ayers

**Confirmation of Minutes:** +1 missing for the reference to the 7+1+1+1 contract, first bullet point under **Contract Term** heading. The rest of the minutes of the meeting held 21 June 2018 were confirmed as true and correct.

**Verbal update on briefing sessions as part of the Solid Waste Procurement process**

∑ Briefing sessions occurred with 12 suppliers / contractors between 10 and 12 July: Friendly Binz, Quick Skips (soon to become Total Waste Solutions), EcoCentral, MT Drums, WasteCo, J.J. Richards, Waimak Bins Limited, Envirowaste, Metallic Sweeping, Waste Management, Smart Environmental and SICON.

∑ Issues raised / advice provided during the briefing sessions included:

**Development of KPIs and establishment of a governance group.**

- Negotiation can occur after awarding the tender to finalise the composition of this group. This should not only be a staff group but could include, amongst others, the Solid Waste Portfolio Holder.

**Allowing a grace period for bin swap.**

- Previously discussed by this Working Party. A contractor suggested for a grace period to start after two or three months after contract commencement to provide users the time to get used to their new bins. The grace period would not allow customers to opt out, but just swap bins size.

**Intentions regarding a potential enhanced refuse bin service.**

- The decision was previously made to allow for a 80 L and a 140L rubbish bin, but not for a 240L bin. Some contractors have asked if we should supply 240L bins to our residents. Research has shown that limiting the size of rubbish bins increases recycling behaviour. Major demand in Christchurch is for greater organics bin size, not general waste.
- Gerard suggests to keep the status quo and to reassess if there is significant demand as putting one extra bag out may be more cost-effective.
- Clr. Gordon asked for some advice from Morrison Low.
- Council to review need for 240L for rubbish if there is a subsequent significant demand for 240L bins.

**Moved: Clr. Brine – Seconded Clr. Wendy Doody**

**Community involvement with recycling centre.**

- Feedback received on instances where community involvement has not been successful. Contractors recommend that Council be clear with the objectives of community involvement and to be specific in the tender: is it to divert waste or is it to produce social outcomes? It is
more difficult for the contractor to oversee the community group if there is a wider objective than waste minimisation.

- Clr. Doody referred to Hurunui where the community group collected rubbish and ran the transfer station in Amberley. The collection did not work, however their other involvement in recycling and resource recovery worked well.
- Gerard informed that any failure with community involvement can become a community issue and a media issue if it does not work - a risk for Council. From an economic point of view, Council would very likely be subsidising the community group.
- Clr. Doody referred to the social obligation associated with community involvement for Council. Clr. Gordon highlighted that Council is currently at an early stage in the process as there has just been a request for an expression of interest.
- Staff will provide feedback from expressions of interest once they’re available. Deadline is 3 August 2018.

4:20 pm: Mayor arrives

*Contractors’ involvement with education.*

- Staff will ask contractors what they can offer, what they intend to provide and the price of these services. Some options could include bringing collection vehicles to schools.

*Schools and churches.*

- Current encouragement to educate youth via providing free recycling bins to schools. Staff asked if free collection and disposal options should be expanded to organics bins or should schools pay for the service like any customer?
- Kitty and Elodie informed that the policy is to provide one 240L recycling bin for three classes and that according to recent audits at the Rangiora and Kaiapoi High School, the quality of recycling is good. Council is already encouraging schools to compost their organics via Eco Educate.
- Clr. Brine reminded that not all organics can be home composted, e.g. chicken bones. However, he agreed that education is currently provided to divert organics and that schools can seek advice from Lesley from Eco Educate. He concluded that schools and other organisations should be charged if they want the kerbside organics collection service.
- Clr. Gordon recommended to remind schools that the Council is giving them the recycling bins free of charge for education purposes. Clr. Doody recommended some article on the papers about free recycling provided at schools.
- Clr. Stewart asked about the number of schools in the district having the free kerbside recycling collection and the associated costs for Council. Kitty to send list of schools
- Kitty informed that some schools do not use all allocated bins. There might be some cost savings if Council has these extra bins removed. Staff will prepare an overall report on waste minimisation education last year that includes education provided through schools and by Eco Educate.
- Gerard informed that the current policy is for churches and other non-for-profit organisations to pay an extra $40 for each additional recycling bin. Kitty said that those having the service currently pay for it. Kitty has recently received a query from a business in High Street: we can provide the service, but at a cost.

*Bag collections.*

- Bag collections have been presented as going against company policy for two contractors, mainly for health and safety reasons. Gerard informed this is not a surprise for staff.
- Clr. Doody said that Council needs a transition between bags and bins.
- Gerard confirmed that the tender will require bag collections to be done in a safe manner, i.e. not by throwing bags into the collection vehicle.
Cr Brine said there were some media reports about Westport taking all South Island’s rubbish to be incinerated. Council is committed to sending our rubbish to Kate Valley. Simon confirmed it will be clear in the tender that rubbish transportation and disposal is not part of this contract.

**Verbal update on community engagement process**

Kitty informed that Council has received about 20% of replies on the Your Choice consultation so far (Thursday 19 July). Additionally the ratio of choices is the expected percentage of responses at this stage. Multiple property owners receive several cards. Currently forty reports are invalid. A reminder will be sent with the first rate instalment.

Kitty informed of pop up stands at diverse locations to engage with our community, e.g. PAK’nSAVE session for one hour earlier on the day.

Clr. Doody asked about consultation in Oxford. Elodie to send information to Clr. Doody

Kitty said that reminders will be sent to property owners. It can be a text reminder, ongoing ads on Facebook and in the papers.

**Council adoption of the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan**

Kitty informed that report 180710076344 has been updated since the agenda was sent out, and was circulated to the members separately.

Recommendation:

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

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180710076344.

(b) **Adopts** the final Waste Management & Minimisation Plan 2018 (180710076343)

(c) **Circulates** a copy of this report to all Community Boards for their information.

Moved: Clr. Brine – Seconded Clr. Wendy Doody

Passed

**Christmas collection**

Kitty informed that on previous public holidays where the collections did not get done on the holiday, kerbside collections occurred on the previous weekend if collections occurred on Monday or Tuesday and that collections occurred over the following weekend if collections were to occur on Wednesday, Thursday or Friday. The Christchurch City Council has recently postponed all their collections to a day later, on the weeks with an affected public holiday; e.g. if the public holiday is on a Tuesday, the collection will occur on the following Wednesday. Council has the opportunity to align regionally with CCC and the contractor is supportive of this change. The only holiday collections affected are: Christmas Day, New Year’s Day.

Clr. Brine supports this.
**General business**

∑ Clr. Brine asked for a copy of the current KPIs with the current contractor and a copy of the current schedule for the tendering process.

Meeting closed at 4.50 pm
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE OXFORD-OHOKA COMMUNITY BOARD HELD IN THE WEST EYRETON HALL, 3 EARLYS ROAD, WEST EYRETON ON THURSDAY 5 JULY 2018 AT 7.00PM.

PRESENT
D Nicholl (Chair), M Brown, W Doody, J Ensor, S Farrell, K Felstead, J Lynn and T Robson.

IN ATTENDANCE
E Cordwell (Governance Adviser), S Markham (Manager Strategy & Engagement), T Ellis (Development Planning Manager), J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager), B Rice (Senior Transport Engineer) and E Stubbs (Minute Secretary).

Thirty members of the public were present in the gallery for Item 5.1. The meeting adjourned for a short break from 7.53pm to 7.55pm to allow the public to leave.

1 APOLOGIES
Nil.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
James Ensor advised that he was a member of the Mandeville Residents Association – Item 5.1

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board – 7 June 2018
Moved S Farrell seconded M Brown
THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
(a) Amends the minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board 7 June 2018, the last paragraph of Item 8.4 should read ‘S Farrell commented that all the Council community buildings that had wooden floors were well booked up and the Oxford A&P building was being used as a community building by OxBox and Yoga at present. It needed maintenance on it to meet Health & Safety standards.’
(b) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting, held 7 June 2018, as a true and accurate record.

4 MATTERS ARISING
Nil.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
5.1 Rosina Rouse and T McBrearty Mandeville Residents’ Association (MRA) and Eyre District Environmental Association Inc. (EDEAI) spoke in relation to the Canterbury Landscape Supplies (CLS) activity at Diversion/ South Eyre Roads, Eyreton. R Rouse and T McBrearty introduced themselves and their relationship to a number of community groups in the area. T McBrearty advised that he was the also a local Water Committee Representative for Ohoka, Mandeville and Oxford. They noted the large public gallery supporting their deputation who were also affected by the CLS operation and advised that
they believed that around 300 people were actually affected. They spoke to a tabled presentation (Trim 180706075233).

R Rouse and T McBrearty appreciated the opportunity to speak to matters of concern to the residents including potential impact on ground water, lack of firefighting facilities, unresolved issues and operation of the site.

It was noted that there were three separate Resource Consents for the proposed composting activity. Two to Environment Canterbury (ECan) CRC175344 and CRC175345 for ‘discharge to land and air, with a separate consent application to Waimakariri District Council (WDC) regarding ‘land use’ including stockpiling.

These applications are being processed and addressed separately with the application to ECan being refused by two independent Hearing Commissioners on 26 June 2018. It was acknowledged that the Community Board formally submitted in opposition to the CLS operation.

These same Commissioners have been engaged by WDC, to ensure consistency and to determine whether the consent application to WDC should or should not be publicly notified in accordance with the strict criteria of the Resource Management Act (RMA). This is the first stage of the RMA consenting process and is not subject to interpretation.

The MRA were of the understanding that this decision had already been made and that the WDC consent was to be non-notified and had prepared their material for the Board on that basis.

Staff and Deputy Mayor Felstead confirmed that this was not the case and that no decision had been made and that this is still before the independent Commissioners to determine. K Felstead also advising later in the meeting that the Commissioners’ decision was subject to a 15 day time frame for CLS to appeal and that this had not yet expired. Any such appeal would be heard by the Environment Court and would automatically place the WDC consent on hold pending any Court outcome.

(Post meeting note - this appeal was lodged on 18 July 2018).

R Rouse advised that the MRA believed that the matters were not minor and that the application to WDC must be publicly notified. They were not against compost production or business and agreed with the findings of the Hearing Commissioners to refuse the ECan consent.

R Rouse expressed a number of concerns regarding communication of the consents to local residents. Many residents were distressed, angry and frustrated. She commented that the community had fully and respectively engaged in the entire process because they believed it was the right thing to do out of concern for the environment, for its future protection and necessary remediation. R Rouse commented that they placed trust that the governing authorities: Waimakariri District Council and Environment Canterbury would do the right thing.

R Rouse noted that WDC provided representation at the Mediation meeting through its lawyer Andrew Schultze of Cavell Leitch but that neither staff nor Councillors had attended any of the four days of the ECan Hearing. The Oxford-Ohoka Community Board (Doug Nicholl and John Lynn) had presented their submission.

K Felstead and staff advised that it was imperative that both WDC staff and Councillors maintained scrupulous independence from the ECan process to ensure that the WDC consenting process could withstand any potential challenge or Judicial Review as regards pre-determination or other impropriety.

R Rouse spoke to the issue of water noting local residents relied on their shallow wells to provide safe, good-quality drinking water. Many were located
on a red nutrient water zone where nitrate levels are already high and they
could not afford further nitrates to seep into the ground water. R Rouse
outlined results of various local supplies. Currently her own supply was just
below the Maximum Allowable Value (MAV) for nitrates and she had installed
a reverse osmosis filter at a cost of $900 with additional ongoing costs. She
asked in the case of nitrate levels increasing above MAV who would fund and
supply safe water; it was not fair to expect residents to pay. She had been
advised that it could be done but would be very expensive. Residents did not
want a repeat of the Havelock North situation.

