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RANGIORA-ASHLEY COMMUNITY BOARD

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

RECOMMENDATIONS IN REPORTS ARE NOT TO BE CONSTRUED AS COUNCIL POLICY UNTIL ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL

BUSINESS

1 APOLOGIES

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board – 11 April 2018

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting, held on 11 April 2018, as a true and accurate record.

(b) Receives the circulated minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Road and Reserve naming Committee, held on 4 April 2018.

4 MATTERS ARISING

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

Nil.
7 REPORTS

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

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

(a) **Receives** report No. 180504048871.

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

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

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

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

(f) **Recommends** to the Council that the Water Supply Advisory Group comprises:
   - 4-6 Volunteer representatives from the Garrymere water supply
   - 2 members of the Rangiora Ashley Community Board
   - Councillor Williams as portfolio holder for water and wastewater
   - Council’s Water Asset Manager and 3 Waters Manager (or Manager Utilities & Roading)
   - 1 representative from the CDHB (Drinking Water Assessor), if agreeable,

   And that the Advisory Group be directed to report its recommendations to Council in by June 2019.

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

(h) **Notes** that the current programme is based on the project being funded entirely from the Garrymere water supply scheme members.
7.2 Crayfish (Koura) Creek Pedestrian Footbridge – Owen Davies (Drainage Asset Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180502047945.

(b) Approves the design of the proposed footbridge in the location shown in Crayfish Creek Footbridge, Site Plan 3802, for an estimated cost of $56,000 (refer attachment i).

(c) Notes that construction of the footbridge will be tendered and is currently planned to be completed before 30 June 2018.

(d) Circulates this report to the Utilities and Roading Committee for their information.

7.3 Ratification of the Board’s Submission to the Waimakariri District Council’s Long Term Plan 2018-2028 – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180328033649.

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

8 CORRESPONDENCE

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chair’s Diary for April 2018

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180508049899.

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

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

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

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

10.4 Youth Council meeting minutes – 27 March 2018


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

10.10 **20 February 2018 Storm Event** Report to Council 3 April 2018 (Trim No. 180322031170).

*THAT* the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.10.

**Note:** Matters for Information were circulated separately to members.

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.

12 **CONSULTATION PROJECTS**

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


13 **REGENERATION PROJECTS**

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


14 **BOARD FUNDING UPDATE**

14.1 **Board Discretionary Grant**
Balance as at 16 May 2018: $6,264.04.

14.2 **General Landscaping Fund**
Balance as at 16 May 2018: $1,840.

15 **MEDIA ITEMS**

16 **QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**
NEXT MEETING

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

Workshop
- Members Information Exchange review.
- Holiday Trading
- Members Forum

Briefing
- Sparks Lane Reserve – Dan Cameron (Green Space Community Engagement Officer)
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE RANGIORA-ASHLEY ROAD AND RESERVE NAMING COMMITTEE HELD IN THE RAKAHURI COMMITTEE ROOMS, RANGIORA SERVICE CENTRE, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON WEDNESDAY 4 APRIL 2018 AT 3PM.

PRESENT
J Hoult (Chair), K Galloway and J Gerard QSO.

IN ATTENDANCE
S Morrow (Land Information Officer) and E Cordwell (Governance Advisor).

1 APOLOGIES
Moved J Gerard seconded K Galloway
An apology was received and sustained from D Lundy for absence.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Nil.

3 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
Nil.

4 REPORTS
4.1 Road Naming – Freeman Homes Limited – S Morrow (Land Information Officer)
S Morrow spoke briefly to his report. J Gerard queried whether Crescent might be a more appropriate descriptor for the right of way under consideration.
S Morrow advised that Crescent could imply a wider road and might mislead drivers.
K Galloway explored using Mews as a descriptor.

Moved K Galloway seconded J Gerard

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Road and Reserve Naming Committee:
(a) Receives report No 180313026231.
(b) Approves the following new road name for a private Right of Way over Lot 503 DP 506907 as Tutton Mews.

CARRIED
J Gerard noted that although the name ‘Tutton’ was not that of a local resident for the geographical area under consideration he was content to support the motion.

4.2 Road Naming – St Mary’s Investment Limited – S Morrow (Land Information Officer)
S Morrow spoke briefly to his report.
K Galloway felt that the name was very apt and reflected the history of the site as the location of St Mary’s Convent.

Moved K Galloway seconded J Gerard

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Road and Reserve Naming Committee:
(a) Receives report No 180314027138.
(c) Approves the following new road name for a Private Right of Way over Lot 2 DP 29824 as St Marys Lane.

CARRIED

NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Road and Reserve Naming Committee will convene as required.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 3.11PM

CONFIRMED

________________
Chair

________________
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 APRIL 2018 AT 7PM.

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

IN ATTENDANCE
J Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support), T Sturley (Community Team Leader), M Burdon (Community Development Advisor), J McBride (Development Manager, Project Delivery Unit), B Rice (Senior Transport Engineer), G Barnard (Park Community Assets Officer), S Hart (Business and Centres Manager), G Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading), Mayor D Ayers, E Cordwell (Governance Adviser) and E Stubbs (Minute Secretary).

1 APOLOGIES
Nil.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Item 7.2 D Gordon

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board – 14 March 2018
Moved P Williams seconded D Gordon
THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting, held on 14 March 2018, as a true and accurate record.
CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
Nil.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
5.1 Tessa Sturley (Community Team Leader) and Madeline Burdon (Community Development Advisor) provided a brief update on the Kippenberger Estate survey. T Sturley and M Burdon spoke to a PowerPoint presentation and noted a summary and report was circulated to the Board the previous month. The purpose of the survey was to help understand more about the aspirations of those that live in the area and what might assist in enhancing a sense of community and place.

The project was assisted by two student interns over a three month period. The survey was available by hardcopy and online. There was a 54% response rate (102 of 189). Some of the key findings were 73% were interested in meeting other residents, 43% had been there over four years and 60% were over 70 years old. Many residents wanted an area with a playground.

As a follow-up to the survey, where a number of respondents had said that they would like opportunities to meet others, a barbeque was organised where early findings were presented. At the barbeque people had the opportunity to
raise issues and meet with elected members. M Burdon expressed thanks to those elected members who attended.

M Burdon advised that next steps including enhancing connections to benefit residents, looking at transport limitations. University of Canterbury student interns were exploring projects to enhance elderly connection to the wider district and Greenspace would be following up with consultation around the Gordon Reserve development.

M Burdon explained that learnings included seeking advice from key stakeholders around survey methods – for example hardcopy versus online, to share the survey report with all participants in a timely manner so that everyone was on the same page, and the importance of responsiveness – for example the barbeque was held very soon after the survey and had been very valuable as a consequence.

D Gordon asked if there were any service request related matters to be followed up. M Burdon replied that full comments had been passed onto Greenspace and some comments had been passed onto roading.

D Gordon asked if information would be fed into the Older Persons Strategy and M Burdon replied she believed it would need to be.

D Gordon commented that the Kippenberger model had been excellent for engagement and asked if any consideration had been given to rolling it out to other areas. T Sturley advised that M Burdon and W Howe (Community Development Facilitator) were identifying neighbourhoods across the district that were developing and were putting together a systematic plan to address. Alongside Greenspace, two neighbourhood barbeques had been held at Arlington and Oxford Estate which had been successful with good connections developed. Staff had worked with developers at Silverstream and co-hosted events with Neighbourhood Support. The work with YouMeWeUs with welcome bags had been ongoing for a couple of years.

C Prickett noted that 60% had been aged 70 or over and suggested a barbeque might not be so successful with a younger demographic. M Burdon replied it was important to get to know key contacts in an area and discuss with them. Those at Kippenberger Estate had indicated they wished to get to know others. Staff were already involved with community and residents’ associations and supported organisations as required. There were some other types of events such as ‘coffee and chat’ at Waikuku. It was a matter of capacity, resourcing and finding champions in the community. J Gerard commented that he had observed that community barbeques were successful and residents welcomed them.

5.2 J McBride (Development Manager, Project Delivery Unit) G Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading) and Shaun McCracken (Regional Lead, River Engineering, ECan) provided an update on potential stopbank work around the Ashley River. G Cleary advised there had been discussions around options to close the two gaps in the Ashley River Stop banks following the creation of the secondary stopbank to the northern end of Rangiora. The gaps were on Cones Road and Milton Avenue. It had been decided that the best option was to raise the road to close the gaps.

S McCracken spoke to a PowerPoint presentation. He advised that the project had started 10 years ago as a joint venture between ECan and WDC to look at the most vulnerable points and develop a forward management plan. The two most vulnerable points were opposite where the Okuku Stream entered the Ashley River and where the river was squeezed to fit under the Cones Road and Railway bridges. The last time the river had flooded was 1953 and there were half a dozen times prior to that. K Galloway noted that the stopbank had had to be dynamited to prevent further inundation.
S McCracken said that even as the stopbanks were now, there was a certain amount of benefit derived from deflecting the flow, however there could be still water backflow up those roads. The final piece of work was lifting the roads to fully close the gaps. The design they were working with would maintain current speed limits with the design speed for the vertical curve being 110km/hr. Cones Road had a 1.5m change in gradient over 150m. The rise on Millton Avenue was more sizeable at 3m. Other options had been considered including a ‘roller door’ that could temporarily be closed and big piles of shingle and gravel that could be pushed into the gap if needed. Under a risk and resilience analysis the sensible option was to raise the road to maintain access as long as possible.

The tender process would be completed in May 2018 with a start date for construction in June 2018. The construction would be in 3 stages.

1. Upgrade works outside of the road reserve at Taggart Earthworks, June/July.
2. Cones Road raising in July-September. This will require the closure of Cones Road (Millton Road open).
3. Millton Avenue raising in September-November. This will require the closure of Millton Avenue (Cones Road open).

The ‘open’ roads would still be full lane traffic with no need for stop/go. Some big pine trees would need to be removed. J Gerard asked if the stumps could be removed at the same time and S McCracken replied yes.

G Cleary noted that the cycling/walking path on the eastern side of Millton Avenue would be reconstructed and suitable for disabled access as they did not want to create a barrier.

The same presentation would be provided to the Utilities and Roading Committee the following week and G Cleary advised any Board feedback would be passed to the Committee. In May the Council would be asked for approval to proceed. The project was funded by ECan but on Council road, therefore it required Council approval.

J Gerard asked if there would be barriers right across the closed road and G Cleary replied yes, it was fortunate there were two roads.

C Prickett was concerned about the visibility at River Road / Ashley Street corner and suggested there would need to be traffic management. G Cleary noted that at that intersection the only traffic should be turning.

C Prickett noted a low point on Millton Avenue that regularly flooded and asked if that would be addressed at the same time. G Cleary advised that the area relied on soakage, it would be funded by Council and they would have a look to see if there was benefit with the contractors there. C Prickett noted the footbridge would be removed as part of the project.

M Clarke was also concerned with the visibility at River Road / Ashley Street. S McCracken advised that they were planning a phase of public communication before the road closure with joint messaging from ECan and WDC. It would include dates / duration / detours to make as clear as possible.

R Brine asked about sight lines with going up the stopbank, down and then up onto the bridge. S McCracken advised that there had been strong messaging from WDC that vertical curves needed to be very gentle.

D Gordon referred to public communication noting there was increased sensitivity due to closures of the Ashley Bridge previously. He asked if there could be flyers to every household as people did not read advertisements in newspapers. D Gordon asked if the visuals could be improved for the U&R meeting with 3D modelling rather than flat imagery. S McCracken was not confident that would be possible for the following week however he agreed 3D imaging in communications would be valuable.
D Lundy highlighted that the River Road / Cones Road intersection would be congested. He asked who would have right of way. G Cleary advised that would be part of Traffic Management and that decision had not been made. Unless there was good reason it was preferable to leave the control as it was currently. That could be assessed on site and changes made as required.

K Barnett asked if the work would exacerbate water pooling in that area in a general rain event. S McCracken commented it would not make it worse. The plan was for all the catchment north of the stopbank to be captured into soak pits for that triangle. G Cleary commented there may be potential for nuisance ponding to the north but there would be no effect to the south. J McBride commented that the area was good free draining gravels where soakage to ground was effective. D Gordon asked if there would be flooding in the Millton Road Dog Park and G Cleary replied no, they would ensure soakage.

D Gordon noted there was a community event sign and Welcome to Rangiora sign in that vicinity that had been installed at reasonable cost and asked what the impact on those signs would be. G Miller asked if the planting would also be replanted.

S McCracken advised there would be engineering equipment available to relocate the signs at an appropriate location.

C Prickett suggested that the communication with the community should also involve the Hurunui District Council as there were a number of commuters from that district who would also be affected. J McBride concurred and noted they were in contact with the trucking association also.

D Lundy noted that the Rangiora A&P show was in October and K Galloway commented that there would be Christmas traffic in November.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
Nil.

7 REPORTS
7.1 Millton Avenue RDA requested Tree Removals – Greg Barnard (Park Community Assets Officer)

G Barnard spoke to the report advising it related to the request for the removal of three Council owned trees in the area leased to Riding for the Disabled (RDA). RDA had placed a container for tack between two trees. They approached the Council concerned that the trees were unsafe. A Contractor was engaged to undertake tree maintenance on all trees in lease area and work included the removal of two trees considered dangerous and removal of dead wood. The arborists had no concern in relation to tree safety.

Following the work RDA still believed the trees were unsafe and were nervous to have clients around the container. In addition, pine needles falling onto the container caused rust and pine cones fell intermittently. A simple solution was to move the container which was the stance of staff and adhered to policy. G Barnard advised that following completion of the report further information was provided by RDA and through the Board Chair a meeting to discuss on site was arranged with G Barnard, J Gerard (as Board Chair), C Brown (Greenspace Manager) and the Chair of the Equine Trust. The RDA Chair also attended and advised that the container needed to remain in the same place due to ground conditions in the rest of the area, also fences and walkways would need to be moved. The onsite conditions had not been apparent until the site visit.

