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The Mayor and Councillors

WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

A meeting of the WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL will be held in the COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA on TUESDAY 6 NOVEMBER 2018 at 1.00PM.

Sarah Nichols
GOVERNANCE MANAGER

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

BUSINESS

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
   Conflicts of interest (if any) to be reported for minuting.

3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

4. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
   4.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 2 October 2018

   RECOMMENDATION
   THAT the Council:
   (a) Confirms as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 2 October 2018.

   4.2 Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 2 October 2018
   (refer to Blue agenda papers)

MATTERS ARISING

5. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
   5.1 Pegasus Golf Club
   Mr Sam Huo representing the ownership of Pegasus Golf Club, will be present to inform the Council on development plans for the Club and future PGA tournaments.
6. ADJOURNED BUSINESS

Nil.

7. REGENERATION REPORTS

7.1. Adoption of Reviewed Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan – 2028 and Beyond – Draft Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan Submissions Hearing Panel (Mayor Ayers, Councillors Blackie and Meyer)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 181001113553

(b) Notes the summary of public submissions received, and the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan Hearings Panel's recommendations.

(c) Adopts the attached Final Draft version of the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan – 2028 and Beyond (Trim 181017121695) as the finalised version of the Plan.

(d) Circulates a copy of this report to the Community Board's for their information.

8. REPORTS

8.1. Carryover Budget Adjustments 2018-19 – Paul Christensen (Finance Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 181003115088.

(b) Approves the budgets for the 110 changes to the 2018-19 capital programme;

(c) Notes the capital works programme will increase by $12.8million to $85.3million;

(d) Notes 19 of these projects were completed between July and September 2018;

(e) Notes that all projects are forecast to be completed this financial year, excluding multi-year projects/programmes.
8.2. Re-allocation of Footpaths Maintenance and Renewals Funding to New Footpaths – Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 181024124660;
(b) Approves the reallocation funding for the construction of new footpaths in Harewood Road and Burnt Hill at an estimated cost of $80,000 (PJ 100746.000.5134);
(c) Supports the construction of the new footpaths being carried out under the Road Maintenance Contract on the basis this is the most cost effective method of completing this work as the contract rates are competitive and tendering costs which for straightforward work like this can be disproportionally high and would result in less footpath being constructed;
(d) Notes that it is proposed to reallocate savings from NZTA subsidising of footpaths as detailed in this report and also to Roading Development Contributions (Doc. 181025124661) and Urban Cycleways Projects (Doc. 181002114346);
(e) Notes that the Utilities & Roading Committee supported the inclusion of new footpaths in Harewood Road and Burnt Hill Road, subject to NZTA confirmation of 51% subsidy for Footpath Renewals and subsequent approval to reallocate budget by Council;
(f) Circulates this report to the Utilities & Roading Committee for information.

8.3 Urban Cycleways Project Completion Report – Dan Lewis (UCP Project Manager) and Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 181002114346;
(b) Approves the reallocation of $83,734 from Footpath Renewals and Maintenance budget to the Cycleway budget (PJ 100749.000.5135).
(c) Notes that the total cost of the project is $2.824 million against the approved budget of $2.5 million.
(d) Notes that a further claim has been submitted to NZTA for funding of $77,056 (NZTA share) under the NLTF.
(e) Circulates this report to Utilities & Roading Committee and Audit & Risk Committee for information.
8.4. **Roading Subdivision Contribution Budget Update and Reallocation of Budget – Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) ** Receives** report No. 181025124661;

(b) ** Approves** the reallocation of $228,000 from the Footpath Renewals and Maintenance budgets to the Council Performed Works budget (PJ 100361.000.5133);

(c) ** Supports** the Duffs Road property owner funding 50% of the cost of sealing a 100m section of the roads by agreeing to approve an exemption to the 50% cost share policy of 1km/year if they come up with their share of the funding;

(d) ** Notes** the Council’s share of urbanising Chinnerys Road is $298,507.93 which will be paid to the Developer;

(e) ** Notes** that further reports will be brought before Council as and when there is more certainty around future projects and costs;

(f) ** Notes** that support has previously been given to Browns Road and North Eyre Road property owners north of the Eyre River, as well as Broad Road/Rangiora Leithfield Road property owners should they come up with a 50% cost share for sealing outside of their properties;

(g) ** Circulates** this report to Utilities & Roading Committee for information.

8.5 **Request for Three Elected Members to be appointed to a Hearing Panel to consider Objections to a New Bus Shelter Installation adjacent to 321 High Street, Rangiora - Kathy Graham (Journey Planner / Road Safety Coordinator)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) ** Receives** report No. 181024124226:

(b) ** Appoints** three (3) Councillors, Councillor John Meyer (Roading Portfolio), Councillor.......................... and Councillor........................ to a hearing panel to consider the objection to the proposed installation of a new bus shelter at 321 High Street, Rangiora.