R Rouse requested a WDC report into the feasibility, timeframe required and
cost of providing a safe supply of potable water to the potentially affected
residents of the district. She also requested that the drinking water from her
reverse osmosis filter system be tested so that other residents may have
certainty about the success of this means of dealing with nitrates.

R Rouse spoke to the issues of stormwater and leachate. She commented
that she believed that the site was unsuitable and was located in a sensitive
environment. There was uncertainty regarding what was in the compost
material including pathogens, ponding of water and still no collection of
stormwater and leachates. The material had been on bare ground for over
two years. R Rouse outlined what she believed the requirements needed to
be for the site, including impermeable barriers, permanent bunding, engineer’s
report, safe collection of all polluted water, lining of pad and collection ponds
and assessment of materials.

R Rouse spoke to the issue of fire. She believed that the site Fire Plan needed
to be updated. Water was currently supplied by a neighbour which had initially
been only a short term agreement. There was no well on site yet and no
application for one had been made. Based on pipe diameter R Rouse
suggested that the applicant’s assertion of 15L/s may be overinflated and that
the 25,000L tank was insufficient to fight fires. There were flight restrictions
due to overhead cables so aerial firefighting was not an option. They believed
24/7 monitoring of composting temperatures was required and R Rouse
highlighted what she felt was the poor track record of the applicant with regard
to fires. Residents were also concerned about the speed of progress of fire,
ability to halt a fire in very strong winds, detection, how residents would be
advised of danger and believed there was an unacceptable risk to residents,
property, stock, livelihoods and the Waimakariri River. R Rouse noted there
were a number of unresolved issues including flies and midges, the smell and
transport of hazardous materials and spillages.

T McBrearty commented that in his view the applicant had a long history of
compost production but appeared to have issues with compliance. Changes
to composting operating procedures were post-complaints and in a reactive
rather than proactive way. T McBrearty commented that residents had a lack
of trust in the applicant’s ability to successfully establish and manage the
operation.

In conclusion T McBrearty advised that the Mandeville Residents’ Association
believed that the WDC Resource Consent sought by Canterbury Landscape
Supplies Ltd should be refused. They believed the application for this consent
should be publicly notified.

In addition the Mandeville Residents Association wanted to ensure that this
kind of situation did not happen in the future, suggesting that there could be a
Bylaw that would prevent retrospective consents on any new rural operation.

The Board were advised that the applicant did seem to be removing large
amounts of material from the site in accordance with an ECan notification.
R Rouse requested that after the removal of material that the land be tested so it was known what condition it was in and there was reassurance it would be reinstated and was safe. This would be a matter to be raised with ECan.

R Rouse referred to photographs on the handout which showed the site after rain events in 2018. Water was ponding and running off.

S Markham noted the appeal period expired in a few days.

S Markham provided an overview of various scenarios depending on whether or not the applicants lodged an appeal to the Environment Court. He also advised of the various types of notifications: non-notified, publicly notified or limited notification.

K Felstead asked staff if the applicant did not appeal would the land use consent application be withdrawn. T Ellis replied that this was likely as WDC could not give effect to a land use consent if there was no discharge consent.

S Markham acknowledged the significance of the community’s concerns. He highlighted that when, or if the land use consent was considered, it would be by the same Commissioners who had considered the discharge consents so they were familiar with the background and had been involved throughout the process.

S Farrell raised concerns about residents not having a platform to be heard in relation to the land use consent (WDC) if it was not notified. T McBrearty replied that he would be disappointed if this were to be the case as the Council had an excellent track record of community engagement but he acknowledged that this was a decision under the RMA, rather than a Council decision, as to notification. R Rouse commented that residents were not experienced in these types of RMA processes and had found it to be lengthy and difficult. However, they had not taken what they had been presented with at face value and had done their research, which included visiting a number of other composting operations including that of Timaru District Council. As a result of their research they felt they understood what best practice at a composting site was – and that this was not happening at the CLS operation. T McBrearty believed the withdrawal of support for CLS from Silver Fern Farms at the hearing when they learnt that CLS was operating without consent, was of note.

J Lynn asked for clarification regarding compost removal and R Rouse advised it was being removed under ECan direction. It was understood that CLS had until the end of the week to supply a plan on how it was to be removed. The removal was expected to go past the deadline.

J Ensor asked what the residents would like to see regarding monitoring water and ensuring safe drinking water. R Rouse advised they would like the reverse osmosis water filtration method to be tested to provide clarity around whether the system worked. If nitrate levels continued to increase there were likely to be other residents who would require a solution. They understood that there other contributing factors in increasing nitrates, but they could not afford any more going into the drinking water. They would like a report to look at the possibility of a potable water supply to protect residents in the future.

The meeting adjourned from 7.53pm to 7.55pm to allow members of the public to leave.

5.2 Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager) spoke to the previously circulated memo (Trim 180703073912) providing an update on roading priorities for 2018-2019. To determine conditions of kerb and channels and footpaths a condition rating is carried out every three years. There was also
coordination with 3Waters and Greenspace. J McBride advised that she was happy to take feedback on the priorities at the meeting or following via phone or email.

J Lynn, as Chair of the Ohoka Residents’ Association, noted that the proposed new footpath in Ohoka, was planned for 2022 which was another four years out, and it had already been raised for the last 10 years. He expressed disappointment at the delay and noted it was for the safety of children walking to Ohoka School. K Felstead asked if the path needed to be sealed or would crusher dust be sufficient. J Lynn replied that in the absence of seal it would suffice. J McBride advised that there was separate funding for walking and cycling projects and that a list of projects would be going to the Utilities and Roading Committee for approval.

M Brown asked with regard to Tram Road (at Woodfields Road) improvements did that include consultation to which J McBride confirmed it did.

M Brown asked whether ‘Roadside Hazard Removal’ projects included roadside drains. J McBride advised it included removing obstacles such as concrete tombstone ends that were close to the road. M Brown asked where roadside drains fell in terms of roading as some blocked culverts under roads that were not being addressed. J McBride replied that it came under roadside maintenance issues, and she was happy to discuss specific sites.

M Brown asked about funding for cattle underpasses as it was his understanding that the farmer paid. J McBride advised that this was usually the case but on occasion, where an underpass was necessary in terms of safety outcomes, the Council would consider assisting but they were heavily subsidised by the NZTA and the farmer.

S Farrell raised a concern regarding shingle spreading onto South Eyre Road from Diversion Road and Browns Road which was causing problems. J McBride advised that over recent years Council had been re-sealing side roads back to the boundary as part of resealing improvements however there were others that did need to be looked at for sealing back.

D Nicholl asked with regards to Browns Road could residents assist with costs. J McBride noted there would be a report to the Utilities and Roading Committee soon regarding the upcoming seal process.

J Ensor noted that following the recent work completed at North Eyre Road it was not sealed back to the boundary which created issues with the Mandeville Sports Club carpark. J McBride advised she would follow up on this. J Ensor also noted problems at Mill Road and was happy to discuss further with J McBride.

M Brown asked if seal back at intersections came under maintenance or capital works. J McBride advised that if a reseal was being completed there would be seal back to the boundary on either side, however if more sealing was required it would be put into the programme to bring to Community Boards.

K Felstead commented that it was good to see the new Oxford footpaths. He noted that a number of years ago Harewood Road was at the top of list for a footpath however residents had requested that drainage issues be fixed first. The drainage works had now been completed and he asked for an update on when the footpath work would be completed. J McBride agreed to follow up on this.

K Felstead noted the Board’s submission to the Long Term Plan regarding German Road, Browns Rock Road and Cust Road being in a rough condition and asked if those road repairs had been programmed. J McBride would follow up on the matter.

T Robson queried the Ashley Gorge Road guard rail project. B Rice advised that it was at the end of the straight heading toward Oxford. T Robson asked
if the Ashley Gorge route assessment would include an assessment of cycling usage as it was a very popular route and cyclists could present a safety risk. J McBride advised that this was a joint project with NZTA and ACC looking at roadside hazards.

W Doody noted that she was pleased to see the guardrails included. She also noted that there were gum trees on the south side of Tram Road that were now affecting the road and creating a ridge.

J Lynn provided feedback from local residents in Ohoka who were concerned that a commercial entity on Mill Road had created a turning bay on the grass verge. They questioned why they had been allowed to do so while farmers had to increase the size of culverts for milk tankers to enter and exit farm driveways. J McBride would follow up and to ascertain if formal permission had been sought for the widening.

S Farrell asked for an update on the hand rail in Meyer Place. J McBride would follow up.

5.3 Trevor Ellis (Development Planning Manager) provided an update regarding the District Development Strategy (DDS) and tabled the finalised Waimakariri 2048 District Development Strategy. S Markham noted it was the lead-in document to the upcoming District Plan review and provided direction. T Ellis also tabled a spatial overview of residential section sizes and growth. Oxford Township was not experiencing rapid growth and zoning within the Oxford Township would be looked at as part of the District Plan Review.

T Ellis advised there was appetite for rural residential development to continue including in Mandeville / Ohoka. There was potential for larger rural residential lots to intensify. The tabled map provided analysis of lot sizes by certificate of titles. It showed there was preference for four hectare subdivision in the eastern part of the district. The review would consider whether the current four hectare minimum rule was sustainable. There were regional provisions to protect and manage primary production land and rural character. There had been an initial briefing to Councillors regarding the potential for up to twelve different ‘character areas’.

S Farrell referred to the planner’s report (Agenda Item 8) which highlighted that there was not much industrial land available in Waimakariri, for example for composting. T Ellis noted there was approximately 60-70 hectares of industrial land in Southbrook that was vacant however it was held by a handful of landowners who could choose when or if they wanted to make it available. Council would continue to monitor the situation. Staff were considering a number of different zoning options and areas as part of the review.

J Ensor referred to subdivisions such as Ohoka Meadows and Mandeville Park which he felt did not have sufficient infrastructure to cope with heavy rain events. He asked why adequate infrastructure was not installed at the time of development rather than needing to fix down the track. T Ellis could not comment on specific examples. Decisions were based on what was known at the time. S Markham advised there was now a proposal for transition from a more reactive approach that was led by private plan changes, to more proactive provisions. There was a parallel stream of work about a more planned approach. Private plan changes created an incremental cumulative effect rather than proactive zoning by the Council. It would be more costly to the Council in the short term as historically the private plan change process relied on the applicant doing a lot of the work.

J Lynn referred to the growth in Woodend and Pegasus and the deferment of the Bypass, asking if there needed to be consideration around the impact of this. S Markham commented there was a paradox, as development would potentially bring the bypass timeframes forward. There was active work ongoing with NZTA. It was a difficult situation that required clarity.
T Ellis noted there was a sum of money for Greater Christchurch to be allocated for mass transit.

D Nicholl expressed concern at the splitting of farmland into small blocks highlighted by the comparative images from the 1980’s to early 2000’s. There had been a significant change to the District over the life of the current District Plan. T Ellis commented that there was a lot of crystal ball gazing going on at the moment around rural futures and what it meant for future land use.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
Nil,

7 REPORTS

7.1 Oxford Area School Pick Up / Drop Off Area on Bay Road – B Rice (Senior Transport Engineer)

B Rice spoke to the report noting that it was in response to a request from the Oxford Area School for a drop-off zone outside the school on Bay Road. Like many schools around New Zealand there were issues with picking up and dropping off children safely at the beginning and end of the school day. The effectiveness of the proposed area would be greater in the morning and limited in the afternoon and would be largely dependent on monitoring and enforcement. Enforcement by Police or Council parking staff was likely to be limited. While the drop-off zone would not totally mitigate the issues, school staff supported it, had agreed to assist with monitoring it and speaking with parents.