Although the trees were safe from an aboricultural point of view, they did grow many pinecones, were unattractive and were closer to 50-60 years old than
the initially believed 30 years old. It was likely the two trees to the west would start to deteriorate in the near future (5-15 years).

Following discussion onsite a compromise proposal of removing the two trees to the west and retaining the tree to the east was suggested. Staff still recommended that all three trees remain under Council policy, however if one remained staff considered that a viable compromise.

C Prickett asked why the container had been placed under the trees initially and it was unknown but suggested it may be due to the shade provided by the trees. The ground around the container had changed level and contour following completion of the stopbank and it was difficult to find a level place. J Gerard added there was potential for the container if moved back to get flooded.

J Hoult asked about the cost of shifting the container and G Barnard noted that the RDA had offered to cover the cost of tree removal so it was likely they could also fund any shifting of the container. J Hoult asked if they were aware they could apply for grant to the Board’s Discretionary Fund for cost of shifting and G Barnard said he could advise. J Gerard noted the RDA had taken an inflexible position on relocating the container.

G Miller noted that the trees had been there 60 years and asked how long ago the container had been moved to that position, G Barnard advised it was about 2.5 years ago.

Moved J Gerard seconded D Gordon

**THAT**

- the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board:
  - (a) **Receives** report No. 180327032604.
  - (b) **Approves**
    - i. The retention of the Monterey Pine situated on the north-east side of the container.
    - ii. The removal of the two Monterey Pines situated on the south-west side of the container.
  - (c) **Notes**
    - i. That the tree removal is the responsibility of the Riding for the Disabled.
    - ii. That Riding for the Disabled is to remove the two stumps at the same time as they remove the two trees.

CARRIED

G Miller abstain

J Gerard commented that it was a difficult position and a difficult meeting, G Barnard and C Brown had performed admirably. When he had first read the report he wondered why the container could not be moved. Onsite he could see the container location was the closest, most level site to the dressage arena. The recommendation was partly outside policy, however the board did have discretion. The RDA were good tenants and had carried out beautification and planting projects. The retention of only the attractive tree made sense, and needles would not be dropped on the container roof. He suggested it was a reasonable compromise for all parties. He noted the RDA would replace trees with specimen trees.

D Gordon thanked the Chair for convening the onsite meeting. He was a reluctant supporter of an aesthetic removal but was persuaded by the
compromise. The RDA undertook a lot of good work on the land including extensive planting.

7.2 Application for Rangiora-Ashley Community Board Discretionary Grant 2017/2018 – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

Having previously advised a conflict of interest D Gordon left the room.

E Cordwell advised she would take the report as read, there had been similar requests for the Art Expo in the past.

Moved G Miller seconded K Barnett

THAT the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180327032777.

(b) **Approves** a grant of $500 to the Waimakariri Arts Trust – Kaiapoi Art Expo towards the running costs of the Kaiapoi Art Expo and Schools’ Art Expo, particularly promotional advertising in the Northern Outlook.

CARRIED

K Galloway against

G Miller believed it was money well spent.

K Barnett was pleased to support a district wide event.

K Galloway did not support the application as it was outside the area and he did not want to subsidise an advertisement in the Northern Outlook which he believed was not necessarily a good use of funds or publicity.

G Miller commented that it was a great event that many from Rangiora attended.

7.3 Anzac Day Services 2018 – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

E Cordwell spoke briefly to the report explaining that Councillors were also attending the services at Rangiora High School and Fernside, and that the either/or recommendation allowed the choice for Board members to place a wreath with Councillors or to place their own wreath.

Moved J Gerard seconded D Lundy

THAT the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180326032235.

(b) **Appoints** Board member D Lundy to lay a wreath on behalf of the Board at the Ashley War Memorial on Tuesday 24 April 2018.

(c) **Appoints** Board member K Galloway to attend the ANZAC Day service at Rangiora High School at 9.30am (assemble 9.20am) on Wednesday 25 April 2018 and to lay a wreath on behalf of the Board.

(d) **Appoints** Board Member D Lundy to lay a wreath on behalf of the Board at the Rangiora Cenotaph Service at 11.30am (assemble at RSA 11.15am) on Wednesday 25 April 2017.

(e) **Appoints** Board Member J Hoult to attend the Cust and West Eyreton Anzac Day Parade at 10.00am on Wednesday 25 April 2018 and to lay a wreath at Cust.

(f) **Appoints** Board Member G Miller to attend the Fernside Anzac Day Parade at 10am on Wednesday 25 April 2018 and to lay a wreath on behalf of the Board

CARRIED
M Clarke advised he was available to stand in for another member if they could not attend.

E Cordwell advised she would advise the time for the Ashley War Memorial service and S Nichols would coordinate wreath arrangements.

8 CORRESPONDENCE
Nil.

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT
9.1 Chair’s Diary for March 2018
Moved J Gerard seconded R Brine
THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 18040435207.
CARRIED

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION
10.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 8 March 2018
(Trim No. 180301021620).
10.2 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 12 March 2018
(Trim No. 180306023479).
10.3 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting Extraordinary meeting
minutes – 26 February 2018 (Trim No. 180301021894).
10.4 Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 19 February 2018
(Trim No. 180214015060).
10.5 Youth Council meeting minutes – 27 February 2018
10.6 Library Update Report to Community and Recreation Committee 27 March
2018 (Trim No. 180316028214)
10.7 Lees Road and Barkers, Kaiapoi Road Speed Limit Report to Council 6
March 2018 (Trim No. 180115002738).
10.8 Update on the Management of Council Wastewater Treatment Plants
Report to Council 20 March 2018 (Trim No. 180301021993).
10.9 Poyntzs Road Source Upgrade Project – Consultation Report to Utilities
and Roading Committee 20 March 2018 (Trim No. 180305022630).
10.10 ANZAC Day Services 2018 Report to Council 3 April 2018
(Trim No. 180321030283).
Moved G Miller seconded J Hoult
THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board receives the information in
items 11.1-11.10.
CARRIED

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE
11.1 P Williams
• Had been appointed as the Council’s representative to Waimakariri
  Irrigation Limited.
- Attended three meetings regarding Springbrook subdivision flooding issues.
- Attended Citizens Advice Bureau migrant employment event at Mainpower Oval and commented that new migrants to the Rangiora area were well supported.
- Attended ECan meeting with other Councillors to discuss water issues.
- Attended ‘Eats and Beats’ evening and noted there were a number of people attending from outside the area. Great music, busy stalls, well organised – great event.
- Noted the Long Term Plan consultation was completed with 700-800 submissions.
- Had received an update on town centre car parking.

11.2 **C Prickett**
- Attended ‘Colours Festival’.
- Attended Garrymere water supply public meeting.
- Standing Orders meeting refresher – was good to go through the process.
  Noted that the realignment of the Cones Road / Carrs Road intersection was underway.

11.3 **G Miller**
- Submission to LTP for Keep Rangiora Beautiful.
- Emailed Chair with regard to comments on the Board’s LTP submission. J Gerard commented that all members had been circulated with a draft for comment prior to submission.

11.4 **S Lewis**
- Commented that ‘Eats and Beats’ was a fantastic event and congratulated Rangiora Promotions Association.
- Advised that she had raised an issue with signage to Kensington Street which was hidden behind a tree and after raising with K Graham the sign was shifted within two days and was now visible.

11.5 **J Hoult**
- Assisting with tidying up ANZAC photos with Rangiora Museum.
- Timebank was receiving financial advice.
- LTP submission.
- Attended Annual Hui - was impressed with the way the relationship was developing and congratulated staff.
- Road Naming Committee – two new private lanes had been named.
- Commented that the Enshi Exhibition in the Chamber Gallery was very interesting.

11.6 **M Clarke**
- Had been busy with family arrangements.

11.7 **R Brine**
- Provided an update on an issue with recyclables. Currently there were shipped to China with a 3% contamination rate, they had now said they would only accept product with a 0.5% contamination rate which was not achievable. This was not budget forecast and as a consequence there may be a $300,000 loss out of the solid waste budget. There was a meeting with the Canterbury Regional Solid Waste Committee to discuss. Hopefully it would just be a ‘blip’.

11.8 **K Galloway**
- Attended Standing Orders training.
• Attended Friends of the Dog Park meeting. McAlpines offered to donate shelters. Looking at parking area to relieve pressure on the croquet parking area.
• Attended Public Spaces Policy meeting.
• Attended Road Naming Committee meeting.

11.9 **D Lundy**
• Thanked the Board for sympathy card.
• Had a number of calls from Garrymere residents regarding water supply project. Noted there was a 4% average rate rise and asked what was the range in. J Millward commented it was 2.3% up to 25%. A large range was always the case, and noted the increase for Garrymere was considerable.
• Asked if skateboards were an issue in Conway Lane. J Gerard did not believe they were an issue. R Brine advised that a few years ago there was a bylaw that fixed the problem. There were no prosecutions but it was widely advertised. The issue was re-emerging. There was uncertainty if the bylaw was revoked or lapsed.

11.10 **D Gordon**
• Met with town promotion chair and coordinator with Simon Hart regarding service level agreements across the Promotions Associations for the purpose of greater accountability. It would go back to the Audit Committee.
• There was currently a scoping project around electric vehicle charging stations in Rangiora.
• Assisting with concerns regarding high grass in sections. If not improved Council would undertake the work.
• RSA AGM – President Ian Thompson was made a life member of the NZRSA. A letter of congratulations would be written on behalf of the board.
• Attended a meeting with Mainpower CE and Chair regarding trees on Kippenberger Avenue and at Southbrook. It was a positive discussion and the Mainpower CE was open to looking at ways they could work together. If trees were to be removed there could be a significant contribution to a memorial or planting. There was no intention for underground wiring.
• There was still concern for residents of Ashley Street due to nuisance road noise. Staff were looking at options to improve.
• Attended Festival of Colour, Pride picnic and ‘Easts and Beats’.
• Noted the 60th Anniversary of Tractor Club held in Rangiora.
• Youth Council – considering submission to LTP regarding creation of youth space/outdoor area possibly adjacent to skatepark based on an idea that was successful in Westport.

11.11 **K Barnett**
• Noted the Rangiora Lions Club was in good heart and fundraising supported the Festival of Colour.
• Council passed resolution recommending re-accreditation of Safer Communities which would happen over the next 12 months.

12 **CONSULTATION PROJECTS**
There are no current consultation projects.

13 **REGENERATION PROJECTS**
Updates on the Rangiora Town Centre projects are emailed regularly to Board members. These updates can be located using the link below:
14 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE
14.1 Board Discretionary Grant
   Balance as at 11 April 2018: $6,764.04.
14.2 General Landscaping Fund
   Balance as at 11 April 2018: $1,840.

15 MEDIA ITEMS

16 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

17 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Wednesday 16 May 2018 in the Council Chambers at the Rangiora Service Centre.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 8.40PM.

CONFIRMED

________________________________________
Chairperson

________________________________________
Date
Workshop


K Galloway spoke to a short presentation of the work of the Advisory Group and that a Draft Policy had been developed which would go to Council and then Public Consultation in due course.

2. Members Forum: 9.30pm – 9.45pm

P Williams advised of concerns raised by mums using the Victoria Park playground and finding drug paraphernalia. This to be raised with Greenspace. The Mayor also advised that he was in close communication with the Police in this regard.

Members received a Briefing from 8.55pm to 9.30pm regarding car parking in Rangiora and possible long term plans to improve the situation.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: CON201673 / 180504048871
REPORT TO: Rangiora Ashley Community Board
DATE OF MEETING: 16 May 2018
FROM: Colin Roxburgh, Water Asset Manager
Gary Boot, Senior Engineering Advisor
SUBJECT: Garrymere Water Supply Upgrade – Feedback from Community Consultation

SIGNED BY:
(for Reports to Council or Committees)

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report twofold:

1. To present the consultation feedback from the community on the proposed upgrade of the Garrymere water supply.
2. To seek direction from the Community Board on the preferred way forward for the water supply.

1.2. The Garrymere water supply does not comply with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand (DWSNZ) and represents an unacceptable risk to the public health of the Garrymere community in the long term.

1.3. The Health Act requires Council to “take all practicable steps” to comply with the DWSNZ. Following the contamination event in the Havelock North water supply, the CDHB have signalled that cost is not a practicable barrier to upgrading the Garrymere supply because it considers it to be affordable for the Council.

1.4. The Council has previously met its obligations under the Health Act by complying with an approved Water Safety Plan. The Water Safety Plan however commits Council to completing the upgrade by 2017. Therefore, an upgrade to the Garrymere supply is overdue and should not be unduly delayed.

1.5. Circumstances have conspired to make the cost to ratepayers of upgrading the Garrymere scheme very high. These circumstances being:

a) A lack of good quality sources in the area, specifically deep groundwater.
b) Relative isolation, leading to a lack of nearby schemes to amalgamate with and benefit from improved economies of scale.
c) No imminent growth planned to help improve the economies of scale.
d) The significant cost of upgrading the treatment of the existing shallow well to comply with the DWSNZ relative to the small rating base.
e) The Council’s long established practice of individual schemes funding their own improvement works.
1.6. At the heart of the issue is a tension between the water supply provisions in the Health Act, Council’s Revenue and Financing Policy, and the Council’s Community outcome that Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable and affordable manner.

1.7. The Garrymere scheme members have not responded positively to the proposed upgrade, or specifically the cost of the upgrade. The scheme members have almost unanimously signalled they consider the upgrade to be excessive and / or unaffordable.

1.8. One of the submissions which is claimed to be supported by more than half of the scheme members has suggested a delay to the project for 12 months while a water supply advisory group is established to work through the issues and options, and find an efficient and affordable solution.

1.9. Staff are supportive of the principle of this approach, and recommend that the project be delayed by up to 12 months, while a working group considers the issues and options and reports back to Council by June 2019.

**Attachments:**

i. Consultation material (180504048869)
ii. Set of frequently asked questions and answers (180314027477)
iii. Summary of feedback from the community (180504048682).
iv. Garrymere Landcare group submission (180406036544)
v. Copy of letter from Mayor to Hon David Clark requesting advice on potential government funding options (180316028182).

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Rangiora Ashley Community Board:

(b) **Receives** report No. 180504048871.

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

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

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

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

(g) **Recommends** to the Council that the Water Supply Advisory Group comprises:

- 4-6 Volunteer representatives from the Garrymere water supply
- 2 members of the Rangiora Ashley Community Board
- 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.

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

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

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

**Background**

3.1. The Garrymere water supply scheme has been identified for a proposed upgrade to be
completed by June 2019 to provide a supply that meets the water quality requirements of
the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand (DWSNZ), and to provide a safe and
reliable water supply.

3.1. The Board and Utilities and Roading Committee have received the following reports on
the proposal to upgrade the Garrymere water supply which can be referred to for
background information:

- 8 November 2017 Report to RACB Request to consult with community (171025115123[v2]).
- 12 December 2017 Report to Utilities and Roading Committee, Request to consult
  with community (171128128873[v2]).

3.2. The most recent report to the U&R Committee on 12 December 2017, which was
forwarded to the Board for information, (Ref 171128128873) authorised staff to consult
with the community over four upgrade options. These options were:

- Option A – Treat existing shallow well with filtration and UV system
- Option B – Drill new deep well with the aim of finding high quality groundwater
  source
- Option C – Connect with Summerhill water supply scheme
- Option D – Connect to Summerhill and convert semi-restricted connections to fully
  restricted connections

3.3. Central to the consultation material was the rating impact of each option, which is
summarised in the table below.
Table 1: Proposed rating impact of all options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Capital Cost</th>
<th>Projected Rate for 2-unit Property for 2019/20</th>
<th>Projected Rate for 19-unit property for 2019/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Rates (17/18)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$1,272</td>
<td>$1,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Treat Existing Shallow Well</td>
<td>$387,490</td>
<td>$2,602</td>
<td>$3,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Drill New Deep Well</td>
<td>$878,724</td>
<td>$2,813</td>
<td>$3,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Connect to Summerhill</td>
<td>$1,812,304</td>
<td>$4,819</td>
<td>$6,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Connect to Summerhill and Convert Semi-Restricted Connections</td>
<td>$1,048,901</td>
<td>$3,384</td>
<td>$3,579 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This rate is for connections that are currently 19 unit connections that would be converted to 3 unit connections under this option.

3.4. Significantly, the option of individual onsite treatment systems being installed was assessed and discounted due to it being more expensive than a centralised treatment upgrade and because it was unlikely to comply with the future requirements of the Health Act following expected changes following the Havelock North Drinking-water Inquiry Stage 2 Report.

Consultation

3.5. The consultation process comprised the following steps:

1) An information brochure was distributed to all scheme members. This was distributed on 5 February 2018, with submission originally required to be returned by 2 March 2018.

2) A drop in session was held to discuss the issues and options. At this session strong feedback was received requesting that a public meeting be held, more information provided, and that the consultation period be extended. Following this, the following steps were taken:
   a) Consultation period extended to line up with the Long Term Plan consultation period, with all feedback required to be received by 9 April 2018.
   b) A set of frequently asked questions and answers were distributed to residents on 13 March 2018 to provide more information as requested.
   c) A public meeting was held on 20 March 2018. Key points covered at this meeting were:
      - The background to the project
      - The options available
      - Why point-of-entry treatment is not considered viable.
      - Why the costs are so high, and whether it could be funded differently
      - Next steps.

3) Written submissions were received by 9 April 2018, rather than the original date of 2 March 2018.

3.6. An official head count was not taken at the drop in session, but it is estimated 15 people attended.

3.7. The public meeting was well attended by the scheme members, elected members, and Council staff. It is estimated approximately 25 scheme members attended the meeting. A detailed presentation was given by staff, and this was followed by a good number of
questions that covered a wide range of concerns and issues, with some strong views being expressed by the community.

3.8. The principal concerns raised by the community primarily related to the high cost of the current water supply, and the projected cost increase after the proposed upgrade.

3.9. Formal written feedback was sought from the community, and a total of 12 submissions have since been received as part of the targeted consultation for the project. The majority of these submissions were in the format provided by Council staff, however some were simply by way of email or letter correspondence.

3.10. In addition to those residents who submitted feedback as part of the targeted consultation for this project, a number of residents submitted as part of the consultation process for the Council’s draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan either in addition to or instead of submitting directly to the targeted consultation for the project.

3.11. For completeness the submissions made to the Long Term Plan as well as the submissions made as part of the targeted consultation for the project have been considered in this report.

3.12. In total, 23 submissions have been received across both consultation processes. However, there were a number properties that provided dual submissions. If the double-ups were ignored, then 16 submissions were received out of the 41 properties on the scheme (40% response rate).

3.13. Of the 16 submissions, one was received from the Garrymere Landcare Group which claims to represent over half the properties on the scheme, although the specific properties represented were not stated.

3.14. The submissions (excluding names) are attached to this report.

3.15. The submissions essentially fall into two categories:

1) Those that selected a preferred upgrade option.

   There were six submissions from individual properties where an option was selected, of which five out of six selected Option A (Upgrade treatment of the existing shallow well). The sixth submission which selected an option selected Option D (Join with Summerhill and reduce allocation of semi-restricted properties).

2) Written comments, either on the feedback forms or as a separate stand-alone submission.

   There were eleven written submissions. They almost all expressed strong concerns over the proposed cost of the upgrade, or the consultation process, or both. Table 2 summarises the number and types of comments:
Table 2: Summary of consultation comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summarised Comment</th>
<th>Number of Submissions making comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All upgrading options are too expensive and / or unaffordable</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More work needed to consider options.</td>
<td>6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defer the upgrade works and form an Advisory Group to consider and determine most efficient and cost effective upgrade solution.</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question reliability of costings provided</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate upgrade is needed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question balance between cost and risk</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate consultation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes submission from Garrymere Landcare Group, which claims to represent over half of the properties on the scheme.

3.16. The written submissions have generally been well considered and presented. The submission from the Garrymere Landcare Group is of particular interest and is discussed further in the Options section of this report.

3.17. Combining the formal feedback with verbal feedback from the drop in session and public meeting, staff believe the following summarises the feeling within the community regarding the proposed upgrade:

1) Overwhelmingly, the community considers the upgrade costs are excessive and unaffordable.
2) The unpalatable costs has led the community to question the options considered, the reliability of the costs, the need for an upgrade, and the consultation process.
3) Of the few that selected a preferred upgrade option, they almost all favoured Option A (5 out of 6), presumably because it has the lowest financial impact.

Issues

3.18. The issues associated with the Garrymere water supply are relatively easy to define, an acceptable solution is not. The issues being:

1) The Garrymere water supply does not comply with the DWSNZ and represents an unacceptable risk to the public health of the Garrymere community in the long term.
2) The Health Act requires Council to “take all practicable steps” to comply with the DWSNZ. Following the contamination event in the Havelock North water supply, the CDHB have signalled that cost is not a practicable barrier to upgrading the Garrymere supply because it considers it to be affordable for the Council.
3) The Council has previously met its obligations under the Health Act by complying with an approved Water Safety Plan. The Water Safety Plan however commits Council to completing the upgrade by 2017. Therefore, an upgrade to the Garrymere supply is overdue and should not be unduly delayed.
4) Circumstances have conspired to make the cost of upgrading the Garrymere scheme very expensive. These circumstances being:

   a) A lack of good quality sources in the area, specifically deep groundwater.
b) Relative isolation, leading to a lack of nearby schemes to amalgamate with and benefit from improved economies of scale.

c) No imminent growth planned to help improve the economies of scale.

d) The relatively high cost of upgrading the treatment of the existing shallow well to comply with the DWSNZ relative to the small rating base.

e) The Council’s long established practice of individual schemes funding their own improvement works.

4) Unsurprisingly, the Garrymere scheme members have not responded positively to the proposed upgrade, or specifically the cost of the upgrade. The scheme members have almost unanimously signalled they consider the upgrade to be excessive and/or unaffordable.

3.20. The following provides some context around the proposed rate increase following the upgrade of the Garrymere water supply:

1) The current Garrymere water supply rate is approximately $1,300 for a 2 unit restricted supply and $1,800 for an original 19 unit connection.

2) The upgrade would double the cost to $2,600 (2 unit) and $3,600 (19 unit).

3) The scheme rates, following the upgrade, would be between six and eight times the cost of the district’s highest urban water rate (Oxford) and double the cost of the district’s highest restricted water scheme (Summerhill).

4) After the upgrade, the average total district rate for a Garrymere property would be approximately $5,800, which is almost double the district average of approximately $3,000.

Options

3.21. Despite some feedback to contrary, Council staff are firmly of the view that an upgrade is essential, and that upgrading the treatment of the existing shallow well is the best option. Point-of-entry treatment has been investigated in some detail at the request of residents, and this has been discounted due to it being expected to be higher cost than central treatment, as well as having a high risk that it would not comply with future revisions to the Health Act and the DWSNZ.

3.22. The Council has previously considered and discounted the option of offsetting some of the upgrade cost for Garrymere across the district’s larger schemes. The Council has not signalled any shift in its thinking in this regard and therefore this option will not be discussed further in this report.

3.23. The Mayor has written to the Hon. David Clark to request clarification regarding potential funding options for upgrading the water supply. Verbal advice is that there is no funding available, but a formal written response has not been received to date.

3.24. In the absence of a shift in policy relating to funding, either from the Government or the Council, there are very limited practical funding options for the Garrymere water supply.

3.25. The Garrymere Landcare Group have made a particularly well considered, researched and presented submission. While perhaps not doing the submission justice, staff would summarise it into three key points:
1) The upgrade options offered are too expensive and unaffordable to the Garrymere Community and, by extension, the Council is not delivering its Community Outcome of providing core utility services in an affordable manner.

2) An appropriate balance between cost and risk would not be delivered by the proposed upgrade, which seeks to fully comply with the DWSNZ and therefore meet the Council’s commitment under the Health Act.

3) The relief sought is to defer the upgrade 12 months and establish a Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group to determine the most efficient and affordable way to upgrade the supply.

3.26. The Group makes some very good points in their submission. In particular, Council staff have a lot of sympathy for the argument relating to the balance between risk and affordability. Indeed staff have submitted many of the same arguments during national consultation on the water supply legislation. This is not to say staff are of the view that a lesser standard of upgrade would be appropriate for Garrymere. Rather, a balance between affordability and risk is essential, albeit difficult to achieve in this instance.

3.27. Staff are of the view that the proposal by the Garrymere Landcare Group to establish an advisory group has merit. However, a balance needs to be found between delaying the project long enough to determine the optimum solution and proceeding in a timely manner to complete an upgrade of the supply.

3.28. Therefore, staff propose the design and physical works be delayed 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.

**Proposed Way Forward**

3.29. It is proposed that the project be progressed according to the timetable below:
Table 3: Proposed project plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Complete by</th>
<th>Agenda by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rangiora Ashley Community Board provide recommendation to Utilities and Roading Committee to proceed with community consultation, and provide feedback on draft consultation material.</td>
<td>8th November 17</td>
<td>27th October 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Draft consultation material updated (based on RACB feedback)</td>
<td>24th November 17</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Approval from U&amp;R Committee to consult community on recommended upgrade options</td>
<td>12th December 17</td>
<td>1st December 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Consultation commences</td>
<td>February 2018</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Public drop-in session</td>
<td>February 2018</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Public meeting</td>
<td>20 March 2018</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Consultation closes</td>
<td>9 April 2018</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Staff report to RACB with results of community consultation and to seek endorsement of recommended way forward</td>
<td>16 May 2018</td>
<td>3 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Council adopt budget based on delayed works and Option A (as a holding budget) as part of adoption of 2018-28 Long Term Plan but split over two financial years</td>
<td>19 June 2018</td>
<td>8 June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Staff report to Council with the recommendation to delay the design and physical works by up to 12 months and establish an advisory group.</td>
<td>3 July 2018</td>
<td>29 June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Working Group established</td>
<td>31 July 2018</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Council adopts pathway forward based on outcome of Working Group findings.</td>
<td>prior to June 2019</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>July – Oct 2019</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Nov - Dec 2019</td>
<td>Feb - June 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. The views of the Garrymere community have been outlined in the consultation section above.

4.2. In brief, there are strong reservations within the Garrymere over the affordability of the upgrade. Of those that selected a preferred upgrade option, five out of six selected Option A. The community has proposed, and staff agree with, the establishment of a Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. A total budget of $450,000 was allocated as part of the Council 2017/18 Annual Plan to fund the proposed source upgrade which was based on Option A.

5.2. This budget was then further refined as part of the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan that went out for consultation. The refinements to the budget are summarised below, and are based on updated information regarding the expected costs of Option A:

- $250,000 available in 2017/18 (current financial year) which includes $50,000 that was carried over from the 2016/17 financial year. The original $50,000 was intended for preliminary design and options assessment works to inform the consultation. The $200,000 of new funding available in the 2017/18 financial year was intended to fund consultation, design, tender and some of the construction works.
• A further $140,000 was proposed for the 2018/19 financial year to make up a total budget of $390,000 for the project. This final $140,000 of funding was intended to fund the completion of the construction works of the proposed solution.