S Farrell asked if B Rice believed it would cause more parents to do U turns to get to the drop-off point and suggested it may create confusion for cars getting into the drop-off zone. There was still the ability to park on the west side. B Rice agreed that this could be an outcome but that it was preferential to have parents do U turns than for children to cross the road. It would of course be better if drivers went around the block, but that was driver behaviour and could only be encouraged.

S Farrell asked if it were possible to include a 40km/hr school zone at the same time. B Rice advised that was something that could be considered. K Felstead asked if that had been discussed with the School Board. W Doody asked what K Graham the Road Safety Coordinator thought of the zone. B Rice advised that K Graham had offered to work with the school regarding reducing the number of cars ‘dropping off’ and other measures to assist with the situation.

Moved T Robson seconded M Brown

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 180614066438.
(b) Adopts the attached Amended Second Schedule – Parking Restrictions to the Parking Bylaw 2007 (Trim No 180621069253).
(c) Notes that enforcement of the drop off zone by Police or Council parking staff is likely to be limited.
(d) Notes that the Oxford Area School has indicated a willingness to provide staff to monitor the drop off zone.

CARRIED
7.2 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2018/2019 and General Landscaping Fund 2018/2019 – E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

E Cordwell spoke briefly to the report noting the Board’s General Landscaping Budget allocated by the Council for 2018/19 was $12,160 and the Board’s Discretionary Grant Funding allocated by the Council for 2018/2019 was $6,520. The noted corrections to the Application and Accountability Forms were in hand.

Moved S Farrell seconded J Lynn

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180619067874.
(b) Notes that the Board’s General Landscaping Budget allocated by the Council for 2018/19 is $12,160.
(c) Notes that the Board’s Discretionary Grant Funding allocated by the Council for 2018/2019 is $6,520.
(d) Approves the Board’s 2018/2019 Discretionary Grant Fund Application Criteria and Application Form (Trim No. 180621068982).
(e) Approves the Board’s 2018/2019 Discretionary Grant Accountability Form (Trim No. 180621068877).
(f) Approves that Discretionary Grant Fund applications will continue to be considered at each meeting for the 2018/2019 financial year (July 2018 to June 2019).

CARRIED

7.3 Application to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2018/2019 – E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

E Cordwell spoke briefly to the report noting that the Club had received $3,500 from a Pub Charity Grant toward the full cost of the new uniforms.

Moved K Felstead seconded S Farrell

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180621068915.
(b) Approves a grant of $500 to Ohoka Netball Club towards the cost of new uniforms.

CARRIED

7.4 Approval of the updated Oxford-Ohoka Community Board Plan 2018/19 – E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

E Cordwell noted a further draft had been circulated, and that there was the provision for the Chair to sign off the Plan on the Board’s behalf subject to minor edits. There was still a placeholder for a photo and E Cordwell suggested the new Oxford Library and Service Centre.

A number of minor edits were noted.

Moved M Brown seconded S Farrell

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180618067171.
(b) Approves the final draft of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board Plan
2018-2019 (Trim 180523056760) subject to any minor edits discussed and approved by the Board Chairperson.

CARRIED

8 CORRESPONDENCE

E Cordwell noted the tabled response to the Draft Stormwater Bylaw (Trim 180619067653).

The memo regarding the CLS operation provided an update on progress including various reports and the Commissioners' findings for the ECAn consent refusal.

S Farrell requested that the Board formally express their concern that residents affected by the CLS did not have a platform to be heard by WDC if the Commissioners determined that the land use consent to WDC be ‘non notified’. K Felstead opposed this proposal given that the decision to notify or otherwise had not been made and so the Board should not yet express views.

J Lynn expressed a number of concerns. He believed that there should have been a formal report to the Community Board seeking recommendations to the Council as to whether the CLS application should or should not be notified. He was disappointed with the inability to engage with the decision process as regards notification.

It was noted that at the previous month’s meeting, in the workshop S Nichols (Governance Manager) had covered a number of matters including the RMA process for notification.

E Cordwell explained that the Community Boards were not part of the RMA planning assessment. Under the Resource Management Act (RMA), whether an application was notified or non-notified followed very specific legislative rules, and that process did not include directly either the Council or the Community Board.

K Felstead reiterated that this was a highly legal process. In addition this specific CLS application was being assessed by independent Commissioners to ensure scrupulous adherence to the RMA and prevent any subsequent challenge from the applicants or any other party.

M Brown acknowledged it was a legal process. He believed the general feeling of the Board members was that they needed to take every opportunity to advocate for change in the RMA legislation and associated processes, including through the District Plan Review. Whilst they could not affect the current application, members of the Board wished to make it clear to residents that they were listening to them and that they did not like the current process and would advocate for change to that process.

T Robson agreed with J Lynn and felt uninformed and frustrated. The confusion it created for residents was the main concern.

J Lynn was disgusted with the RMA process, noting the number of concerned residents who had supported the deputation and were living daily with the issue. There was a strong concern regarding water and the Council needed to be acting faster.

S Farrell expressed her own concerns and disappointment with the RMA process. She also asked if WDC staff and the planning consultant had been to the CLS site. S Farrell stated people were suffering adverse effects including to their mental and physical health.

S Markham noted that the planning consultant’s report regarding notification should not be confused with a report on the detail of the application. The current report, looked at the threshold for notification against strict criteria in
the District Plan and the RMA. Multiple reports and technical assessments would be produced relating to the consent itself and presented in due course to the Commissioners that would take into account a range of issues pertaining to the proposed site and operation. This was a later stage of the process.

However, if the applicant appealed the ECan discharge consent then the situation would alter. S Markham acknowledged it was a convoluted process that was far from clear cut. If there was no appeal by the 18 July then the matter was over, however this may not be the case.

K Felstead believed staff had summed up matters well. The elected members did not get to decide if the application was notified or non-notified. K Felstead also referred to Page 65 of the agenda where it was noted there was a site visit on 25 April 2018.

M Brown reiterated that the Board needed to advocate for change through local and central government so the situation did not happen again. It was of concern that CLS could set up an operation before a resource consent was granted. S Markham advised that there was a test in the RMA around notification. It was possible that changing the provisions of the District Plan from an effects base to an activities based plan could assist. The plan could specify certain activities that needed to be publicly notified. Initiating change to the RMA itself was more challenging, as that was a parliamentary process.

Moved M Brown seconded J Ensor

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives the memo regarding Canterbury Landscape Supplies Operation in Eyreton (Trim 180625070336).

CARRIED

Moved M Brown seconded J Lynn

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(b) Notes that, if it had been the case that the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board were material to the decision for notification, the Board would have strongly advocated that the Canterbury Landscapes Supplies application be publicly notified.

CARRIED

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chairperson’s Report for June 2018

Moved T Robson seconded J Ensor

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 180621068953.

CARRIED

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 13 June 2018 (Trim No. 180606062470).

10.2 Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 21 May 2018 (Trim No. 180518054887).
10.3 **Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 14 May 2018**
(Trim No. 180510051232).

10.4 **Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 11 June 2018**
(Trim No. 180606062391).

10.5 **Youth Council meeting minutes – 29 May 2018**

10.6 **Environment Canterbury Representation Review – report to Council 3 July 2018**
(Trim No 180624069683).

10.7 **Draft Business Zones 1 & 2 Public Spaces Policy report to Council 5 June 2018**
(Trim No. 180507049501).

10.8 **Final Utilities and Roading Activity Management Plans 2018 – report to Council 19 June 2018**
(Trim No.180521055689).

Moved M Brown seconded J Lynn

**THAT** the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.8

CARRIED

11 **MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

**J Ensor**
- Attended Waimakariri Health Advisory Group meeting. A Terms of Reference for the group was introduced (Trim 180706075244). Noted the helicopter pad funding was proceeding.
- Noted upcoming Civil Defence Welfare Exercise Friday 27 July.
- Attended Mandeville Sports Centre meeting – main item was Health and Safety.
- Mandeville Village and Main Road open – LED lights not as effective as could be due to colour choice. Care needed to be taken with decisions regarding that intersection.

**J Lynn**
- Gatekeepers Lodge – Council agreed to fund to tie down the building foundation.
- Noted mess outside Ohoka Domain carpark.

**T Robson**
- Attended Ashley Gorge Advisory Group meeting where work on removing the Lombardy Poplars was viewed, as well as the heritage building – good progress.
- Oxford Promotions Association (OPAC) – Oxford Lights Festival successful with a good turnout.
- Upcoming Oxford Garage Sale Sunday 5 August.

**S Farrell**
- Assisted with Oxford Lights Festival.

**M Brown**
- Judging at local pony club events – clubs were in good heart.
- Attended Oxford Rural Drainage Committee meeting, discussed joining with Cust Rural Drainage – answer was no. Reasons for ‘no’ included Cust had a zero balance while Oxford had $70,000 available.
- Attended Mandeville Sports Club Board meeting - Canterbury Sports Trust had been engaged to assist with a Strategic Plan.

**K Felstead**

Noted Council reports:
- Oxford Museum and Jaycee Room strengthening – not strengthen as not high use. Approved new entranceway from carpark $125,000.
Public consultation of Draft Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan in August.
Set up project management group for Multi Use Sports Facility.
CWMS Annual Report.
Mayor to champion Sustainability Strategy.
Solid waste transfer station – tender.
Approved request for additional funding for Kaiapoi well head security.
Submission to Mainpower Trust.
Final Greenspace Activity Management Plan.
Submission on ECan Representation Review.

W Doody
Tabled her Councillor’s Report (Trim No 180706075224). Points noted were:
- Ken Stevenson retirement.
- Kerbside collection – what service and bin size.
- Public consultation for ‘Alcohol in our District’.
- Oxford Rural No2 in operation.
- Oxford Rural No1 – consent decision in favour.
- Progress on Ashley Gorge Heritage building was moving fast.
- Oxford Museum – work starting soon.
- Oxford Festival of Lights – an incredible event.

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS
**Business Zones 1 & 2 Public Spaces Policy**
Consultation closes Monday 30 July 2018.

13 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE
13.1 **Board Discretionary Grant**
Balance as at 5 July 2018: $6,520.

13.2 **General Landscaping Fund**
Balance as at 5 July 2018 – 12,160.

14 MEDIA ITEMS
Nil.

15 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
Nil.

16 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
Nil.
NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board is scheduled for Thursday 9 August 2018 commencing at 7.00pm, in the Ohoka Hall.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 9.54pm.

CONFIRMED

________________
Chairperson

________________
Date
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WOODEND-SEFTON COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN MEETING ROOM A, WOODEND COMMUNITY CENTRE, SCHOOL ROAD,
WOODEND ON MONDAY 9 JULY 2018 AT 7.00PM.

PRESENT
S Powell (Chairperson), A Thompson (Deputy Chair), A Allen, J Archer, A Blackie,
R Mather and J Meyer.

IN ATTENDANCE
S Markham (Strategy and Engagement Manager), S Nichols (Governance Manager),
C Brown (Community Greenspace Manager), J McBride (Roading and Transport
Manager), Mayor D Ayers and E Stubbs (Minutes Secretary).