5.3. The total expenditure to date is approximately $28,000 spent on investigation works and consultation.

5.4. Based on the feedback from the community and the recommendation to defer the construction works to allow the establishment of an advisory group, a staff submission to the 2018-28 Long Term Plan is proposed to split the budget over the following two financial years, rather than aim for completion of all works within the 2018/19 financial year. This would involve the following changes:

Table 2: Proposed changes to budget timing as per staff submission to Long Term Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Change to Funding as per Staff Submission</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000 carried over from 17/18</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5. In addition to deferral of some the capital budget, there would need to be deferral of some operational budgets that have been allowed for to start operating the new treatment system once it is constructed. It was initially anticipated that it would be constructed part way through the 2018/19 financial year, while it is now proposed that construction be completed by the end of the 2019/20 financial year. The following changes to operations budgets would be required as a result of deferring the project:

• Pump Power budget for 2018/19 reduce from $8,810 to $6,110
• Pump Power budget for 2019/20 to reduce from $11,760 to $6,240
• Pump Maintenance budget for 2018/19 reduce from $5,040 to $2,040
• Pump Maintenance budget for 2019/20 to reduce from $15,060 to $2,080
• Water Unit Costs budget to reduce from $13,000 to $9,500 in 2018/19
• Water Unit Costs budget to reduce from $16,860 to $9,710 in 2019/20

5.6. The draft Long Term Plan includes rating increases for the Garrymere scheme of 35% in the 2018/19 financial year, followed by 62% the following year. If the project is deferred as suggested the rating increase for the 2018/19 financial year of 35% will be able to be minimised to approximately 5%, with the increases currently consulted on to occur 12 months later than previously reported.

5.7. The capital cost and projected rating impact of the most viable option (Option A – Treatment) is summarised on the table below.
Table 3: Assessment of Rating Impact to Garrymere Water Supply Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>A – TREATMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in Operational Cost (first year after upgrade completed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Impact based on different allocations of units currently on the scheme</th>
<th>Existing Rates ($/year)</th>
<th>Increase in Rates ($/year)</th>
<th>New Rate ($/year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 units (24 properties)</td>
<td>$1,803</td>
<td>$1,796</td>
<td>$3,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$2,397</td>
<td>$2,387</td>
<td>$4,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$1,335</td>
<td>$1,329</td>
<td>$2,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$1,303</td>
<td>$1,298</td>
<td>$2,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units (14 properties)</td>
<td>$1,272</td>
<td>$1,267</td>
<td>$2,539</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.8. It is noted that on schemes such as Garrymere with ‘fixed-variable’ rating charges (i.e. a fixed ‘per connection’ rate as well as a variable ‘per unit’ cost), the fixed charges cover 75% of total costs against the scheme, while the variable charges cover the remaining 25% of costs against the scheme. This has the result that as the number of units that a property has increases, the rates do not increase directly proportionally to the additional volume of water being supplied, which is evident in the table above.

5.9. As noted earlier in this report, Council has an obligation under the Health Act to take all practicable steps for the water supply to comply with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand. It could be argued that by deferring the project to allow the formation of the advisory group that Council is not taking all practicable steps to complete the upgrade. The Council’s approved water safety plan states that the upgrade would have been completed in 2017. This delay will mean that the extent of time by which this upgrade is overdue will be increased.

5.10. There is therefore some risk taken on by Council in opting to defer this upgrade. This is due to balancing the risk associated with the water supply with the need to consult with the affected parties, and provide affordable services.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy

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

6.2. Legislation

The Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act is relevant in this matter.

6.3. Community Outcomes

This project is related to the following community outcomes:

- 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.

6.4. This matter significantly challenges the Council's ability to deliver the above Community Outcomes. More specifically, the community has strongly signalled that it considers the proposed upgrade of the Garrymere water supply to be unaffordable. Yet, the Council needs to provide a water supply that meets the needs of the community, including being safe to drink.

6.5. Essentially, there is a tension between the water supply provisions in the Health Act, Council's Revenue and Financing Policy, and the Council’s Community Outcomes.

6.6. The best way to find an appropriate balance between these tensions is to establish a focused water supply advisory group to work through the issues and options.
The Garrymere Water Supply Scheme requires an upgrade to comply with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand.

We have identified four possible solutions and would like to get your feedback around which option your household prefers.

PUBLIC DROP IN – 15 February 4-7pm at Loburn Domain
What’s the issue?

The existing Garrymere supply draws water from a shallow bore. The water supply is chlorinated but this is not a sufficient treatment system to remove all potential contaminants such as protozoa. Protozoa are organisms such as giardia that can be harmful to humans.

Because of this, the water supply does not comply with Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand (DWSNZ) and must be upgraded to meet its requirements under the Health Act. Not upgrading the scheme is not an option that Council can consider.

What are the options and how much will it cost?

There are four options for providing good quality water to the existing Garrymere community that will meet the requirements of the DWSNZ and are outlined below. Costs will vary depending upon how many units your property is allocated. A fifth option, private treatment systems is also outlined, but assessed as not being viable.

Costs for each of the options are based on our best estimates for the infrastructure and operating costs required for each option. The final rates will be based on actual costs of the project, and may differ from those presented below.

This information can be viewed on our website and you can give us your feedback online – waimakariri.govt.nz/letstalk

Option A – Treatment of existing source

This option involves the additional treatment of the existing shallow well through the installation of a pre-filtration system, followed by ultra violet (UV) disinfection. This will further treat any potential contaminants that survive the current chlorine treatment. Rates provided are on a per year basis.

Capital cost for this option $387,490
Operational cost for this option $29,440

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Impact by Number of Units</th>
<th>Existing Rates</th>
<th>New Rate</th>
<th>Increase in Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 units (24 properties)</td>
<td>$1,803</td>
<td>$3,599</td>
<td>$1,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$2,397</td>
<td>$4,784</td>
<td>$2,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$1,335</td>
<td>$2,664</td>
<td>$1,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$1,303</td>
<td>$2,601</td>
<td>$1,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units (14 properties)</td>
<td>$1,272</td>
<td>$2,539</td>
<td>$1,267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Option B – Drill new well at Garrymere**

In this option, we would drill and develop a new deep well up to 300m deep within the Council easement at the existing Garrymere headworks site. The aim would be to find a secure water source with adequate capacity for the scheme. This option has a high risk that the new well may be unsuccessful. The deepest wells currently in the area are no more than 80m deep and yield less than the required capacity for the scheme.

**Capital cost for this option $878,724**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Impact by Number of Units</th>
<th>Existing Rates</th>
<th>New Rate</th>
<th>Increase in Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 units (24 properties)</td>
<td>$1,803</td>
<td>$3,898</td>
<td>$2,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$2,397</td>
<td>$5,181</td>
<td>$2,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$1,335</td>
<td>$2,885</td>
<td>$1,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$1,303</td>
<td>$2,817</td>
<td>$1,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units (14 properties)</td>
<td>$1,272</td>
<td>$2,749</td>
<td>$1,477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Option C – Connect to Summerhill Water Supply**

This option would involve connecting the Garrymere scheme into the Summerhill water supply scheme from the existing pipe at the old Summerhill intake at the Ashley River. Construction would involve two river crossings; one across the Ashley River and one across the Garrymere River and require approximately 2.9km of pipe. This would also include additional upgrade works at the West Eyreton water supply headworks and within the Summerhill scheme to cater for the additional demand.

**Capital cost for this option $1,812,304**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Impact by Number of Units</th>
<th>Existing Rates</th>
<th>New Rate</th>
<th>Increase in Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 units (24 properties)</td>
<td>$1,803</td>
<td>$6,741</td>
<td>$4,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$2,397</td>
<td>$8,960</td>
<td>$6,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$1,335</td>
<td>$4,989</td>
<td>$3,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$1,303</td>
<td>$4,872</td>
<td>$3,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units (14 properties)</td>
<td>$1,272</td>
<td>$4,755</td>
<td>$3,483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operational cost for this option $1,817**

**Operational cost for this option $31,970**
Option D – Connect to Summerhill and reduce demand

This option is similar to Option C in that it involves a connection into the Summerhill scheme from the existing pipe at the old intake at the Ashley River. However, in order to minimise capacity upgrades within the West Eyreton and Summerhill schemes, demand would need to be decreased within the Garrymere scheme. This would be achieved by changing the semi-restricted 19 unit (13 litres per minute) connections to 3 unit (2 litres per minute) restricted connections. This would decrease the costs within the West Eyreton and Summerhill schemes for capacity upgrades, and will include the install of tanks and pumps on these properties in order to convert the existing semi-restricted connections to fully-restricted connections.

**Capital cost for this option $1,048,901**

**Operational cost for this option -$3,450**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Impact by Number of Units</th>
<th>Existing Rates</th>
<th>New Rate</th>
<th>Increase in Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 units (24 properties)</td>
<td>$1,803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$2,397</td>
<td>$7,895</td>
<td>$10,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$1,335</td>
<td>$2,373</td>
<td>$3,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$1,303</td>
<td>$2,210</td>
<td>$3,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units (14 properties)</td>
<td>$1,272</td>
<td>$2,048</td>
<td>$3,320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumed all 19 unit connections converted to 3 unit connections.
Private Treatment Systems

The Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand allow for private on-site treatment systems to be implemented, where a scheme can be classified as a Rural Agricultural Drinking Water Supply (RADWS). In order for a scheme to be classified as a RADWS it must be able to be demonstrated that a minimum of 75% of water used on the scheme is for agricultural purposes, with the remaining 25% for domestic use. Staff have assessed Garrymere and have concluded that the scheme does not meet this criteria. For this reason the use of private treatment systems is not considered to be a viable option to comply with the Drinking Water Standards. It is noted that staff could not find any examples of schemes in New Zealand that have been classified as a RADWS.

The table below provides a full overview of the associated costs for each of the four options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>A - TREATMENT</th>
<th>B - DRILL WELL</th>
<th>C - CONNECT TO SUMMERHILL</th>
<th>D - CONNECT TO SUMMERHILL AND REDUCE DEMAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cost</td>
<td>$387,490</td>
<td>$878,724</td>
<td>$1,812,304</td>
<td>$1,048,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Operational Cost</td>
<td>$29,440</td>
<td>$1,817</td>
<td>$31,970</td>
<td>-$3,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Impact by Number of Units</th>
<th>Existing Rates</th>
<th>Increase in Rates</th>
<th>New Rate</th>
<th>Increase in Rates</th>
<th>New Rate</th>
<th>Increase in Rates</th>
<th>New Rate</th>
<th>Increase in Rates</th>
<th>New Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 units (24 properties)</td>
<td>$1,803</td>
<td>$1,796</td>
<td>$3,599</td>
<td>$2,094</td>
<td>$3,898</td>
<td>$4,937</td>
<td>$6,741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$2,397</td>
<td>$2,387</td>
<td>$4,784</td>
<td>$2,784</td>
<td>$5,181</td>
<td>$6,563</td>
<td>$8,960</td>
<td>$7,895</td>
<td>$10,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$1,355</td>
<td>$1,329</td>
<td>$2,664</td>
<td>$1,550</td>
<td>$2,885</td>
<td>$3,654</td>
<td>$4,989</td>
<td>$2,373</td>
<td>$3,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 units (1 property)</td>
<td>$1,303</td>
<td>$1,298</td>
<td>$2,601</td>
<td>$1,514</td>
<td>$2,817</td>
<td>$3,568</td>
<td>$4,872</td>
<td>$2,210</td>
<td>$3,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units (14 properties)</td>
<td>$1,272</td>
<td>$1,267</td>
<td>$2,539</td>
<td>$1,477</td>
<td>$2,749</td>
<td>$3,483</td>
<td>$4,755</td>
<td>$2,048</td>
<td>$3,320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: assumed all 19 unit connections converted to 3 unit connections.

The additional cost for the proposed upgrade will be recovered through your water rate. The rates in the table above show how much you would pay for each of the options.

For example – Bob Jones has a property with a 19 unit connection (19,000 litres per day allocation), he currently pays $1,803 for his water rate.

Under **Option A – Treatment**, the new water rate for Bob’s property would be $3,599, an increase of $1,796.

In comparison, if **Option B – Drill Well** was the preferred option, Bob’s new water rate would be $3,898, an increase of $2,094.

**What are the risks?**

There are two main risks associated with the options being considered.

- **If Option B – Drill Well** is adopted, the well may not be successful in striking a water source of the required quality and capacity. If this were the case, the scheme would have to not only cover the costs of the unsuccessful well, but also the costs of one of the alternative options.

- **All options**: Construction costs may be higher than the Council has estimated, which would increase the impact on rates. This risk is arguably higher for Option C and D (connecting to the Summerhill water supply scheme) as these two options involve a substantially greater amount of capital expenditure.
How will the Council decide?
Feedback from the community will be collected and presented to Council along with a report from council staff on the various options. After carefully considering the feedback from the community, Council will choose an option to proceed with. We will notify you once the decision has been made, which is expected to be in April 2018.

Public Information Drop In Session
You can find out more and ask questions at a sausage sizzle at the Loburn Domain Pavilion on Thursday 15 February between 4 and 7pm.

What now?
Tick which option you prefer and return this form to the Council no later than Friday 2 March 2018.

**OPTION A** – Treatment of existing source

**OPTION B** – Drill new well at Garrymere

**OPTION C** – Connect to Summerhill water supply

**OPTION D** – Connect to Summerhill water supply and decrease allocated demand

You can also give us your feedback online - waimakariri.govt.nz/letstalk

If you have any questions, or if you would like further information, phone 0800 965 468 or email your feedback to records@wmk.govt.nz

Make sure your feedback reaches us by Friday 2 March 2018.
Please indicate your preferred option for the Garrymere water supply upgrade:

- **Option A** – Treatment of existing source
- **Option B** – Drill new well at Garrymere
- **Option C** – Connect to Summerhill water supply
- **Option D** – Connect to Summerhill water supply and decrease allocated demand

Name: 
Address: 

If you have any comments or questions regarding the upgrade please contact:

Sean de Roo  
Project Coordinator  
Water Unit  
Phone 0800 965 468  
Email sean.deroo@wmk.govt.nz

Or return this feedback form (no stamp required) back to us before Friday 2 March 2018.
Garrymere Water Supply Upgrade – Frequently Asked Questions

What have previous water test results on the scheme shown?

The water is tested for E. coli at the headworks (after chlorination) and within the reticulation (pipework). Samples are taken at the headworks weekly and within the reticulation monthly as required by the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand (DWSNZ).

There have been no positive E. coli tests from samples taken on the scheme since 2002 from either of the official sampling points for the scheme at the headworks or within the reticulation.

The source water is not required to be routinely tested (only the treated water is required to be tested under the DWSNZ), however when a raw source water sample was taken in 2017 this showed a presence of E. coli. The E. coli did not show up in the official sampling for the scheme as this is treated with chlorine as part of the current treatment process. This positive E. coli test is not unexpected given the shallow nature of the existing source well.

The E. coli samples that are taken only show if bacteria is present in the water, but not protozoa. Protozoa is not tested for on the scheme, and this is not able to be treated using chlorine.

Rather than upgrade the treatment system, why can’t we stop the contamination from occurring in the first place?

Under the current Drinking Water Standards the only way to prove a well is free from sources of contamination is to demonstrate that it is a secure well.

One of the key criteria for a well to be secure is that the water must be more than one year old (i.e. the time taken for the water to travel from the surface to the well screen must be greater than a year). This can generally only be achieved with deep wells, which is one of the options presented. This criteria is not able to be met for the current shallow well however.

Given that the existing well cannot be deemed to be a secure well, treatment must be provided for both bacteria and protozoa if it is to be retained.

Why are we only hearing about the need for the upgrade to the scheme now when the Drinking Water Standards were published in 2005 (revised 2008)?

When the new Drinking Water Standards were published in 2005 there was not a requirement that all schemes should comply with the standards immediately. The first requirement in the Health Act was the each scheme develop a Public Health Risk Management Plan (now referred to as a Water Safety Plan) to demonstrate how compliance will be achieved and when, and also how the safety of the scheme will be managed in the meantime. The first Public Health Risk Management Plan for the Garrymere scheme was submitted in 2009.

The need to either upgrade the existing source or develop a new source has been identified as part of the Annual Plans and Long Term Plans from as far back as the 2007/08 Annual Plan for the scheme, which are consulted on with the wider community each year.

Each year a new version of the Annual Plan is produced, except for every three years where a Long Term Plan is produced. As part of this annual process Council adjusts and reprioritises projects, which means that the timing of projects proposed can change from year to year.
In addition to the Annual Plans and Long Term Plans, in September 2006 a public meeting was held to discuss issues on the scheme, including raising the issue of the need to upgrade the source or improve treatment in the future.

The targeted consultation is taking place now as an assessment of potential options has been carried out. The approach taken was to investigate all potentially feasible options prior to consulting with the community on what options are available. Without this detailed analysis taking place prior to engaging with the public, it would have been difficult to provide sufficient detail to make the consultation process meaningful.

**Why were additional properties allowed to connect to the scheme when it had a water supply that does not comply with the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand?**

While the scheme does not comply with the Drinking Water Standards it does comply with the Health Act in that it has an approved Water Safety Plan (previously referred to as a Public Health Risk Management Plan) documenting how the risks associated with the scheme is managed, and that there is a plan in place to achieve compliance in the future. It is not unusual for schemes that do not fully comply with the current standards to accept new connections, with the key requirement under the Health Act being that the scheme has a documented and approved process in place to work towards compliance.

**Why has the scheme not received any government funding that was previously available to assist with upgrades of water supplies to meet the Drinking Water Standards?**

There are two key ways in which drinking water suppliers could in the past apply for and receive funding for upgrades of water supplies to meet the drinking water standards. This is either through the Tourism Demand Subsidy Scheme, or the Drinking Water Assistance Programme funding. The Garrymere scheme was assessed as not qualifying for either of these funding sources.

The Tourism Demand Subsidy Scheme is targeted at communities with high tourism numbers and small resident populations, which is not applicable to Garrymere.

There are a number of criterion for a drinking water supply to be eligible for Drinking Water Assistance Programme funding, but the key barrier is requiring a confirmed ‘Deprivation Index’ score of 7 – 10. All schemes within the district were assessed in 2006/07 and Oxford Urban was the only scheme the met the deprivation index requirements therefore making it the only scheme eligible for funding.

Further to the above Council made a submission on the 11th of August 2006 to the Ministry of Health highlighting the issue of the high rates that would result on schemes such as Garrymere as a result of carrying out works to comply with the Drinking Water Standards and noted that the ‘Deprivation Index’ alone should not be a barrier to a supply receiving funding. This submission however was not successful in changing the criteria for a scheme to qualify for funding, and as such the scheme was not able to receive any government funding. It is also noted that the drinking water assistance subsidy is now closed, so no new funding is currently available for future upgrades.

Council staff are aware of a paper that will likely be presented to cabinet in March of this year regarding a national regulator for water suppliers. If this offers any opportunity for funding to upgrade existing schemes, Council will be advocating for Garrymere to receive any such funding.
Why have the water rates in Garrymere increased in recent years, before the upgrade has been completed, and why have rates not decreased despite new connections being allowed to join the scheme?

The rates on the scheme in the 2007/08 financial year were $1,052 per property per year. They then generally increased annually for a variety of reasons such as the following:

- Allowance of leak reduction budget in accordance with Council’s Water Conservation Strategy.
- Allowance for restrictor checks and chemical costs not initially allowed for.
- Increased allowance for building maintenance and water sampling budgets.
- Increase in depreciation funding not previously allowed for.

There was a decrease from the 2013/14 to the 2014/15 financial year (approximately 20%) due to new connections joining the scheme as a result of a subdivision.

More recently there have been some rating increases as a result of investigations and budget allocated towards the source upgrade project.
How are the current rates collected spent?

The expenditure of the current rates is summarised below from the 2017/18 budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Type</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reticulation</td>
<td>Pipeline repairs, valve repairs, water conservation &amp; leak reduction and restrictor checks</td>
<td>1,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headworks</td>
<td>Pump power, pump maintenance, electrical repairs and building maintenance</td>
<td>9,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Chemical costs, Water Unit costs, water sampling and SCADA costs.</td>
<td>18,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>Internal interest</td>
<td>5,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>Depreciation of existing assets to fund future renewals</td>
<td>10,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Expenditure</td>
<td>Rating collection costs, Asset Information Team recoveries, Indirect recoveries</td>
<td>6,466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (GST Exclusive) 57,937

Total (GST Inclusive) 66,628

Why has the Council / scheme not been saving up for this project, rather than only increasing rates after the upgrade is completed?

Council can only collect rates based on actual genuine costs. Therefore funds cannot be collected for a loan that has not yet been raised, but only after the loan has been raised (once the budget is in place for the capital expenditure). This means that rates cannot be increased to pre-empt a future expenditure, but only as a result of the expenditure once it is budgeted to occur.

The above approach is consistent with the Local Government Act, which sets out that Council can only rate for what is currently benefited from, not in anticipation of a future benefit.

Why can’t the rates be capped at an affordable level and the additional costs be spread across the district?

Using the Council’s current rating system, rates for water supplies must be targeted at schemes where the expenditure occurs.

The option of spreading some of the costs amongst other ratepayers was considered by Council however was not adopted at this point in time. Council decided to revisit consideration of this funding approach in 2022.

Why are some services rated across the district and others using a targeted rate?

The Council undertakes a review of its Revenue and Financing policy which identifies the costs for services and what is the fairest funding mix and who should fund these services. This is generally
reviewed between Long Term Plans. It is also updated regularly due to necessity e.g. legislative changes or when a new supply is added for example.

In relation to why some rates are District wide and others are targeted is directly related to the Revenue and Financing Policy.

District wide rates are those rates that are charged on all properties for District-wide services, including libraries, swimming pools and community facilities. Some differential or targeted services may apply.

Rates are targeted where there is a close correlation between the levels of service received and those that benefit or receive that service. Targeted rates are used when the properties receiving the benefit of service are charged for that service. In the example for water, there 16 different water supplies, that have different levels of service provisions and costs for each are different. Accordingly, the amount they are paying for the services reflects the profile and costs relating to each.

Why is the increase in rates so sharp, and can this be smoothed?

The rates projections presented in the original consultation material were based on the increases in costs being passed on directly to ratepayers as the expenditure occurs, which is the standard way that rates are charged. Council could consider an option to smooth this increase to spread it over a number of years. This is an option that Council could consider for whichever option is preferred. This would essentially mean phasing in the increase by paying less in the initial years, but more in the later years.

An example of how this may occur is depicted on the graph and table below:
### What happens if I want to disconnect from the scheme?

If an individual property owner wishes to disconnect from the scheme and find their own drinking water supply, there would be a number of considerations. These are:

- A land use consent would be required as the property’s building consent and resource consent would have been issued on the basis of a connection to the reticulated water supply. A change in this would trigger the need for a new resource consent to retain the dwelling without the connection to the public water supply.
- The Council would still have the ability to collect water rates from a property even if they do not wish to use their connection to the scheme. The reason is that rates are not charged per volume of water used, but by providing a connection available for use. Council could use its discretion not to enforce this, however for fairness of other ratepayers on the scheme and consistency with other schemes it is likely that rates would still be charged to properties even if they do not wish to utilise their connection.

### Can the entire scheme be disbanded and run by the residents, or closed down completely?

There are provisions in the Local Government Act by which Council can hand over the responsibility for providing a service to another group, or the scheme be disbanded. A summary of these requirements is below:

- Council would have to consult with the Medical Officer of Health, from the Canterbury District Health Board.
- Council would have to undertake investigations and make a plan as to how the scheme will be managed in the future.
- Taking into account the views of the Medical Officer of Health and the investigation the Council would then decide whether a referendum should be held to pursue one of these options further.
- If a referendum was held on either handing the scheme over to residents or closing down the scheme, there would be the following requirements:
  - More than 75% of votes cast would have to be supporting of a potential proposal to close down the scheme, or;
  - More than 50% of votes cast would have to be supporting of a potential proposal to hand the scheme over to the residents.

In the event that the scheme be closed down entirely, all residents would have to drill their own wells and undertake the resource consent application process (by way of land use consent application) as described earlier.

In the event that the scheme be handed over to the residents to run, the obligations of the residents running the scheme would be no different to the obligations of Council in terms of complying with the Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act and Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand.
Why can’t individual point-of-entry / point-of-use treatment systems be used?

The Rural Agricultural Drinking-water Guideline allow for Point-of-Entry style treatment systems, under certain criteria. The key criteria is that more than 75% of the flow must be able to be demonstrated to be for agricultural use. Initial estimates are that the scheme does not meet this criteria, however this conclusion could change if individual flowmeters were installed at each house to get more accurate data.

In order to assess whether it would be worthwhile to invest money installing flowmeters at each property, an assessment has been carried out to determine what the costs of a point-of-entry system would be.

Two estimates were carried out. The first was based on a set of design assumptions as consistent as possible with the assumptions made in the other cost estimates. This included allowances for contingency in case actual costs are higher than those estimated. This cost estimate gave an expected additional annual cost of $2,960 per property per year, which is approximately 84% greater than the average estimate of $1,606 for the central treatment option. On this basis it was deemed that point of entry treatment systems would not be viable.

It is acknowledged however that some of the assumptions made in deriving the above estimate could be considered conservative. Given the potential range in costs depending on the assumptions made, an alternative cost estimate was made based on a set of optimistic assumptions. This included such things as no contingency allowance, and assuming a compliant individual treatment system could be found for a cost of $1,500 per unit, which may not be possible. This produced a best case ‘optimistic’ cost estimate of $1,287 per property per year. This is approximately 20% less than the average cost estimate for the central treatment system of $1,606 per property per year.

In order to provide a fair comparison between options, an optimistic version of the central treatment option was derived as well. This included removing the contingency allowance, as well making other modifications to make it more consistent with the assumptions made in the optimistic point-of-entry cost estimate. This resulted in the average rate increase projected for the central treatment option reducing from $1,606 per connection per year to $1,154 per property per year.

This potential ‘best case’ rating impact of the central treatment option is less than the ‘best case’ potential cost for the point-of-entry treatment option.

What are the risks associated with the point-of-entry treatment option?