1 APOLOGIES
Nil.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Nil.

3 CONFIRMATION MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board – 11 June 2018
Moved J Meyer seconded J Archer

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community
    Board meeting, held 11 June 2018, as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
Nil.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS FROM THE COMMUNITY

5.1 Julie, Wayne and Tyler Power (Pegasus residents) addressed the Board to
seek the removal of several lake side trees on the north side of Pegasus Lake
(Item 7.1). J Power spoke to a handout (Trim 180718079871) asking the
Community Board if four Griselinia Shrubs, three of which have formed a
hedge, could be removed from the front of their lake side section at 55 The
Esplanade, Pegasus Town as they blocked a good part of their lake view.
J Power advised that they loved shrubs, bushes and trees. They had started
a lifestyle property from a bare block where they planted a large variety of
trees, bushes and shrubs.

J Power advised that after finding their dream section at Pegasus Town with
a beautiful lake view they were disappointed and upset with the Griselinia
shrubs which have grown into large bushes. They impinge on the lake view
and if left will keep on growing. They were happy to pay for the removal of the
bushes and to pay for replacement trees in consultation with the Council, as
to variety. These would be trees that can be seen through as they form a
canopy with a trunk, unlike Griselinia that do not have a single trunk but a
variety of stems from ground level. A quote, from the Oxford dictionary tree
definition "A woody perennial plant typically having a single stem or trunk
growing to a considerable height and bearing branches at some distance from
the ground". J Power noted that the Council had a tree policy and asked if
Griselinia shrubs fell under that policy.
J Power advised that she had spoken to several nurseries and had been told by all that Griselinia were well known, bought and produced for hedging which can be considered as unsuitable to grow in front of a lake side property. The growth rate was medium with one nursery saying that the shrub could grow up to 10 metres tall.

J Power advised that she first contacted Council in January 2017 asking if the Griselinia could be trimmed or removed. She received an email response from Council staff that it is not the intention to remove healthy trees or shrubs. Eventually, the shrubs did get a small height trim. J Power got back in touch with the Council April 2018 and met G Barnard (Parks Community Assets Officer) on site. It was then arranged to meet C Brown (Community Green Space Manager) and Shona Powell (Community Board Chair) on-site at which time options were discussed, however it was agreed that they could not be trimmed further than they had been. J Power believed that a suitable compromise could have been substantial trimming 18 months ago when first requested.

J Power referred to para 4.5 of Report 7.1 in the agenda which was a summary of concerns raised and staff responses. J Power provided replies to those items.

1. Concern is more than the height of the Griselinia. Griselinia form a hedge, which three already have. They grow to three metres in width and five metres plus in height which is a block unlike a tree which one can see through. All benefits for example: vertical relief and breaking up the built form as viewed from Western shores, will still be there with replacement “trees”.

2. The bushes require ongoing maintenance as they grow onto the path. That cost would be eliminated, if the shrubs were removed.

3. The other planted shrub beds around the lake, are substantially further from residential properties. Most of them being on Lakeside Drive which has a berm, a footpath, a road, grass frontage then the bushes. J Power’s property had the closest strip of reserve around the lake that has planting next to properties. At 5 Kewai Court there are just two bottle brush trees with a gap in the middle. As they are in tree form they do not block the lake view.

4. There would be no negative effects as listed and perhaps more benefits. A tree creates a canopy for all day shade unlike bushes. Regarding landscape amenity enhancement, it would be superior with a tree as you can see through the trunk area to other plantings. Wind protection is minimal on the inside of the bushes as you need to stand on the path, and on the lake side of the bushes there is no designated picnic area. There is also no lake access or lake edge access because of other plantings.

5. The report says there were no residents at the time of planting to consult with. There are now several residents.

6. An experienced landscape architect would be unlikely to plant hedging in front of a property with a lake view. Consideration needs to be given to how these lake side properties were marketed, sold and priced by the developer. Replacement trees will also benefit the wider Pegasus community.

J Power noted that at no time was it said that they would like the trimming or removal because of the “distant mountains” view. One of the policy objectives 7.2.2 is to plant appropriate trees on Council managed land for the benefit of current and future generations. J Power believed it was unfair to plant an unsuitable bush just because it grew easily in the environment.

J Power thanked the Board for listening, saying that people’s genuine concerns and feelings were more important than bushes, especially bushes
that had a direct negative impact on someone and were able to be remedied. The Power family were hoping for the Board’s approval to remove the bushes. J Power commented that they loved Pegasus and were looking forward to living there.

R Mather noted that she had visited the site and referred to a tabled photo asking if it showed half the width of the section. J Power commented that one fence and the real estate sign on the other side could be seen. R Mather commented that the section had beautiful views and J Power advised that they had bought the section when it had a clear lake view and the bushes had grown up to impinge on that view. The issue was upsetting and getting worse.

J Archer advised that he had visited the site and noted that the Griselinia had been badly affected by trimming. He agreed with removal of some of the Griselinia and saw others as part of the view.

A Allen asked if removal of the three hedge Griselinia would suffice for the Power family. J Power replied she would be happy for the hedge (three shrubs) to be removed. T Power commented that would be a concession to remove three of the four shrubs.

S Powell asked if the section was currently on the market. J Power replied that they owned two lake side sections, both of which were on the market. The sale of one section would determine their building plans on the remaining section. If the bushes were removed there was a good chance that they would build on that section. They had received feedback from potential purchasers regarding the bushes, and how they detracted from the lake view, and potentially purchase of the section.

S Powell asked if it would be possible to leave the decision around bush removal for a potential purchaser in the future. J Power replied they had received a lot of feedback from Pegasus residents and potential purchasers that the hedge was unsuitable for a lakeside view. She did not think they would get a potential buyer if the bushes kept growing.

J Archer asked what they thought of cabbage trees as a suitable replacement and J Power liked that they had a single trunk.

Item 7.1 was taken at this time. Note that the minutes have been recorded in accordance with the order of the agenda as circulated.

5.2 J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager) provided an update on roading priorities for 2018-2019 and sought feedback from the Board on the roading programme. J McBride advised that the renewal of kerb and channel and footpaths was driven by the condition rating for which an inspection was carried out every three years. Work was coordinated with the 3Waters and Greenspace teams.

R Mather asked about crossings in Pegasus. J McBride advised that Pegasus rumble strips were being taken out under maintenance. It was not sitting as a specific project in the three year plan. I Kennedy (Road Maintenance Engineer) was in contact with the Pegasus Residents Group and J McBride would follow-up with I Kennedy.

S Powell noted the extension of the footpath in Woodend to the Anglican Church which was in the Board Long Term Plan (LTP) submission. J McBride advised it had been assessed as part of the new footpath programme. Due to the presence of a large drain it was expensive, and from a cost/benefit analysis the project had fallen in priority. J McBride noted there was funding for cycleways and footpaths in a new NZTA category. There was potential to feed the project into that funding stream. Another factor was the NZTA funding set asked for safety improvements in Woodend. There was still a lot of work to do in that space connecting Woodend and North Woodend.
A Allen asked if there was potential for traffic lights as an alternative to the Pegasus Roundabout. J McBride commented in the future traffic movements would increase with Ravenswood and traffic lights may be required at some time in the future. The roundabout was a good interim measure.

A Thompson asked about a Woodend path extension north to Pegasus/Ravenswood on the State Highway and asked if there was an option for path to go through Ravenswood. J McBride was not aware of details but understood there was a path planned; it was a few years away.

A Thompson referred to the drain on the eastern side on the main entrance to Rangiora and asked if there were plans for that drain to be piped. J McBride advised that there were plans to upgrade Flaxton Road and there would be discussions around what the road would look like. The project would likely include kerb and channel on the drain side, and improvements to tidy up the drain, but there were no plans to pipe as that was a costly exercise.

S Powell asked about a compulsory stop at Flaxton Road/Fernside Road intersection. J McBride noted the new route linking West Belt and Townsend Road to Fernside Road.

S Powell asked about the Rangiora Woodend path ends. J McBride advised there was a project underway looking at cycleways in the district and where improvements could be made.

S Powell asked about Gressons Road improvements and J McBride noted that it would look at the bridges, road signs and markings to make sure they were suitable.

S Powell asked about the Rangiora Woodend Road, in particular road safety at the Boys Road intersection and J McBride advised there was funding this financial year for design.

J Archer asked about a Tuahiwi footpath noting the Board's LTP submission. J McBride advised that project is part of the walking/cycling programme.

5.3 S Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement) provided an update regarding the District Development Strategy (DDS) and provided a copy of the Waimakariri 2048 DDS. He commented it was the end of a long process to finalise the document. There had been workshops with the Board and members of the community to look ahead, set out and describe the broad direction for development for the next 30 years. It was expected that there would be a continuation of the significant growth in the district.

S Markham noted the other purpose of the document was to provide context within which to undertake the review of the District Plan. A wider context was the Greater Christchurch Partnership and the opportunities and constraints that it provided to the Council.

S Markham referred to page 43 of the 2048 DDS document which related to transport in the Woodend/Pegasus area. Even if the Council undertook no new zoning the community had an estimated population of 12,000. There had been some discussion at the workshop of what a community of that size needed or wanted. There needed to be thought about movement patterns within towns and connections. The eastern bypass was a live issue and the Council was mindful to engage with government to get certainty around the confirmed alignment and timing.

S Markham referred to page 33 of the document which related to key activity centres in the area. The proposed Ravenswood commercial area provided an element of opportunity. There would be a more intensive workshop discussion with the developer. Also in light of the persistent uncertainty regarding the Woodend Bypass there was a need to manage the existing Woodend Town Centre including safety until the long term situation was resolved. It was not about doing nothing but keeping a push on active management and looking to the long term role of the commercial area in Woodend without a highway designation.
The Board raised a number of corrections around road locations/names in the document.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

Nil.

7 REPORTS

7.1 **Pegasus Lake Griselinia Removal Request — C Brown (Community Greenspace Manager)**

C Brown spoke to the report noting that its purpose was to seek a decision regarding the four Griselinia trees located outside 55 The Esplanade. C Brown acknowledged the thorough deputation from the Power family.

C Brown highlighted para 7.2.1 in the report regarding legislation. The Griselinia were of a significant enough size to be treated as trees and therefore the Council’s Street and Reserves Tree Policy applied.

C Brown highlighted the benefits of the four plants for the Pegasus area. It was important to note that the Griselinia were very healthy as many trees planted in Pegasus have struggled to grow in the difficult environment. The Griselinia provided vertical relief, native habitat biota nodes, wind protection, landscape amenity enhancement, creation of more discrete areas for passive recreation activities and breaking up the built form. C Brown commented that the Griselinia were effective in providing those benefits.

C Brown referred to para 4.5 in the report which was a summary of the request of residents for removal and staff comments. There had been no feedback from flyers distributed to three neighbouring residents.

C Brown referred to the criteria in the Council Street and Reserves Tree Policy and advised that currently the Griselinia did not meet the criteria to remove.

J Archer asked about the ongoing maintenance problem keeping the hedge off the path. C Brown replied that the bushes had been hedged and were not able to be ‘lifted’ as they had too many stems. They required maintaining off the path however the cost was not significant. J Archer noted C Brown’s ongoing maintenance and asked if cabbage trees would provide the vertical relief. C Brown replied they would, however the lake was big and there was a need to plant new trees for vertical relief. He noted that trees were inspected on a three yearly basis and would require more ongoing cost than the bushes.