The point-of-entry treatment option has the following key risks:

- The proportion of flow use between domestic and agricultural may change over time, which could result in this type of treatment system becoming non-compliant. This risk may also restrict the ability of properties to sub-divide as this would shift the proportion of flow towards more domestic use (and less agricultural).
- Indication from Water New Zealand is that the Rural Agricultural Drinking-water Guideline may be withdrawn as part of the next revision of the Drinking Water Standards. Therefore, the risk is that investment in this type of scheme may not be allowed in the future which would mean it could become a sunk investment. Part of the reason for this is that there are currently no schemes in the country that utilise this section of the Drinking-water Standards.
- Point-of-entry systems rely on either staff entering private households to carry out maintenance works on individual systems, or individual residents being required to operate and maintain their own systems.
- The systems could provide a lower level of service as they can reduce flow depending on the capacity of the system specified, or as a result of filters becoming blocked and not changed.
- The systems require a location for their installation to be provided by residents which may be challenging at some properties.
- Some properties may require multiple units if they have multiple dwellings or buildings on them, which would increase their costs substantially.
- The cost analysis has shown that in a best case scenario the point-of-entry may cost marginally less than the conservative estimate for the central treatment plant option, but the most likely scenario is that they would have the same costs or higher costs than the central treatment option. Therefore, the risk with this option if it were preferred would be that the actual costs would be higher than the alternative central treatment option while introducing a number of other risks.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Conn.s</th>
<th>Rates per prop'</th>
<th>Rate per conn.</th>
<th>Rate per Unit</th>
<th>Rate per 2 unit conn.</th>
<th>Rate per 19 unit conn.</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>Allowance of leak reduction budget and groundwater certification budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>1,218</td>
<td>Allowance added in budget for restrictor checks and chemical costs (not previously allowed for).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1,006</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>Increase to building maintenance, chemical costs and water sampling budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td>Rates reduction as a result of new connections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>1,189</td>
<td>Increase to water sampling and depreciation budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td>Increase to depreciation and internal interest budget as a result of investigations commencing for new source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>1,601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>1,803</td>
<td>Increased depreciation and interest costs associated with further expenditure on project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(current year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1,754</td>
<td>2,483</td>
<td>Increased depreciation and interest costs associated with further expenditure on project plus operating costs associated with upgrade being completed partway through financial year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(future projection)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019/20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2,445</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2,571</td>
<td>3,638</td>
<td>Increase in internal interest cost due to final expenditure on source upgrade project occurring in the 2018/19 financial year, as well as increased operating costs associated with upgrade being applied over full financial year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(future projection)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* rates are projections for future (not actual).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Mgmt Plans</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services Recovery</td>
<td>3,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Rights</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operations</strong></td>
<td>5,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reticulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline Repairs</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valve Repairs</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Conservation &amp; Leak Reduction</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictor Checks</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reticulation</strong></td>
<td>1,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Headworks</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump Power</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump Maintenance</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical repairs</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building maintenance</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Headworks</strong></td>
<td>9,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Costs</td>
<td>3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Unit Costs</td>
<td>9,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Sampling - WINZ</td>
<td>5,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCADA</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment</strong></td>
<td>18,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Interest</td>
<td>4,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Interest</strong></td>
<td>5,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depreciation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>10,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Depreciation</strong></td>
<td>10,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Direct Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>51,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating collection costs</td>
<td>1,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIM recoveries</td>
<td>1,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Recoveries</td>
<td>4,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>6,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Operating Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>57,937</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why can’t individual point-of-entry / point-of-use treatment systems be used?

The Rural Agricultural Drinking-water Guideline allow for Point-of-Entry style treatment systems, under certain criteria. The key criteria are:

- More than 75% of water used on the scheme must be able to classified as being for agricultural use, with the remaining 25% or less for domestic use.
- The systems installed must be certified against the requirements of the Drinking Water Standards.
- There must be an approved Water Safety Plan to demonstrate how the water supplier (Council) will ensure that the individual treatment systems are operated and maintained as required to comply with the standards.

Assessment of Criteria

The staff have assessed the flow on the scheme to determine whether it would meet the first key criteria above regarding the proportion of agricultural flow. Initial calculations indicate that it does not meet these criteria (based on average domestic use profiles). However, it is possible that if individual flowmeters were installed at each dwelling on the scheme it may be possible to demonstrate that the proportion of domestic and agricultural use would satisfy the criteria. This would come at a cost however to install and monitor the flowmeters and there would still be a reasonable likelihood that this would not provide the flow balance required, so to consider this there would need to be a good case made that this style of system would offer benefits over a central treatment system.

For this reason, the viability of this style of treatment system has been assessed in terms of cost and risk.

Assessment of Cost of System.

The cost of point of entry treatment systems was analysed in terms of capital cost and repayments, depreciation, operating costs and maintenance. In order to assess this a number of assumptions were required to be made in terms of the type of system required to meet the standards, the level of operation and maintenance works, and who would be responsible for the ongoing maintenance.

Given the range of assumptions required, the costs were assessed in two ways.

The first assessment was done to replicate all the assumptions made in estimating the cost of the centralised treatment system. In particular this included:

- A 30% funding contingency was applied to the capital cost to allow for any unforeseen costs.
- Professional fees associated with facilitating the installations estimated at 15% of total capital cost.
- It was assumed that the Council’s Water Unit would undertake all operational activities (filter and bulb changes).
- Units specified such that they can measure dose rate and log this to download to demonstrate compliance.
- The amount of filter changes assumed to be monthly (this is at the upper end with what may be required, but is a conservative estimate which was made to the central treatment option).
• Replacement timeframes of other components such as bulb and UV sensor as per manufacturer recommendations.
• An allowance for pump upgrades at each property to overcome potential headloss induced by filtration systems.

Based on the above assumptions, a total annual cost has been estimated at $2,960 per property per year, which is approximately 84% greater than the average estimate of $1,606 for the central treatment option. On this basis it was deemed that point of entry treatment systems would not be viable.

It is acknowledged that there may be a lower cost way to implement point-of-entry treatment if the assumptions made were modified. It is thought that some of these assumptions could be considered optimistic, however for a point of comparison an alternative ‘optimistic’ cost estimate was also derived for point-of-entry treatment.

The reason for calculating this ‘optimistic’ cost estimate was to answer the question of even if every possible cost of the project is minimised and if low cost treatment systems can be found that still meet the required standards, would the option stack up against the central treatment plant option.

They key differences in assumptions for this option are below:

• Assumed that a compliant system could be found for a cost of $1,500. There are some units marketed at this price, however none that staff are aware of have been able to demonstrate compliance with the required standards. As a comparison the lowest cost unit that has been found that would be compliant has a cost of approximately $2,800 per unit.
• No funding contingency allowed for in capital cost estimate.
• Installation costs estimated at only $200 per property, which assumes each property is suited to a very simple installation, and has an area within the dwelling where the treatment unit could be easily installed.
• Assumed that private property owners would undertake all maintenance works, with quarterly inspections carried out by Council staff to verify compliance.
• Dose rate not able to be recorded and downloaded (lower cost but may introduce challenges in terms of compliance).
• Amount of filter changes reduced significantly relative to central treatment option (may be possible depending on how quickly filters block, but not a fair comparison with the central treatment option).
• Assumed that performance of UV bulbs and UV dose sensors exceeds manufacturer’s recommendations (so lower cost for replacement by replacing less frequently than recommended).
• No pump upgrades to overcome headloss induced by filters. This may mean that filters may begin to restrict flow over time, or that residents may try to bypass filters (losing compliance of systems). This is a risk that would have to be managed, but would reduce overall cost.
• Power cost assumed based on lowest flow capacity unit being installed at each property. Depending on actual use, this may mean that some properties have to restrict their demand.

Based on all the above assumptions, an equivalent annual cost of $1,287 per property per year was calculated. This is approximately 20% less than the cost estimate for the central treatment system of
$1,606 per property per year. It would however rely on all the above assumptions being accurate. These assumptions are either considered optimistic, would result in a lower level of service, a lower level of safety, or may compromise the compliance of the potential system.

Therefore it is concluded that even if all costs are minimized as far as could be considered possible, the cost savings at best would be marginal over the central treatment system or in a worst case may be significantly more than the central treatment option.

Modified Cost Estimate for Central Treatment Option

It was noted above that the ‘optimistic’ point-of-entry cost estimate could in a best case scenario provide a moderate cost saving over the central treatment option. This however is not considered a fair comparison, as some of the assumptions applied to one option were not equivalent with the other. For a fair comparison, there should be the same assumptions applied to both.

Therefore, for a more fair comparison, the central treatment option cost estimate has been updated with some assumptions modified for better consistency with the optimistic point-of-entry cost estimate:

- Removed 30% funding contingency of $80,000. This would reduce the cost of this option as follows:
  - Capital repayments portion of rates reduce by $159 per property per year
  - Depreciation portion of rates reduce by $45 per property per year
- Assumed filter changes only required 4 times per year rather than 12 times per year. This would reduce operational costs by $248 per property per year.

Using the above assumptions, the projected rating increase for the central treatment option could reduce by an average rate of $452 per property per year. This would reduce the average forecast rate increase by 28% from $1606 per property per year to $1,154 per property per year.

This potential ‘best case’ rating impact of the central treatment option is less than the ‘best case’ potential cost for the point-of-entry treatment option.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIM No.</th>
<th>Submission type</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
<th>Key Submission Points</th>
<th>Submission comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>180302022320</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>A - Treatment of existing source</td>
<td>Concerned with cost, requests a breakdown of operational costs for Option A</td>
<td>My preference is for Option A as I am concerned with the possible costs to the scheme should the Council proceed with Option B and not find satisfactory water. I presume both schemes would be treated so therefore the greater risk of not finding adequate satisfactory water via a new well is too great for the community. I would like to see a breakdown of the operational costs as they seem high for Option A. I reiterate that I have previously put in my own UV system at my North Island property and found it most satisfactory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180305022661</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>A - Treatment of existing source</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180301021574</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>None suitable</td>
<td>I don't accept any of these options.</td>
<td>I don't accept any of these options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180212013470</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>A - Treatment of existing source</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180219016762</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>A - Treatment of existing source</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180212013473</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>A - Treatment of existing source</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180321030206</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>None suitable</td>
<td>Questioning the purpose of proposal, concerned with cost, requests that Council brainstorm a solution with Garrymere community.</td>
<td>*Where did these figures come from? *Does the council have actual quotes that Garrymere residents are able to view? *What is the actual issue the council is trying to address? Quantity of water available is not an issue there is by all accounts plenty - it does overflow! There has only been one single occurrence of a water quality problem. That problem was singular, did not accelerate and was not found after retesting, which makes one consider contamination from the testing equipment or testing process. So if quantity and quality are not an issue, than what is? We would like it noted that we do not agree with any of the suggestions put forward, and most strongly disagree with the costs associated and the astronomical increase in rates (with no end in sight for that increase) associated with any of the suggestions. Time is also an issue. Why the rush. Good water/good water flow does not equate to an emergency that requires jumping on hastily. What we would like, is for the Council to come together with the Garrymere water scheme community to brainstorm ideas and come to a mutually acceptable conclusion that is financially acceptable to the users. After all, we are the people who will be paying for this, and we are also the people who vote for council members who are meant to represent us, the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timestamp</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180423043948</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Concerned with costs</td>
<td>Hi my name is Gene Carter, I'm writing to you in regards to Garrymere Water Supply Scheme-Source Upgrade. As far as the upgrade to the Garrymere Scheme, I find the cost for this water to well exceed living cost for our family. If we were to pay the exorbitant rates that the council are expecting us to pay, this would put our family in financial jeopardy. Financially, in this case the goods for our family we would have to opt-out of the Garrymere Water Supply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180426045024</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Requests more information on quote obtained, concerned with costs</td>
<td>Thank you for working on the Garrymere water scheme. We are grateful that you are our voice for water in Okuku. Affordable, clean water is our most fundamental need in life and in our district. It comes first before all other needs and is meant to be the greatest priority for our community. It is not an extra. It's a given. After consulting with two other well drillers, we feel that the quoted cost of drilling a well is inconsistent with the actual cost of well drilling. Could we please have the source of your quote and a list of quotes from other well drillers? This will give us reassurance that the quote is consistent with the actual cost of well drilling. Showing the community various quotes from local well drillers who would be more than happy to help, would make these numbers more understandable.Doubling our rates is too great a financial stress on many citizens. We would appreciate a reevaluation of the priorities for rural families and appreciate your help in redirecting money to help fund our most basic need of clean water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180426045020</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Concerned with costs, subsidies available</td>
<td>Refer to email train via TRIM Link for email and responses provided by WDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Note</td>
<td>Proposal/Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180426045030</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Treatment of existing source (Option A noted by process of elimination when reading submission)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feel process has been rushed, lack of WDC investigation, UV Treatment suggested,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback regarding the proposed upgrade to the Garrymere Water Supply Scheme. We feel that this process has been very rushed by the Waimakariri District Council and a meeting of residents should have been arranged to discuss this, not just a drop in session, so that all residents could have a voice and we have an understanding of each others views. We do not think that the WDC has investigated all options before presenting this. We are all aware that the Ministry of Health has given all councils a directive to improve water quality in New Zealand following the contamination issues in the Hawkes Bay area. As the Garrymere Water Scheme is already chlorinated and a vast proportion of this is used by stock we believe the option of providing UV treatment units for household use only has not been investigated thoroughly enough or given to us as an option. We understand that this option is currently being trialled in the Hurunui District at present. We would be happy as many other residents in Garrymere Road would to pay for a UV treatment unit for our house at a cost of around $1500 and any annual service fee. The proposed $1796 increase in rates per year is a substantial amount of money to find per household which will be ongoing. If household UV treatment units are not currently certified by the MOH then surely this could be explored to find a company who could produce one that would meet approved standards. We do not support the other 3 options ie. drilling a new well or connecting to the Summerhill Scheme. Thank you for your consideration of this matter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180406036543</td>
<td>LTP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Endorse Garrymere Landcare Group, support deferring decision on the upgrade, establish a Garrymere Water Advisory Group, meet compliance with the DWSNZ is transparent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to TRIM Link for full submission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180409037235</td>
<td>LTP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support establishing a Garrymere Water Advisory Group, further investigation required, rushed project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to TRIM Link for full submission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180403034501</td>
<td>LTP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Delay decision, conduct more research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to TRIM Link for full submission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180406036544</td>
<td>LTP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Defer upgrade for 12 months, establish a Garrymere Water Advisory Group, undertake further investigation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to TRIM Link for full submission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180504048680</td>
<td>Web form</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Join with Summerhill and reduce allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not supplied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not supplied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REPRESENTATIVES OF THE GARRYMERE LANDCARE GROUP WISH TO
SPEAK TO THE COUNCIL ON THIS SUBMISSION

Submission to Waimakariri District Council
Regarding the Garrymere Water Supply Scheme
Source Upgrade

Prepared by Steve Gregory on behalf of the Garrymere Landcare Group

On the 11 March 2018, the Garrymere Road Landcare Group was formed to address
concerns the rate payers on the Garrymere Water Scheme, had with the four
proposals put forward by the District Council for upgrading the Garrymere Water
Scheme.