J Archer asked if the shelter provided would be minimal and C Brown replied that there would be some degree of shelter by tucking up on the other side if you were having a picnic.

A Allen asked C Brown who he perceived the lake edge users to be. C Brown advised that was anyone who used that lake as it was a public space. A Allen commented that no one used that area for picnicking or shelter as it was not possible to approach the water. C Brown commented that they could not monitor all parks and locations which was why the Community Board was important. The Griselinia did break up the space for passive and recreational use and by removing the Griselinia that opportunity was reduced for future users of the space.

J Meyer asked whether the bushes could be shaped into individual trees. It was noted that it was not possible as there were now too many leaders.

J Archer asked about removing a selected few of the plants. C Brown noted that for the reasons identified individual plants were not recommended to be removed as it would still have a negative impact on values. It was the decision of the Community Board, as per their delegation from the Council.
A Thompson commented it was an important issue with a variety of views. He asked if there were other Griselinia around the lake and C Brown replied yes. A Thompson asked if staff had hedged the Griselinia and C Brown replied they had been pruned after requests by the owners and also due to their locality next to the footpath.

A Thompson asked if the area had been planted at the time of the section being sold. C Brown replied yes they were planted as part of the overall development with a lot of thought from the landscape architect to provide a cohesive planting plan including the bottle brush to attract birds.

R Mather asked if there was a precedent for the plants removal elsewhere in the district and what the likelihood was for it setting a precedent in Pegasus. C Brown replied that other residents did have plants in front of the properties in Pegasus. In those instances the trees were generally further away. A precedent could be set anywhere. The Community Board had the delegation to approve the removal of trees from Council Green Space land and there were many situations where trees were removed or retained outside of policy. It was looked at on a case by case basis.

Moved A Allen seconded A Blackie

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180629072319
(b) Notes that removal of the shrubs would not be consistent with Councils Tree Policy.
(c) Notes that three adjacent residents were sent a letter asking for feedback however, no replies were received.
(d) Approves the removal of the three hedged Griselinia and the lone Griselinia and request they are replaced with alternative planting at the cost of the Power family. Replacement options to be determined by Community Greenspace and presented to the Woodend-Sefton Community Board for approval by way of report and sample photography.

CARRIED

J Archer and R Mather Abstained

A Division was called

For: A Allen, A Blackie and J Meyer
Against: S Powell and A Thompson
Abstain: J Archer and R Mather.
Motion carried 3:2

A Allen commented that it was a comprehensive report and there had been a passionate submission from the Power family.

A Blackie referred to previous requests for tree removal for example silver birches near schools and Kaiapoi cherry blossoms. He supported the motion as he believed there were a number of items in favour of the request to remove including, costs would be met by the applicants and not the ratepayers, although the Council had signed off planting it was not a Council arborist who had chosen the trees, he believed the Griselinia were ugly, shelter was limited and it was a solvable issue at no expense to the Council.

A Thompson did not support the motion for a number of reasons including that there were many situations where people liked or disliked public plantings, there was still a substantial view from the property, the plants were present when the property was purchased and the representation was from one
property owner rather than a group of residents. He noted the owners had offered to meet the costs.

R Mather remarked she found the decision difficult. She agreed with A Thompson, believing there was nothing wrong with the view, the photograph shown was a part of the property, and the plants had the advantage of blocking the view of the apartments. As a house was yet to be built on the section, the impact of the view from the future house was yet to be determined. R Mather was concerned approving the tree removal would open it up for more residents to request tree removal in the future. On the other side there was minimal disruption if the trees were replaced.

J Meyer appreciated the submission from the family. He supported the motion to remove the shrubs as the plants were hedges rather than true trees. He did not believe that it would encourage others to request tree removal. He had been swayed by the photographs of ‘true’ trees provided by the family.

J Archer noted that he had walked around the area and looked at the trees. He believed from parts of the property there were clear views and the trees added to the landscape. He would prefer a selection of the trees to be removed. Any remaining Griselinia would still require maintenance.

S Powell advised that she had been to the section a number of times. The plants did provide wind shelter and broke up the landscape. It was possible to picnic in that area. She was concerned about precedent setting and believed, looking at the big picture, the plants did add value to the community and visitors to the lake.

7.2 Woodend-Sefton Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2018/2019 and General Landscaping Fund 2018/2019 - E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

S Nichols spoke briefly to the report and asked the Board to start thinking over the next few months how they would like the landscaping money spent. The funding application criteria remained the same with minor tweaks to the funding form. It was the same form for all Community Boards. It would be uploaded to the website after the Board signed off. S Nichols provided some clarification on the ‘who will benefit’ question on the application.

It was noted there was a CPI increase to the landscaping budget.

Moved A Allen seconded J Archer

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180627071293.
(b) Notes that the Board’s General Landscaping Budget allocated by the Council for 2018/19 is $12,160.
(c) Notes that the Board’s Discretionary Grant Funding allocated by the Council for 2018/2019 is $4,000.
(d) Approves the Board’s 2018/2019 Discretionary Grant Fund Application Criteria and Application Form (Trim No. 180627071237).
(e) Approves the Board’s 2018/2019 Discretionary Grant Accountability Form (Trim No. 18062106888).
(f) Approves that Discretionary Grant Fund applications will continue to be considered at each meeting for the 2018/2019 financial year (July 2018 to June 2019).

CARRIED
7.3 Approval of the updated Woodend-Sefton Community Board Plan 2018/19 – E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

S Nichols spoke briefly to the report noting the layout would be improved when it was in a different format.

Moved R Mather seconded J Meyer

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180627071416.

(b) Approves the final draft of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board Plan 2018-2019 (Trim 180606062276) subject to any minor edits discussed and approved by the Board Chairperson.

CARRIED

R Mather commented that she had provided feedback and was happy for the Chair to approve minor edits.

A Allen was glad the updated version was less ‘wordy’.

8 CORRESPONDENCE

S Powell noted the tabled Waimakariri District Council Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018 submission response (Trim 180619067680).

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chairperson’s Report for June 2018

S Powell commented that it was good to see Board members at the Rangiora-Woodend Path opening.

Moved S Powell seconded J Archer

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180703073564.

CARRIED

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 7 June 2018 (Trim No. 180530059840).

10.2 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 13 June 2018
(Trim No. 180606062470).

10.3 Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 21 May 2018
(Trim No.180518054887).

10.4 Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 18 June 2018
(Trim No.180618067116).

10.5 Youth Council meeting minutes – 29 May 2018


Moved J Archer seconded A Thompson

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.19.

CARRIED

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

11.1 March Diary for J Archer, A Thompson and R Mather
(Trim No. 180703073567)

R Mather
Σ Noted that she was yet to hear back from the meeting regarding the Pegasus Community Centre.

Commented that the Transport Forum had been interesting and noted the public transport focus of the new government.

J Meyer
Σ Noted the presence of the new Roading Manager at the meeting and encouraged Board members to review the roading programme.
Σ Commented that Councillors and staff had been busy with the LTP.
Σ Noted upcoming meetings regarding water quality and the challenges in that space for the future.
Σ Consultation for Kaiapoi Town Centre opens on 6 August and closes on 3 September 2018 with hearings in late September. A Blackie, K Barnett and J Meyer were on the hearings panel.

A Blackie
Σ Advised that S Stewart had provided an update from the Waimakariri Zone Committee and there was planned consultation in July 2018. Nitrate levels were expected to climb for the next 20 years. Silverstream had risen from 6.2 Nitrate-N g/m³ to 11.2 Nitrate-N g/m³ in 12 months, the maximum allowable value was 11.3 Nitrate-N g/m³. It was an intergenerational problem that would take decades to fix. Individuals and Council needed to look at solutions to high nitrate levels in water supplies.
Σ Advised that the Kaiapoi River scheme was facing difficulties around timing constraints and delays. In mid-February 2019 there was to be the River Carnival opening which could include the Christchurch Boat Show on regeneration land.

A Allen
Σ Attended North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support (NCNS) planning meeting. Noted NCNS had good support from Hurunui and Kaikoura District Councils but there was some push back from the Waimakariri District Council. Looking to do a presentation to the Community Boards to improve the relationship. The New Zealand Police were happy with NCNS.
Σ Public Spaces Policy question and answer session at Rossburn Reception 26 July 2018.

A Thompson
Σ Commented planting at Taranaki Stream was going well.

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

Business Zones 1 &2 Public Spaces Policy
Consultation closes Monday 30 July 2018.  
S Powell noted the Kaiapoi Town Centre consultation would occur through August.

13 **FOSTERING COMMUNITIES**  
Nil.

14 **BOARD FUNDING UPDATE**  
14.1 **Board Discretionary Grant**  
Balance as at 9 July 2018: $4000.
14.2 **General Landscaping Fund**  
Balance as at 9 July 2018 $12,160.

15 **MEDIA ITEMS**  
Item in the last issue of the Sefton Community Newsletter regarding funding.

16 **QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**  
Nil.

17 **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**  
Nil.

**NEXT MEETING**  
The next meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Monday 13 August 2018 at the Pegasus Community Centre.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 8.45pm

CONFIRMED

________________
Chairperson

________________
Date
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 11 JULY 2018 AT 7PM.

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

IN ATTENDANCE
J Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support), G Cleary (Manager Utilities and
Roading), Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager), Trevor Ellis (Development
Planning Manager), Owen Davies (Drainage Asset Manager), Mayor D Ayers and E
Cordwell (Governance Adviser).

1 APOLOGIES
Apologies were received and sustained from C Prickett and from D Gordon for
lateness (arriving at 8.10pm).

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Nil.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board – 13 June 2018
Moved P Williams seconded S Lewis
THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Community
Board meeting, held on 13 June 2018, as a true and accurate record.
CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
Nil.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
5.1 Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager) provided members with
an update on roading maintenance priorities for 2018-2019 and sought any
comments on the current schedule of works. J McBride advised that there
were separate budgets for both kerb and channel and walking and cycling
programmes. Further information would be presented to the Board in due
course. J McBride explained the technical assessment and rationale used to
prioritise the maintenance of roads and footpaths, also noting that there was
coordination with 3 Waters to achieve further efficiencies through undertaking
work at the same time. J McBride sought any feedback on the programme by
27 July 2018.

J Gerard advised J McBride that the Board had requested consideration of a
new footpath on Coldstream Road. J McBride advised that this had been
noted and would be assessed as part of a review of new footpaths/walkways.
P Williams queried kerb and channel replacement and how this was prioritised as compared with the installation of new kerb and channel, noting a number of examples.

J McBride advised that the Council funded maintenance of existing kerb and channel whereas new kerb and channel was funded by NZTA. If installation of new kerb and channel was required it would require the Council to make a formal decision on funding.

P Williams advised that this distinction was not understood by residents who saw renewals of kerb and channel being undertaken when there were roads that did not have any. G Cleary advised that, on occasion, a road may be realigned as part of a new development and in these instances new kerb and channel may be installed subject to a 50% developer contribution which eased the financial burden on the Council. P Williams felt that the Council should consider a budget allocation for such works in the future.

G Cleary advised that this could be on a case by case basis.

K Barnett queried the traffic management plans that would be required for the proposed work in Church Street. J McBride confirmed that plans were in place and that the work would also take place in the school holidays to minimise the impact on traffic. K Barnett also queried the 2019/20 activity for Ivory Street/Buckham Street and the turn into Queen Street and whether there would also be some improvements undertaken at the same time. J McBride advised that work was underway to consult with a number of properties in the area with a view to a possible redesign. K Barnett asked whether the overall Maintenance Programme was publicised or could be found on the Council’s website. Staff advised that the programme was presented to the Utilities and Roading Committee and would review additional public availability options on the website.

D Lundy addressed the ‘Other General Categories’ activities and in particular the road flanking for shingle roads. The standard of some shingle roads is not good and they can be badly affected by rain/flooding. J McBride advised that this is a separate budget in conjunction with Sicon and that she would raise D Lundy’s concerns with them. D Lundy advised that the flanking programme seemed to be a little behind and was exacerbating the situation.

5.2 Trevor Ellis (Development Planning Manager) provided members with a copy of the Council’s District Development Strategy (DDS) and outlined a number of key areas within the document and the process that had been undertaken to date. He advised that population modelling had been undertaken with the Greater Christchurch partners. Areas of note included the projected 15,000 increase in households in the District over the next 30 years and the implications of this for residential dwellings, businesses and infrastructure. Key townships of Rangiora, Kaiapoi and the expansion of north Woodend would see the bulk of the growth. T Ellis also noted the issues raised regarding 4Ha sections including the loss of large areas of fertile land as well as commercial use of the sections that was permissible under the current District Plan. Feedback from the community was that change was needed. Staff have commissioned work on the definition of rural character which suggests that the 4Ha section may be unsustainable in the longer term and should be redefined. Rangiora will grow over the next 30 years and the current ‘town limits’ appear valid. Further work is commencing on detailed planning, housing density, subdivisions, new roads and infrastructure. The Draft District Plan will be notified in late 2020 and will include proposals for new zoning in particular for the north east and west of Rangiora.

J Gerard queried next steps. T Ellis referred to the action plan contained within the DDS identifying spatial planning for residential and businesses. Staff are also working on the communications plan and the process going forward.

D Lundy commented that any proposed alteration to the 4Ha minimum would have the potential to affect existing land owners who may be planning to...
subdivide and who may find themselves unable to do this in the future if the District Plan provision altered. T Ellis concurred.

M Clarke asked if sea level rise had been considered and T Ellis advised that it had and that it was a particular issue for Kaiapoi. The government has issued new guidance which is being considered and will affect how growth is managed in areas that are potentially affected.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

Nil.

7 REPORTS

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

O Davies provided members with an overview of the report which was in response to the Board’s request (16 May 2018) that staff reconsider the original design option with specific reference to the recently installed Hegan Reserve bridge.

An estimate of $20,000 had been received from the same designer and staff believed that this was a fair and appropriate figure. Staff had also provided responses to queries that had been raised by D Gordon who could not attend for this item.

J Hoult was pleased with the revised bridge design and queried whether the bridge was to be known as Crayfish, Koura or both. O Davies advised that staff were considering display/information panels for the reserve area as a whole, but were also mindful of the need to protect the rare freshwater crayfish. Koura would be the preferred name.

J Hoult also expressing concern at the need to protect the crayfish.

Moved G Miller seconded J Hoult

THAT the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180627071243.

(b) Approves acceptance of quotation of $20,000, from Andrew Russell Ltd for construction of a new footbridge over Crayfish Creek, similar to the existing Hegan Reserve footbridge.

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

CARRIED

G Miller expressed his strong support for the bridge and for it to proceed as soon as possible.

J Hoult was very pleased with the Hegan Reserve bridge and stated that this new bridge would be equally good.

7.2 Parking Restrictions at Oxford Road Charles Upham Drive Acacia Avenue Intersection and on Charles Upham Drive – Bill Rice (Senior Transport Engineer)

J McBride provided an overview of the report.
K Galloway queried if the current 50km/h speed limit on Oxford Road could be extended beyond Lehmans Road. J McBride advised that this was included for consideration in the current speed limit review. The urbanisation of Oxford Road north of Lehmans Road, including the kerb and channel should encourage lower speed.

K Galloway queried when Charles Upham Drive was to be extended and J McBride advised that this was dependent on the developer.

Moved P Williams seconded S Lewis

THAT the Rangiora Ashley Community Board recommends:

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180628071686.

(b) Adopts the attached Amended Second Schedule – Parking Restrictions to the Parking Bylaw 2007 (TRIM No 180629072243)

(c) Notes that other safety concerns at the Oxford Road, Acacia Avenue, Charles Upham Drive intersection are to be addressed in the Oxford Road urbanisation project

(d) Notes that further parking restrictions may be required on Oxford Road to accommodate right turn bays at the intersection

(e) Notes that further parking restrictions may be required on the roading network north of the Charles Upham village vehicle entrance. These will be added to the parking bylaw second schedule when this section of road is vested in Council.

CARRIED

P Williams was pleased to support the proposal to improve safety.

S Lewis had spoken to a resident at Rymans and was pleased to support the proposals.

7.3 Lineside Road Kerb Extension – Kieran Straw (Civil Project Team Leader) and Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager)

J McBride advised the Board that although Option 2 was being recommended it should be noted that this proposed extension of the existing kerb and channel would not match with that on the opposite side of the road. She had discussed the matter with the Greenspace team, noting that this was a main town entrance and also that the Board had allocated significant funds for beautification of the entrance area once the kerb and channel had been installed.

Greenspace would prefer the kerb and channel to extend a further 25m to that currently proposed in Option 2 to protect the plantings and match with the other side of the road. J McBride advised that funding was available and that the Board could therefore consider an extension of 96 metres at a cost of $33,800.

J Gerard thanked J McBride and staff for all their hard work on the entranceway project over the last few years and believed that it would be helpful to match both sides and also take the advice from the Greenspace team as regards the added protection for the extensive range of trees and plantings.

He stated that the extension to 96m met the Board's expectation and concurred with previous advice from the roading team. K Galloway had visited the site and sought further clarification of how the proposed extension would benefit and protect the plantings. J McBride advised that the extension of the kerb and channel by 96m would prevent cars from parking or driving onto the
garden/planted area and enable shrubs to be planted closer to the road that would otherwise be permitted. It would also prevent bark and soil from getting on to the roadway.

J Gerard commenting that this was a significant road and entranceway to the town and that there had been ongoing issues with parked cars and driving onto the grass verges.

R Brine asked if it would be possible to speak to the new business owners adjacent to the area to prevent cars being parked in the vicinity. J McBride said that the new owners were proposing to landscape the area and were already in discussion to make sure the berm and other areas were tidy.

P Williams queried if the historic issue with parked cars was still continuing. G Cleary advised that bollards had been installed which had helped.

J Hoult commented on whether plantings on the new cycleways could be considered. J McBride confirmed that these were part of the town entrance project.

Moved J Gerard seconded P Williams

THAT the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 180627071216;
(b) Approves the implementation of the extension of kerb and channel for a distance of 96 metres at the entrance to Rangiora on Lineside Road.
(c) Notes that Management Team approval for expenditure has been granted, subject to a decision on the preferred option from the Board.
(d) Notes that physical works will be carried out under existing Contract 17/32: Kerb & Channel Renewals 2017/18 as a variation to the value of $33,800 excluding GST, and receives a NZTA subsidy rate of 51%.
(e) Notes that this project will be funded from the 2018/19 Minor Improvements budget.
(f) Notes that the agreed landscaping treatment previously approved by the Board will be completed after the installation of the kerb and channel.

CARRIED

J Gerard stated that he was pleased to support this last element of the town entrance beautification which had been supported by the Board for many years. The Board had invested the majority of its General Landscaping budget over the last few years towards landscaping and that this would now be protected by the extension of the kerb and channel and for it to match with the other side of the road. He thanked staff for all their work to bring the project to fruition.

P Williams agreed 100% that it was imperative to undertake the work and that this was the main entrance to Rangiora. He would like to see further work to the other entrances in due course.

D Lundy expressed his support for the work. He believed it was essential or the council to be seen to lead by example and that this would then encourage business to follow and result in a more beautiful town and surroundings.
7.4 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2018/2019 and General Landscaping Fund 2018/2019 - Edwina Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

E Cordwell gave a brief overview of the report including the agreement by members, at their workshop on 16 May 2018, that applications should be considered monthly rather than bi-monthly to encourage applications from eligible groups and improve the speed of decisions.

D Lundy queried how newly formed groups could be supported and the scope of the financial balance sheet that is required under the rules.

J Millward advised that groups did not have to provide formally audited accounts as this is extremely expensive, but do need to show that they are trustworthy and that some form of approval and authentication of the accounts has taken place. Groups would still be eligible even if they were in their first year of activity if they met the general criteria.

D Lundy responded that it was good to support new groups.

M Clarke advised that the former Advisory Boards had a scheme to assist fledgling groups with a grant of up to $250.

K Barnett reiterated that the cost of engaging accountants to audit accounts was very costly. J Millward agreed and that it was not something that chartered accountants usually engaged with and could cost between $4,000 and $5,000.

Moved P Williams seconded J Hoult

THAT the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180627051204.

(b) Notes that the Board’s General Landscaping Budget allocated by the Council for 2018/19 is $24,320 with a carry forward of $1,840 from 2017/2018 making a total of $26,160.

(c) Notes that the Board’s Discretionary Grant Funding allocated by the Council for 2018/2019 is $10,400.

(d) Approves the Board’s 2018/2019 Discretionary Grant Fund Application Criteria and Application Form (Trim No.180627071240).

(e) Approves the Board’s 2018/2019 Discretionary Grant Accountability Form (Trim No. 180621068982).

(f) Approves that Discretionary Grant Fund applications be considered at each meeting for the 2018/2019 financial year (July 2018 to June 2019).

CARRIED

J Hoult commented on the difficulties and cost of auditors for small groups and mentioned the recent experiences of the Timebank group when seeking accreditation.

7.5 Application to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2018/2019 – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

E Cordwell took the report as read.

Moved K Galloway seconded G Miller

THAT the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180628071747.
(b) Approves a grant of $410 to North Canterbury Model Railway Club Inc. towards the cost of signage to promote the club’s Rangiora Sunday Markets.

K Galloway had only recently become aware of the group and all the work that they were doing and had also attended the Sunday Market and the club’s train and track layout or children. He believed it was important to support the group’s fundraising activities. The market was good for Rangiora.

J Gerard stated that he was not in support. He believed that the application for funding for advertising did not meet the funding criteria as it was to support an activity whose primary benefit was for the stall holders and not for the club itself. The club was only receiving $10 per stall and was unlikely to generate any substantial amount of capital towards the proposed ‘new premise’ project.

K Barnett respected J Gerard’s reasoning as regards the signs would not benefit the club directly. However, she was extremely supportive of the market initiative, the club and stall holders and that it is a community market and that it is not a commercial activity. There is a need to attract visitors to enable the community market to establish itself and for its contribution to be valued.

K Galloway exercised his right of reply and supported K Barnett’s comments. He reiterated that the club was trying to get a market up and running and that Rangiora needed a market as well as encouraging and supporting the club itself.

7.6 Approval of the updated Rangiora-Ashley Community Board Plan 2018/19 – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

E Cordwell took the report as read.

K Barnett offered to send through any comments.

K Galloway queried how the plan is to be monitored and outcomes reviewed.

J Millward advised that this was a separate process and would consist of an end of year report from the Board to the Council.

J Gerard agreed that it would be helpful to review progress at the end of the year.

Moved K Galloway seconded D Lundy

THAT the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180627071424.

(b) Approves the final draft of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board Plan 2018-2019 (Trim 180528058516) subject to any minor edits discussed and approved by the Board Chairperson.

(c) Notes that an ‘end of year’ report will be prepared.