The Garrymere Landcare Group represents more than half the scheme users, they
are unanimous in their views that the current proposals put before them to upgrade
the water scheme were made without consultation with them, on what was the most
efficient, cost effective and affordable method of upgrading the scheme.

The Landcare Group are seeking any decision on the upgrade to be deferred for 12
months so these matters can be addressed and propose the following.

PROPOSAL

The Garrymere Landcare Group respectfully ask the Council to defer the upgrade of
the Garrymere Water Scheme for 12 months.

We ask that the Council set up a Garrymere Water Advisory Group to undertake
further investigation into the upgrade including, what is the most efficient, cost
effective and affordable method of upgrading the scheme.

Members of the group would include, but not be limited to;

Representatives of the Garrymere Water Scheme Users
Waimakariri District Council technical staff
Representatives of elected Council members
Local Community Board members
Representatives for Canterbury DHB and Health Department

It is envisaged that the core members of the group would continue after this matter
was settled, to be able to address other water issues on the scheme as they arise.

We refer you to the attached documentation in support of this submission.

WATER QUALITY
There have been various comments made about the quality of the Garrymere Scheme water, some of which are misleading.

The technical specifications and overview of the scheme are covered in the **Garrymere Water Supply Scheme Activity Management Plan (2015)**

The existing treatment system comprises pH correction using soda ash and chlorine disinfection, which meets compliance with the microbiological requirements of the Drinking Water Standards.

The water at the heart of the Havelock North contamination in 2016, was contaminated water, that had got into the system from a pond less than 100 meters from the bore after a period of prolonged wet weather. The illness was caused by Campylobacter. They had a similar outbreak in 1998, as the inquiry report outlines;

[12] The Inquiry has found that the August 2016 outbreak was not Havelock North’s first experience of drinking water contamination and that the lessons that should have been learned from an earlier contamination had been forgotten.

[13] In July 1998 the town had an outbreak of campylobacteriosis. Sampling of two of the Brookvale Road bores showed campylobacter in the bore heads. This was the same location that would feature in the August 2016 outbreak. An independent report by Stu Clark (“1998 Clark Report”) concluded that the two bores were a possible source of the campylobacteriosis, and that the likely point of entry for contaminated surface water was a leaking power supply cable gland.(1) The Clark Report raised doubts about the confined status of the Te Mata aquifer from which the bores drew water.(2) It recommended testing the aquifer to establish whether it was confined, along with measures to ensure the security of both bore heads.

[14] Regrettably, while the two outbreaks shared remarkable similarities, it appears nothing was learned from the July 1998 outbreak. The District Council, as the water supplier, did not take the 1998 outbreak seriously enough and implement enduring, systemic changes. Memory of the earlier outbreak simply faded.


The Garrymere Scheme water, cannot be compared to the Havelock North water as it is treated with chlorine and has been since 2009.

Chlorine kills campylobacter, so there is little if any chance of a campylobacter outbreak similar to that which occurred in Havelock North on the Garrymere Scheme.
The chlorine dosing is manually controlled and monitored through an analyser. The chlorine analyser warns of inadequate or failed chlorine treatment.

It is acknowledged that the treatment system provides little protection against protozoan contaminants, such as Cryptosporidium and Giardia.

However, the national rate of cases per 100,000 population is low, in 2015 – 16 there was:

Cryptosporidiosis  15 (2015)  22.6 (2016)
Giardiasis        32.9 (2015)  34.5 (2016)

Notifiable Diseases in New Zealand: Annual Report 2016 Institute of Environmental Science and Research Ltd.

From the 26 of March 2018, Christchurch City introduced a staged chlorination disinfection of the city’s water. The chlorination has been approved for a period of 12 months while work is being done to ensure all the city’s below ground well heads are sealed at the surface to protect them from contamination.

Christchurch City with a population of 341,469, (census 2013) has not seen the need to add a further level of protection for that 12-month period. We are 0.0351% the size of Christchurch City.

In our submission we believe that the risk of anyone catching either Cryptosporidiosis or Giardiasis from the Garrymere Scheme Water in the period of deferral is negligible.

To our knowledge there have been no cases of either, reported in the schemes lifetime.
COMPLIANCE

The Waimakariri District Council are Network suppliers as defined in the Health Act 1956, they are therefore bound by the Act, and the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand. (DSW)

It is submitted that under the current legislation Council are meeting their compliance obligations under part (c) of the Health Act which imposes a range of duties on drinking-water suppliers, including duties to—

(i) monitor drinking water; and

(ii) take all practicable steps to comply with the drinking-water standards; and

(iii) implement risk management plans…….

The Garrymere Water Supply Scheme Activity Management Plan (2015), outlines that;

Council monitor the drinking water.

Council take all practicable steps to comply with the DSW.

There is a risk management plan

The current legislation allows the supplier to “take all practicable steps to comply”

It is our submission that the Council need to comply with the legislation as it is today, not try to achieve a standard that has not yet been written.

We again refer to Christchurch City and their response. They are sealing well heads in order to meet the secure bore status requirements set out in the Drinking Water Standards of today, not what they maybe in the future.

We submit that deferral of the decision to upgrade the scheme will not affect the Councils compliance status, so long as it is added to the Risk Management Plan, and the reasons stated, namely a Water Advisory Group will be set up to investigate and implement a scheme upgrade, that is efficient, cost effective and affordable.
69A Purpose

(1) The purpose of this Part is to protect the health and safety of people and communities by promoting adequate supplies of safe and wholesome drinking water from all drinking-water supplies.

(2) Accordingly, this Part—

(a) provides for the Ministry to maintain a register of all drinking-water suppliers; and

(b) provides for the Minister to issue or adopt drinking-water standards; and

(c) imposes a range of duties on drinking-water suppliers, including duties to—

(i) monitor drinking water; and

(ii) take all practicable steps to comply with the drinking-water standards; and

(iii) implement risk management plans; and

(d) imposes a range of duties on water carriers; and

(e) provides for the appointment of drinking-water assessors to assess compliance with this Part, and sets out their functions and powers; and

(f) provides for the Director-General to recognise laboratories for the purposes of analysing drinking water; and

(g) sets out certain emergency powers that are available during public health emergencies relating to drinking water; and

(h) creates various offences; and

(i) provides for the dissemination of information about drinking water.

69G Interpretation

In this Part, unless the context otherwise requires, —

**Networked supplier**—

(a) means a drinking-water supplier who supplies drinking water from the place where the supply is to 1 or more other properties, by means of a pipe connecting those properties; but

(b) does not include a bulk supplier

The Garrymere Water Scheme are either a --

**Small drinking-water supply means** a drinking-water supply that—

(a) is used to supply drinking water to between 101 and 500 people (inclusive) for at least 60 days per year; and

(b) is not a drinking-water supply to which paragraph (a) or (b) of the definition of neighbourhood drinking-water supply applies

or

**Neighbourhood drinking-water supply means** a drinking-water supply that is used to supply drinking water to—

(a) between 25 and 100 people (inclusive) for at least 60 days per year; or

(b) any number of persons for at least 60 days per year if—

(i) the number of those persons when multiplied by the number of days per year during which those persons receive water from that supply is 6000 or greater; but

(ii) the number of those persons is not greater than 100 on 60 or more days in any year.

69V Duty to take all practicable steps to comply with drinking-water standards

(1) Every drinking-water supplier must take all practicable steps to ensure that the drinking water supplied by that supplier complies with the drinking-water standards.

(2) A drinking-water supplier complies with subsection (1) if the supplier implements those provisions of the supplier’s approved water safety plan relating to the drinking-water standards.
(3) Subsection (2) does not limit the ways in which a drinking-water supplier is able to comply with subsection (1).

(4) Subsection (1) applies to each drinking-water supplier subject to any exemption or variation that has been granted to that supplier under section 69ZZD(2)(k).

(5) Subsection (1) does not apply to those drinking-water standards that are identified in those standards as guideline values for aesthetic determinands for avoiding adverse aesthetic effects in drinking water.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

We understand that not upgrading the scheme is not an option for the Council, we know Council is bound by both the Health Act and the Drinking Water Standards.

The Garrymere Scheme services a small number of people, with only 41 connections. We also understand that under the current regime rates are targeted.

The cheapest proposal put forward sees the water rates increase for the majority of the rate payers by $1796 pa, to $3599pa. This will be ongoing for the term of the loan, stated by Council staff to be 25yrs.

Normal rating requirements are not taken into account in this figure, some rates including water will rise to in excess of $5500.

This is a considerable sum to find for families who live on residential lifestyle blocks, who unlike commercial businesses, can’t pass their costs on.

The Garrymere Water Scheme already has one of the highest costs per user of any water scheme in the country.

A report by Catherine McCallum of Simpson Grierson commented on the inquiry recommendations in regards to costs in an article titled “Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry, Stage 2 Report released,” saying;

Despite the merits of reducing risk as much as possible, the Report does not fully address the cost of doing so. In fact, it specifically noted that an assessment of the financial implications of mandatory treatment was beyond the scope of the Inquiry. [152] Councils are on limited budgets and therefore need to make strategic choices about what is the priority for local areas, which requires a balancing of all the different effects against the economic cost of different responses. Assuming a limited appetite for hiking rates, increased expenditure on drinking water protection is likely to come at the expense of other community initiatives.


The Garrymere Scheme users are an easy target, given the rate for water is targeted, like Councils, families are on limited budgets and it will be individual households who will need to carry out this balancing act with their financial obligations, rather than the Council.

It is therefore paramount that any decisions on the upgrade involve the community who are paying for it.
Our Reference: EXT-30 / 180316028182

19 March 2018

The Hon. David Clark
Minister of Health
Freepost PO Box 18 888
Parliament Buildings
Wellington 6160

david.clark@parliament.govt.nz

Dear Sir,

I am writing to you requesting some advice on the Government’s direction regarding the potential for Government funding to assist small drinking-water supplies in achieving compliance with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand.

Within the Waimakariri District we have a number of water supplies ranging in size from serving approximately 17,000 people in Rangiora to as few as 100 people on our smallest scheme. We have been proactive in undertaking upgrade projects to achieve compliance with the Drinking-water Standards for most of our schemes, but are now coming to a point where we are required to achieve compliance for our remaining smaller schemes. This has introduced the challenge of funding these upgrades, which can have a very significant impact on small communities as water rates are targeted.

In one case the upgrade we are proposing is forecast to cost approximately $400,000. This expenditure would double what are already the highest water rates in the district from approximately $1,800 per connection to $3,600 per connection. Note this is the rates just to supply water, not the full rates charge for the properties.

We are aware that funding was previously available for some schemes under a Drinking-water Assistance Programme, however this funding was not continued under the previous Government.

In light of consideration currently being given to drinking-water following the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry Stage 2 Report, we are seeking any guidance relating to the possibility of Government funding. In particular we understand the Government is currently considering the implementation of a National Regulator as recommended by the Stage 2 Inquiry Report, and would like to understand whether this regulator would cover or consider the funding of water supply upgrades.
We do not want to delay the need to upgrade our last remaining schemes due to the public health risk presented by them, however at the same time do not want to be disadvantaged by missing out on potential future funding by being proactive and carrying out upgrades earlier than others.

I would appreciate any thoughts or advice you have on this matter and look forward to your response.

Yours faithfully,

David Ayers
MAYOR
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 The purpose of this report is to:

   a) Inform the Rangiora Ashley Community Board on progress of the installation of a new pedestrian footbridge across Crayfish (Koura) Creek in the Drainage Reserve, north of Northbrook Road, Rangiora.

   b) Seek approval for the proposed location and design of the footbridge.

**Attachments:**

   i. Crayfish Creek Footbridge Design Drawings (Trim 170711071772)
   
   ii. Artists impression of proposed Crayfish Creek Bridge (Trim: 180509050479,180509050478)
   
   iii. Highgate Subdivision Layout Plan (Trim: 151105149522 – Drawing No. 3041 Rev C)
   
   iv. Photographs of Proposed Bridge Locations (Trim 180503048297)
   
   v. Hegan Reserve Footbridge Photo (Trim: 180509050477)
   
   vi. Woodend Kaiapoi Cycleway Bridge Photo (Trim: 180509050474)

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

   **THAT** the Rangiora Ashley Community Board:

   (a) **Receives** report No. 180502047945.

   (b) **Approves** the design of the proposed footbridge in the location shown in Crayfish Creek Footbridge, Site Plan 3802, for an estimated cost of $56,000 (refer attachment i).

   (c) **Notes** that construction of the footbridge will be tendered and is currently planned to be completed before 30 June 2018.

   (d) **Circulates** this report to the Utilities and Roading Committee for their information.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1. The drainage reserve adjacent to Koura Creek and to the north of Northbrook Road was constructed as part of the East Rangiora Stormwater Management Area (SMA) which services the new Highgate Subdivision and an existing urban stormwater catchment north of Kippenberger Avenue.
3.2. Construction of the SMA which was practically completed in 2012, included a pedestrian footbridge (refer Attachment i and ii). Due to delays in completing the eastern stages of the subdivision and consequent access issues, construction of the footbridge has not been carried out yet.

3.3. The footbridge was designed to provide a pedestrian link between Watkins Drive (Road 1) and an existing walking track on the west side of Koura Creek (refer attached Highgate Subdivision Layout Plan and Site Plan – Attachments i and iii and photographs in Attachment iv).

3.4. The proposed Crayfish Creek Footbridge is of timber construction and is designed to be of a high standard and to be aesthetically pleasing in keeping with the natural amenity values of the reserve - refer Artists Impression of Proposed Crayfish Creek Bridge (Attachment ii)

3.5. The bridge will be tendered and is currently planned to be constructed this financial year (before 30 June 2018).

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The proposed footbridge will provide a pedestrian linkage from Watkins Drive (yet to be constructed) to the existing network of walkways around the East Rangiora SMA and the Northbrook Ponds reserve.

4.2. An alternative bridge location was proposed at the existing concrete weir to the north of the proposed bridge site. This location was not considered appropriate because it did not prove a direct link from Watkins Drive to the reserve. The developer was not in favour of the alternative bridge location.

4.3. The Developer is presently constructing the final stages of the Highgate Development and is levelling the land to the east of the creek.

4.4. Maintenance of Crayfish Creek is carried out by the Three Waters Drainage Department. Native riparian planting has been established on both sides of the creek except where an existing hawthorn hedge borders the eastern bank. Decaying hedge clippings dropped into the creek have been identified by ecologists as a food source for the Koura. It is proposed that the hedge is retained and maintained in its current state.

4.5. The Crayfish Creek spring head is an important feature of the local landscape however the steep banks have been identified as a potential Health and Safety risk, given its proximity to the children’s playground. Future enhancements to this might include low fence/barrier of the spring head incorporating public interpretation boards. No budget has been established for barriers however drainage staff will work with Greenspace staff to develop a plan to enhance the area around the spring head.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

Groups and Organisations

5.1. Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga have been consulted on the Koura Creek footbridge through the monthly WDC, Runanga liaison meetings and the resource consenting process.
5.2. No other community groups have been consulted on the footbridge however community consultation was carried out prior to the construction of the East Rangiora SMA and Greenspace reserve.

**Wider Community**

5.3. Adjacent property owners have taken a strong interest in the reserve, in particular the design and location of the Children’s Playground further to the North at the Crayfish Creek Spring Head.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

**Financial Implications**

6.1. $100,000 of funding has been allocated to this project. Approximately $11,000 has been spent on obtaining resource consents from Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council, leaving approximately $89,000 in the budget. The bridge is estimated to cost $56,000 dollars (including a 10% construction contingency) to build. This compares with $15,258 to construct the Hegan Reserve footbridge (see attachment v) and $50,500 for the Woodend Kaiapoi cycleway bridge (see attachment vi). Tenders for the Cycleway Bridge ranged from $50,000 to $100,000.

**Community Implications**

6.2. The new footbridge will provide a pedestrian linkage to the existing network of walkways around the East Rangiora Stormwater Management Area and the Northbrook Ponds reserve.

**Risk Management**

**Health and Safety**

6.3. Standard Health and Safety requirements during construction will apply to the tender. The footbridge has been designed to meet the current requirements of the building Act.

7. **CONTEXT**

**Policy**

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

**Legislation**


**Community Outcomes**

7.2. The accessibility of community and recreation facilities meets the changing needs of our community

7.3. There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that effects our District.
Delegations

7.1. The Rangiora Ashley Community Board have the delegation to approve the location of the proposed footbridge.
These plans and specifications must be kept on site during construction, and made available to the building officer on request. Failure to do so will mean an automatic failure of the building inspection and will necessitate re-booking the inspection at the applicant’s expense.

All boundary survey pegs must be located and flagged by the owner before work is commenced.

**INSPECTIONS**

for bookings or building enquiries
please phone the BUILDING UNIT on:

03 311 8906

or

Email inspection bookings to: bcbooking@wmk.govt.nz

- Please refer to your inspection schedule for details of inspections to be carried out.
- 2-3 working day’s notice should be given and provision made to allow access.
- The Code Compliance Certificate will be issued once the:
  - Final inspection has been carried out and passed
  - Audit of WDC building consent file has been completed
  - Payment of any outstanding invoices is received
Consent Issued BC170669
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CRAYFISH CREEK FOOTBRIDGE
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SECTION 37 OF THE BUILDING ACT
APPLIES TO THIS CONSENT
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Approved
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Photo 1 – Proposed bridge location looking upstream

Photo 2 – Proposed bridge location looking east from Koura Reserve
Photo 3 – Alternative bridge location at existing weir structure looking upstream

Photo 4 – Alternative bridge location at existing weir structure looking east from Koura Reserve
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 The purpose of this report is to retrospectively ratify the Board’s submission to the Council in relation to the Waimakariri District Council Draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028.

**Attachments:**

i. The Rangiora-Ashley Community Board Submission to the Waimakariri District Council Draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028 (Trim No. 180328033661).

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

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

(a) Receives report No. 180328033649.

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

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 Public consultation on the Waimakariri District Council’s Draft Long Term Plan took place from 9 March 2018 to 9 April 2018.

3.2 Board members met at a workshop on 21 March 2018 to discuss the content of their submission. A first draft was circulated on 28 March 2018 for additional comment and feedback by 3 April 2018 which was incorporated into a final draft and recirculated.

3.3 The finalised submission was approved by the Chair and submitted to the Council on 6 April 2018.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The Board is now asked to retrospectively ratify the attached submission.

4.2. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.
5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

Board members attend various community groups and have sought to ensure that these groups are aware of the Draft Long Term Plan proposals and any particular aspects that may be of relevance including the major capital projects - specifically those relating to community and recreational facilities.

5.2. **Wider Community**

As above (5.1) when attending community events or engaging with individual residents.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

Not applicable.

6.2. **Community Implications**

The Draft Long Term Plan is subject to formal and extensive public consultation and engagement.

6.3. **Risk Management**

Not applicable.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

Not applicable.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

Not applicable.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

- Opportunities for people to contribute to decision making.
- People have wide ranging opportunities for being informed.
- Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality.

7.4. **Delegations**

Not applicable.
To: The Waimakariri District Council
Submission: Draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028
From: Rangiora Ashley Community Board

Contact: Edwina Cordwell – Governance Adviser
Email: Edwina.cordwell@wmk.govt.nz
Phone: 0800 965 468 ext. 8376

The Chairperson wishes to be heard with regard to this submission.

The Rangiora-Ashley Community Board (the Board) thanks the Council for the opportunity to make a submission on the Long Term Plan 2018-2028.

The Board congratulates the Council and staff on an excellently presented and well thought out suite of documents supporting the Public Consultation. All aspects of the style and presentation have enabled a much wider audience to engage and potentially submit on this vitally important strategic document.

The Board also wishes to record the innovation and importance of the Rates Calculator on line facility.

1. Rates Burden

The Board understands the rationale for the proposed rates rises but notes that any rises are cumulative.

It is further noted that there are significant rate rise proposals within the Long Term Plan for Infrastructure, Regeneration, Water and Community Facilities. There is no easy option and the plans appear sound but this is also taking place against a backdrop of many in our community being on fixed or lower incomes. The introduction of free student allowances and fees by the new government has led to an increase in rental charges so the cost of housing to non-students has also been seen to increase but without any accompanying government support.

Housing costs in the area may be below that of Christchurch but this also means that our residents have limited choice to downsize and release capital to add to their fixed incomes. Indeed house prices are rising too.

The Board is aware that there has been no real increase in the Government’s Rates Supplement and requests that the council lobby the government for those living in the Waimakariri District based on the clear evidence of population growth (Statistics NZ), the need to develop infrastructure and services as a consequence of current increases and to meet future identified growth, that this then results in a rate rise for Waimakariri residents that would not otherwise be required and that the Supplement to the District’s residents should be increased as a consequence. Otherwise there is the very real danger that residents will fall behind financially and suffer hardship as a consequence of the success of our own district and its communities. All agencies working with and supporting those on fixed or low incomes are reporting financial hardship issues.
2. Multi –Use Sports Facility

The Board strongly supports the principle of such a facility and the benefits that it would bring to the district. The Board notes that it is a building to meet future needs and a life expectancy of over 50 years which is to be commended.

However members are also mindful of the significant capital cost and the additional $90 per annum rates burden particularly for those on fixed incomes.

The Board seeks assurance that costs will be tightly controlled and that all major items have been fully accounted for and that there will be no deviation from the estimated cost and that any and all steps will be taken to further drive down construction costs whilst ensuring a fully function sports facility.

The Board seeks assurance that the facility will be first and foremost for our District’s use and that there will be appropriate arrangements in place to ensure that this remains the case and that our own communities and residents needs are not impeded by the popularity of the facility and usage by non-District residents and associated sports and other groups. The Board would wish to be advised what these measures will be as it is critical that the facility is seen as a District first in terms of patronage. It is of concern that such a facility could become popular for regional tournaments and other wider events compromising opportunities. One member suggesting some form of differential charging be considered for district residents as opposed to the wider area.

3. Kerbside Collection

The Board supports the choices that are being presented in the Long Term Plan for consultation and feedback by those most directly affected.

The Board remains concerned as identified in its specific submission the matter that there could be a consequential cost burden to the Council depending on the contractual arrangements and the vagaries of the cost and administration of the Opt In and Out processes.

The Board is only supportive of the proposals on the basis that any service is guaranteed to be cost neutral in perpetuity.

Should the proposal be accepted the Board seeks close attention to the arrangements for the transition period that needs to be undertaken, in conjunction with households switching to the new scheme and the private operators to ensure that any such transition is again cost neutral for the householder and that any opt in to the system does not carry any contractual charge/cancellation fee with the current service provider. The Board notes that there are a number of providers and that each household may have a differing contract but that it is clearly important not to have the householder bearing two costs at transition and that this transition may need to be staged accordingly.

The Board remains concerned that there appear to be no arrangements in place to minimize waste and asks that the Council addresses this as a matter of urgency. The EnviroSchool programme has been particularly successful (the Board notes North Loburn School as an exemplar) as well as local campaigns to reduce rubbish and waste in general but there appears to be no complementary Council initiative or overt stance in this regard.

4. Rangiora Service Centre refurbishment

The Board is supportive.
5. **Rangiora Library Extension**

The Board is supportive in principle with the proposal to extend the Library but seeks assurances that trends in usage/nature of services available as influenced by technology and customer needs/demographics will be re-assessed prior to any final decision being made.

6. **Regeneration**

The Board is supportive of the Regeneration projects and timeframe.

7. **Woodend/Pegasus Community Centre**

This is supported.

8. **Proposed Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) – Public Art Trust**

The Board welcomes this proposal and hopes that it will ensure the provision of high quality public art across the District.

9. **Rangiora Car Park Building**

The Board reiterates the urgent need for a Car Parking building in Rangiora and seeks a firm timeline for this within the LTP.

10. **Roading and associated issues**

The Board notes that there are a number of potential NZTA and council roading developments and alterations that will cause a significant alteration in the pattern of usage of roads from the present. A key one being the Rangiora to SH1 connection. The board suggests that the ‘new connectivity’ needs to be formally assessed and mapped onto the cycleway network, walkway and public transport provision at a strategic level.

There is also support for the proposed Lehmanns Road/River Road Bypass.

Flashing Signs – perhaps just those that show ‘Slow Down’ at each of the main entrance ways to remind drivers that they are entering urban areas. Signs in use at Southbrook and in ChCh.

Consideration of ‘no exhaust braking zones’ for lorries in appropriate areas.

Surface smoothing of West Belt between Johns Street and Oxford Road.

11. **Town Entrances**

The board fully supports the proposed strategic review of Town Entrances and that funding to ensure delivery of the recommendations is allocated to ensure that there is no delay in achieving this critical project and for it not to continue to be on a piecemeal basis as this results in additional costs and also a less coherent planting and beautification plan for all townships. The District seeks to attract businesses, visitors and workers and this initiative is fundamental to all of these as well as inspiring a sense of community ownership and pride in our residents.

12. **Water Supply Charges/Cost Sharing Model**

The board is keenly aware of the challenges faced by the Council and affected residents and recognises the work and commitment of all those affected. The Board does NOT support a district wide rate but
suggests that there should be an investigation of the possibility of amalgamating a number of small water schemes together as a means of cost sharing. It is noted that Hurunui has two schemes – one for urban and one for rural.

The Board also suggests that the Council consider lobbying Government to gain recognition of the extent of the rural water schemes in the District and that financial support is needed to deliver these to meet NZ Drinking Water Standards. Noting that the burden may be falling more heavily on Waimakariri and other rural districts as compared with larger cities.

13. Footpaths

The Board requests additional funding for ‘formed’ footpaths around the district. Particular priorities noted in the Board’s community area are:

Coldstream Road from the railway to the artificial hockey turf/school.

East Belt to the schools and to connect to Coldstream Road

North side of Oxford Road between the pathway constructed by Rymans and the existing path as Mobility Scooters and pedestrians have to walk onto the busy road to walk between the two areas.

Jim Gerard QSO

Chairperson
1. SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>EVENT / MEETING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 4 April</td>
<td>• Road Naming Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Passchendaele Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Timebank meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 10 April</td>
<td>• Meeting staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rangiora Network meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rangiora Promotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 11 April</td>
<td>• Meeting with Riding for Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 17 April</td>
<td>• Enterprise North Canterbury (ENC) meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Friends of the Town Hall meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 18 April</td>
<td>• Mayor and Chairs meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Youth Achievement Awards meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Meeting street lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 19 April</td>
<td>• Meeting Simon Hart re Good Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 30 April</td>
<td>• All Boards Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 2 May</td>
<td>• Big Brothers Big Sister’s breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ENC Business Awards function</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180508049899

Jim Gerard QSO
CHAIRPERSON