CARRIED

8 CORRESPONDENCE

Moved P Williams seconded J Gerard

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:
Waimakariri District Council Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018

(a) Receives the decision letter regarding the Board’s submission to the Draft Stormwater Drainage Bylaw 2018. (Trim 180619067670).

CARRIED

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chair’s Diary for June 2018

Moved J Gerard seconded K Galloway

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180703073773.

CARRIED

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 7 June 2018 (Trim No. 180530059840).

10.2 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 11 June 2018 (Trim No. 180606062391).

10.3 Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 21 May 2018 (Trim No. 180518054887).

10.4 Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 18 June 2018 (Trim No. 180618067116).

10.5 Youth Council meeting minutes – 29 May 2018


10.11 Adoption of Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018 – report to Council 1 May 2018 (Trim No. 180329034013).

Moved M Clarke seconded D Lundy

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.11.

CARRIED

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

11.1 M Clarke

∑ Attended Waimakariri Health Advisory Group meeting (WHAG), hardly a quorum attended. Terms of Reference are under review and seeking new members. Received report on Mental Health.

∑ Attended Central Drainage Advisory Group with D Lundy.
Followed up on resident’s problem with culvert, staff addressing.

11.2 **J Hoult**

- Noted that Timebank incorporation is progressing well and application lodged.
- Attended North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support meeting.
- Noted that the Te Reo classes supported by WDC are great fun and help build confidence.

11.3 **S Lewis**

- Attended free concert organised by the Friends of Rangiora Town Hall noting that this was a fantastic event.
- Did not undertake the Big Splash this year but attended to support those that did. Congratulated everyone.
- Attended Oxford Lights Festival which was a great local night out with the Museum well attended.
- Big Pink Breakfast raised between $3,000 and $5,000 for Breast Cancer.
- Attended Rangiora-Woodend Path opening noting the links to other cycling and walking tracks.
- Initial 5 week course of the Learner Driver project has just finished. Nine low income background students attended, aged 17 plus and all passed. Five mentors including S Lewis had met the families. Life changing for the youngsters with Police Inspector Peter Cooper presenting certificates to the youngsters and their mentors.

11.4 **G Miller**

- Attended the Rangiora-Woodend Path opening. Noted that the berm between the cycle path and the road had been damaged by vehicles which was disappointing.
- Keep Rangiora Beautiful had met in June and undertaking planting in various locations.

11.5 **P Williams**

- Had dealt with a range of issues raised by residents.
- Working with staff to understand more detail on the implications of the Government’s water treatment standards and the impact on the District’s supplies and whether chlorine treatment could be necessary.

11.6 **K Barnett**

- Advised of the recent Council decision to establish the process going forward for the Multi-Use Sports Stadium due for completion in 2020.
- Attended Migrant Stories event at the Rangiora Town Hall.
- Also attended the opening of the Rangiora-Woodend Path and was also concerned about the vehicle damage to the berms.
- Did the Big Splash and raised $451.10 for Rangiora Stroke Club and also won $100 donation which went to Big brothers Big Sisters.

11.7 **D Gordon**

- Canterbury Clinical Network is reviewing the afterhours care model and sustainable service delivery. Consultation with doctors in the District is taking place, prior to further consultation with the general public. It is intended to present the proposed model to the Canterbury District Health Board in April 2019.
∑ Met with residents at Ryman/Charles Upham Retirement Village regarding road safety near the complex. Staff arranging for additional road markings and No Parking with a report to the Board in due course.

∑ Attended the Friends of Rangiora Town Hall concert.

∑ Attended Rangiora Airfield meeting.

∑ Rotary donated seating and water fountain installed in Conway Lane.

11.8 D Lundy

∑ Attended the opening of the Rangiora-Woodend Path.

∑ Noted that some plants are dying in the pond area of the Loburn Reserve.

∑ Noted that staff time may be taken up with responding to issues rather than being able to undertake maintenance activities to prevent such occurrences.

17.9 K Galloway

∑ Concerned about the safety at the traffic island in Epson Drive.

∑ The Lions had commenced the installation of the shelters in the Milton dog park.

∑ Had followed up with staff on creek bank erosion at Wiltshire Crescent which has been addressed.

17.10 R Brine

∑ Provided an overview of the implementation of the Kerb Collection – 3 Bin system. Households completing forms to indicate their service preference.

∑ This was a topic at the upcoming LGNZ Conference with implications for the WDC budget if the Government’s proposal to increase the Waste Levy are implemented.

J Gerard queried whether there were any plans to phase in the ‘switch over’ to mitigate the effect on the existing private operators. R Brine advised that the uptake was not yet clear as not all response had been received and there was still detailed work to do.

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

Business Zones 1 & 2 Public Spaces Policy

Consultation closes Monday 30 July 2018.


13 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

13.1 Board Discretionary Grant

Balance as at 6 June 2018: $10,400.

13.2 General Landscaping Fund

Balance as at 6 June 2018: $26,160 (including carry forward).
14 MEDIA ITEMS

15 MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Moved J Gerard    seconded D Lundy

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>15.1</td>
<td>Raymond Qu (Property Assets Advisor) and Rob Hawthorne (Property Manager)</td>
<td>Proposed Sale Process</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>15.1</td>
<td>To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED
CLOSE MEETING

Resolution to Resume in Open Meeting

Moved J Gerard seconded D Lundy

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

CARRIED

OPEN MEETING

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 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Wednesday 12 September 2018 in the Council Chambers at the Rangiora Service Centre.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 9.40pm.

CONFIRMED

__________________
Chairperson

__________________
Date
Workshop

Members Forum 9.40pm to 9.50pm

Concerns raised about cars parking on Flaxton Road and possibility of going into the ditch. J Millward advised that kerb and channel was programmed for 2018/19.

K Barnett sought advice on the context for the Dudley Park Management Plan and arrangements for warm up area for the netball club. J Gerard advised that K Barnett contact C Brown Greenspace Manager.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE KAIAPOI-TUAHIWI COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN MEETING ROOM 1 (UPSTAIRS), RUATANIWA KAIAPOI CIVIC CENTRE,
176 WILLIAMS STREET, KAIAPOI ON MONDAY 16 JULY 2018 COMMENCING AT
4.00PM.

PRESENT
J Watson (Chairperson), C Greengrass, R Blair, M Pinkham and P Redmond.

IN ATTENDANCE
Councillor J Meyer.
S Markham, (Manager Strategy and Engagement), D Haussman (Media and Visual
Communications Coordinator), J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager), T Ellis
(Development Planning Manager), E Cordwell (Governance Advisor), and A Smith
(Committee Advisor)

1 APOLOGIES
Moved J Watson seconded C Greengrass
THAT apologies for absence be received and sustained from A Blackie, Board
Members N Atkinson and S Stewart.

CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
There were no conflicts of interest recorded.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board – 18 June 2018

Moved J Watson seconded P Redmond
THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community
Board meeting, held 18 June 2018, as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
Reference to Item 7.1 Building (Earthquake Prone Buildings) Amendment Act 2016,
and the possibility of reinforcement of the Ranfurly Street parapet of the former
Kaiapoi Mill Building. It was noted that there is significant work required on this
parapet. There was discussion at the June 2018 Board meeting on moving the
footpath to the other side of Ranfurly Street and it was agreed that an update will be
emailed to Board members on this situation.
5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

5.1 Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager) provided an update on roading priorities for 2018-2019.

J McBride advised she will be speaking to all the Boards regarding the proposed 2018/19 Roading Capital Works programme and the indicative programme from 2019/20 to 2021/2022 which are part of the general allocation in the Council’s Long Term Plan (LTP). This excludes major Roading Improvement projects that are specifically listed in the LTP as these are consulted on through the LTP process. Categories included are kerb and channel renewal; footpath renewal; minor improvements; and new footpaths.

J McBride is also seeking feedback from each Board up to the 27 July on all the proposed additions to the 2019/2022 Roading Capital Works Programme. A copy of this document was circulated to all members. J McBride also responded to a document circulated by Board Member M Pinkham, listing proposed additions to the 2019/22 roading capital works programme in the Board’s area, most of which the Board has previously submitted on. J McBride responded to each of these, as follows:

Tuahiwi Road (Bramleys to Greens Roads) – this will be workshoped with the Board.

Ohoka Road (between overbridge and Williams Street) – right turn bay into Robert Coup Road and the reinstatement of cycle lanes from Otaki Street to Williams Street)

Cridland Street west – the kerb and channel is in poor condition – J McBride advised she will check and confirm what the condition rating is for this area. This was not part of a submission to the LTP and would need to go to Council to request funding.

Coups Terrace, south side – this kerb and channel and footpath replacement work has been completed.

Sims Road, north side – this work will need to be put into the work programme. Footpath currently in poor condition.

Fuller Street - noted the $500,000 walking and cycling budget and this could be added into this programme.

Ohoka Road landscaping – this submission has been addressed by the Greenspace team and is a swale. It is a condition of the ECan discharge consent to keep the swale mowed.

Paper Road north of Beach Road – this will open up a link between Kaiapoi North School and Brocklebank Road – this could be opened as part of the walking and cycling strategy. Anticipated that developments will commence at Christmas time. Staff will work with the school to determine their requirements and the school will be forming a shared walkway. This is a popular access from the school. It will be taken right through to Brocklebank Road in future years.

Island Road – Joanne advised that she is finalising the completion of the works in that area.

Members thanked Board member Martin Pinkham for preparing the list of items that J McBride had referred to above.

M Pinkham asked is there a programme in place for the walking and cycling strategy? J McBride advise this will be available in two months’ time, and she will come back to speak to the Board about this.

The Chairperson thanked J McBride for her presentation, suggesting it would be good to have the cycling paths done as soon as possible as they are popular tracks.
5.2 **Trevor Ellis (Development Planning Manager) and Simon Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement)** will provide an update regarding the District Development Strategy (DDS).

Copies of the DDS were distributed to each Board member and T Ellis provided a summary on the consultation process that had been undertaken. It was noted that the key thing for the District Plan is where growth in the district is housed, and this picks up on the existing towns’ approach (Kaiapoi, Oxford and Rangiora). In the ten year horizon, population growth is earmarked mostly for Kaiapoi and Rangiora.

Regarding other land use options, Business zone land is always the most difficult to determine. There is sufficient land zoned Industrial to meet demand in the medium timeframe. Areas such as Southbrook is the place where that type of activity will go.

Currently there is no area that is zoned to accommodate Big Box retailers and staff are working to make sure the District Plan works as well as it can.

A brief outline of key changes was provided, noting that Kaiapoi is summarised as a key location for growth.

Question from R Blair regarding the Smith Street development – are there any further developments on particular retailers coming to this area? Mr Markham advised that there has been enquiries regarding this and noted that the establishment of any such retailers would require a Plan Change. It was agreed that the Planning Manager M Bacon will provide an update to the Board on this matter.

P Redmond questioned the 4ha rule and asked if it was likely there would be any potential changes to this? T Ellis advised that staff are working with consultants looking at opportunities for potentially smaller sized lots in the fringe areas of smaller towns. Mr Markham added that one of the pluses of having smaller sized lots is to identify the transition between rural and urban areas. Any future developments need to consider if there will be rezoning of the smaller lots at some future dates. From previous experience with similar developments, some residents approve of the further rezoning into smaller lots and some are not in favour of this. M Pinkham added that here have been problems with rural residential areas on the fringes of towns in the district in the past, when new owners move in, circumstances change and then residents want changes to the services available.

M Pinkham sought an update on the Ashley River Stopbanks protecting Kaiapoi. Mr Markham noted the “closing the gaps” of the stop bank at Cones Road, Rangiora. This is to protect the populated areas should there be a risk of river break-out flowing south west and flowing towards Rangiora. This is part of the natural hazards work to be considered, taking into account climate change. Localised flooding and river breakout will be taken into account. Some work has been done in the coastal area as well. Further information will be brought back to the Council in August on this matter.

M Pinkham noted disappointment that the DDS did not address how the transport network will respond to the development. Mr Markham acknowledged M Pinkham’s comment and said there will be further work on transport interactions and that the Council will be working with the government and other partners on what strategic networks are required and how they will be funded. There needs to be much more focus on intra-district roading networks between towns.
J Meyer noted that ECan are doing a lot of work with the Cones Road stop bank and also provided an update on gravel extraction from the Ashley riverbed.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
There was no adjourned business.

7 REPORTS

7.1 Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2018/2019 and General Landscaping Fund 2018/2019 - Edwina Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

This report was taken as read.

Moved J Watson seconded P Redmond

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180627051204.

(b) Notes that the Board’s General Landscaping Budget allocated by the Council for 2018/19 is $24,320 with a carry forward of $60,080 from 2017/2018 making a total of $84,400.

(c) Notes that the Board’s Discretionary Grant Funding allocated by the Council for 2018/2019 is $6,000 and that the indicative carry forward from 2017/2018 is $1,161.

(d) Approves the Board’s 2018/2019 Discretionary Grant Fund Application Criteria and Application Form (Trim No. 1806271241).

(e) Approves the Board’s 2018/2019 Discretionary Grant Accountability Form (Trim No. 180621068882).

(f) Approves that Discretionary Grant Fund applications be considered at each meeting for the 2018/2019 financial year (July 2018 to June 2019).

CARRIED

7.2 Approval of the updated Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board Plan 2018/19 – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

E Cordwell presented this report, noting that with the Board’s approval, she will work with the Chairperson for minor edits. It was noted that the Chief Executive had also assisted and provided updated information on the status of projects. There has been a resequencing of the items within this document as from the previous edition of the Plan. E Cordwell called for any feedback from the Board members to be emailed through to her. Members suggested some corrections for the document and these were noted by E Cordwell.

Moved J Watson seconded R Blair

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(g) Receives report No. 180627071450.
Approves the final draft of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board Plan 2018-2019 (Trim 180606062304) subject to any minor edits discussed and approved by the Board Chairperson.

CARRIED

8 CORRESPONDENCE

Moved J Watson seconded C Greengrass

THAT the Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board:

(i) Receives the decision letter regarding the Board’s submission to the Draft Stormwater Drainage Bylaw 2018. (Trim 180619067635).

(j) Receives the Memo, Cherry Tree Removals – Mansfield Subdivision, from Greg Barnard (Parks Community Asset Officer), (previously circulated), (Trim 18070607511).

CARRIED

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chair’s Diary for June-July 2018

Moved J Watson seconded P Redmond

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(k) Receives report No. 180709075951.

CARRIED

10 MATTERS REFERRED FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 7 June 2018 (Trim No. 180530059840).

10.2 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 11 June 2018 (Trim No. 180606062391).

10.3 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 13 June 2018 (Trim No. 180606062470).

10.4 Youth Council meeting minutes – 29 May 2018.


10.9 Adoption of Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018 – report to Council 1 May 2018 (Trim No 180329034013).

Moved R Blair 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.

P Redmond

23 June – attended opening of Rangiora Woodend Path.
25 June – attended meeting of Kaiapoi Promotions Association which included an update on regeneration matters and there was a chance for any questions to be answered. There wasn’t a big attendance at this meeting.
2 July – attended Regeneration Steering Group meeting
3 July – attended the Waimakariri Health Advisory Group meeting. This group are currently reviewing their Terms of Reference
14 – 15 July – Attended the Kaiapoi Art Expo which was a great success.

P Redmond also congratulated Blackwells on the successful Fire and Ice exhibition held over the weekend.

P Redmond noted his previous Notice of Motion and that a report was to be received on the temporary Christmas lighting in the town of Kaiapoi. The Chief Executive had provided advice that a consultant’s report was still awaited. P Redmond asked, if the report became available in the near future, could the Board hold an Extraordinary meeting to discuss this matter, rather than wait until the next scheduled Board meeting on 20 August? It was advised that the Chief Executive will come back to the Board soon on this matter. P Redmond was concerned that there may not be enough time to review any suggested options to achieve temporary Christmas lighting for 2018/19. P Redmond also noted that banners and decorations had been purchased by Kaiapoi Promotions Association for previous festive seasons, but where these are now, is yet to be determined. M Pinkham responded that these decorations had been used over previous festive seasons and some were now showing the wear and tear of exposure to the elements during this use over previous seasons.

Martin Pinkham

23 June – attended the opening of the Rangiora-Woodend Path. Noted some disappointment at the Woodend end of the path, but it was advised that further mapping out of pathways is to be done. Mr Markham said this will be looked at as part of the intra-district connections and patterns of movement.
25 June – attended the North Canterbury Wellbeing Trust meeting
2 July – attended Regeneration Steering Group meeting
11 July – attended the Kaiapoi Promotions Association committee meeting – which included discussion on the Christmas parade
M Pinkham noted that he had submitted on the Northern Corridor and Cranford Street route in Christchurch City.

John Meyer

Noted the district wide footpath replacement programme and encouraged Board members to look through this and to advise if there are any other streets that should be included for Kaiapoi. Noted the old gutters between Cass Street and Charles Street, on the eastern side (opposite Cattermoles). This section has been tidied up but still has the old formation.
J Meyer is on the Local Alcohol Policy Review and Alcohol Control Bylaw hearing panel, attended submission hearings on 11 July, with deliberations being held on Friday 27 July.

C Greengrass

2 July - Attended Regeneration Steering Group meeting
July - Attended Kairaki Pines Beach meeting
10 July - Attended the Waimakariri Access Group meeting with new Chair John Wright.

Extended congratulations to J Watson for the successful Kaiapoi Art Expo on the weekend.

Has been meeting with Jude Archer and Sandra James regarding the book on Disaster Social Recovery.

Red Cross Meetings – noted that it is difficult for these groups in small towns to encourage new membership.

Riverside Café had a celebration for five years in business, run by the Person to Person Help Trust. C Greengrass has been involved in discussions on what the aging community will look like in five years’ time.

Attended the Kaiapoi District Historical Society meeting and noted that the members of the committee would like to see the sundial back in place.

R Blair

9 July – attended Darnley Club meeting – the Club has purchased a robust wheelchair. There was discussion on the current mini-bus as this was purchased new in 2011 and looking ahead to when this will need to be replaced. There are currently no issues with it, but the years and use of it are increasing. The AGM for the Darnley Club is to be held on Monday 27 August at 1.30pm.

Neighbourhood Support meeting, today 16 July – spent some time meeting on the Strategic Plan. The Get Ready programme is working well. Members of Neighbourhood Support discussed the programme “Down the Back Paddock” and members questioned the value for money of this programme. R Blair provided an update on the Neighbourhood Support groups being established in Kaikoura and Hurunui. There is a Civil Defence exercise to be held at the Woodend Community Centre commencing at 7.30pm on Friday 27 July 2018.

Regarding the Signage Committee – it was agreed that members will be advised when there will be any meeting planned for this group.

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

Business Zones 1 & 2 Public Spaces Policy
Consultation closes Monday 30 July 2018.

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:

Submissions open on 6 August and will close on 3 September. A copy of the Plan will be made available to members once it has been finalised. E Cordwell suggested the Board may wish to submit on this process and the Board members get together on 20 August at 3pm, prior to the next Board meeting as a group to discuss this submission.
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 6 August 2018. This meeting is open to the public.

14 **BOARD FUNDING UPDATE**

14.1 **Board Discretionary Grant**

Balance as at 16 July 2018: $6000.

14.2 **General Landscaping Budget**

Balance as at 16 July 2018: $84,400 (including carry forward).

15 **MEDIA ITEMS**

Board Members extended congratulations to the organising committee on the success of the Kaiapoi Art Expo held on the weekend of 14-15 July. J Watson (Vice Chairman of the Waimakariri Arts Trust), noted that there was $45,000 worth of art sold over the weekend and 5,000 people attended.

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 20 August 2018 at the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 5.15pm.

CONFIRMED

_________________________
Chairperson

_________________________
Date
Workshop

∑ Members Forum
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR INFORMATION

FILE NO: GOV-18 / 180720081108
REPORT TO: Council
DATE OF MEETING: 7 August 2018
FROM: David Ayers, Mayor
SUBJECT: Mayor’s Diary 25 June – 30 July

1. SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday 25 June</td>
<td>Mayors Professional Development Advisory Group – phone conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 28 June</td>
<td>Opening of new parsonage for Kaiapoi Cooperating Parish – Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead attended on my behalf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 1 July</td>
<td>Launch of Migrants Story – Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead attended on my behalf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 1 July</td>
<td>Canterbury Justice of the Peace Centenary – Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead attended on my behalf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 1 June</td>
<td>North Canterbury News – David Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 2 July</td>
<td>Kaiapoi High School Chinese Students visit – Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead attended on my behalf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 3 July</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 4 July</td>
<td>Meeting with Rural Canterbury PHO Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting re Mill Road subdivision in Ohoka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury Museum Working Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting with Northern Bulldogs Rugby League Club, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 5 July</td>
<td>Met Jon and Rachel Hales, Kaiapoi Riverside Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting re Canterbury Landscape Supplies (Eyrewell)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 6 July</td>
<td>Citizenship Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Canterbury News – David Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 9 July</td>
<td>Canterbury Museum Redevelopment Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury Museum Trust Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodend Seton Community Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 10 July</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 11 July</td>
<td>Attended Community Coffee Morning, Pegasus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora Ashley Community Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 13 July</td>
<td>Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with David Hill, North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended Waimakariri Art Expo Opening, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 14 July</td>
<td>Attended Waimakariri Winter Festival ice carving and night market,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 15 July</td>
<td>Attended Seafarers Service, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christchurch Seafarers Service – Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attended on my behalf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 15 – 17 July</td>
<td>LGNZ Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 18 July</td>
<td>GNS Science Research delivery – meeting with Kelvin Berryman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended Waimakariri Water Zone Committee Nitrate Consultation -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 19 July</td>
<td>Te Ngāi Tū Ahuriri Rūnanga Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended Waimakariri Water Zone Committee Nitrate Consultation -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solid &amp; Hazardous Waste Working Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 20 July</td>
<td>CREDS Project Meeting – improving productivity project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 21 July</td>
<td>Attended Waimakariri Winter Festival and market, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 23 July</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill, North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 24 July</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 25 July</td>
<td>ENC Board Meeting, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waimakariri Hockey Turf Naming Function, MainPower Hockey Turf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora Promotions Wednesday Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended Waimakariri Water Zone Committee Nitrate Consultation -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 26 July</td>
<td>On-site meeting re fords on Perhams Road, View Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tertiary Education Commission consultation meeting re future of Polytech sector, Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENC Business Networking Event, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohoka Residents Association AGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 27 July</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill, North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registered Master Builders Awards Dinner, Wigram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 29 July</td>
<td>Miss Lilly’s Angels Charity Luncheon, Woodend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 30 July</td>
<td>Attended Waimakariri Water Zone Committee Briefing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THAT** the Council:

a) **Receive**s report No. 180720081108

David Ayers
**MAYOR**