(c) ** Notes** the hearing is proposed to be held in the first week of December 2018.

(d) ** Circulates** this report to the Rangiora Ashley Community Board for information.
8.6. **Council Submission on the Draft Regional Public Transport Plan – Simon Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement)**

*RECOMMENDATION*

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 181018122406.

(b) **Approves** the Submission attached to this report as the WDC Submission on the Draft Canterbury Regional Public Transport Plan.

8.7. **2019 Council Meeting Dates – Sarah Nichols (Governance Manager)**

*RECOMMENDATION*

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 181025125056.

(b) **Adopts** the following meeting schedule for the period from 15 January to 11 October 2019. (as outlined in Trim 181023123426).

Ordinary Council Meeting Dates commencing at 1pm on the first Tuesday of the month:


Council meetings relating to (Draft) Annual Plan and Annual Report including submissions and hearings:


(c) **Adopts** the following meeting schedule for the period from 15 January to 11 October 2019 for Standing Committees:

District Planning and Regulation Committee commencing at 1pm on Tuesdays:


Utilities and Roading Committee commencing at 4.00pm on Tuesdays:


Community and Recreation Committee commencing at 1.00pm on Tuesdays:


Audit and Risk Committee commencing at 3.30pm on Tuesdays:


District Licencing Committee commencing at 9am on Fridays:

(d) **Notes** the 2019 meeting dates of the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee have been set in conjunction with Environment Canterbury.

(e) **Notes** the Community Boards and Regeneration Steering Group will adopt their timetable at their meetings held during November 2018, as proposed in Trim document 181023123426.

9. **HEALTH AND SAFETY**


**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No 181024124320

(b) **Notes** that there are no significant Health and Safety issues at this time, and that WDC is, so far as is reasonably practicable, compliant with the PCBU duties of the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015.

10. **MATTER REFERRED FROM COMMUNITY BOARDS**


*refer to attached copy of report no. 180910103408 to the Utilities and Roading Committee meeting of 16 October 2018:*

**THAT** the Council

(a) **Receives** report No. 180910103408.

(b) **Notes** that a review of the *Water Supply Bylaw 2012* has been undertaken, and it has been confirmed that there is a need for a water supply bylaw, and that the 2012 document is generally fit for purpose.

(c) **Notes** that the proposed *Water Supply Bylaw 2018* does not provide Council with extra rights or powers than it currently has, but rather is an update of the existing document to accurately reference current practices, to clarify some clauses and to reference other policies (the Backflow Prevention Policy) that have been developed since the 2012 bylaw was adopted.

(d) **Adopts** the Waimakariri District Council *Water Supply Bylaw 2018*.

(e) **Circulates** this report to the Council’s Community Boards for their information.
11. COMMITTEE/WORKING PARTY/JOINT COMMITTEE MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

11.1. Minutes of a meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee held on 18 September 2018 168 - 176

11.2. Minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee held on 18 September 2018 177 - 185

11.3. Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri Youth Council held on 25 September 2018 186 - 187

11.4. Minutes of a meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group held on 1 October 2018 188 - 191

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

12. COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

12.1. Minutes of a meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board held on 3 October 2018 192 - 205

12.2. Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board held on 8 October 2018 206 - 211

12.3. Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board held on 10 September 2018 212 - 218

12.4. Minutes of a meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board held on 15 October 2018 219 - 226

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

13. CORRESPONDENCE

14. MAYOR’S DIARY

14.1. Mayor’s Diary 25 September – 26 October 2018 227 - 230

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report no. 181026125532.
15. COUNCIL PORTFOLIO UPDATES

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

16. QUESTIONS
(under Standing Orders)

17. URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS
(under Standing Orders)

18. MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

RECOMMENDATION

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of:</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of Council meeting of 2 October 2018</td>
<td>Confirmation of minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

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

CLOSED MEETING

See Public Excluded Agenda (blue papers)

OPEN MEETING
19. NEXT MEETING

The next scheduled meeting of the Council is on Tuesday 4 December 2018 commencing at 1.00pm.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA, ON TUESDAY 2 OCTOBER 2018, COMMENCING AT 1PM.

PRESENT:
Mayor D Ayers (Chair), Deputy Mayor K Felstead, Councillors N Atkinson, A Blackie, W Doody, R Brine (from 4.00pm), D Gordon, J Meyer, S Stewart and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE:
J Palmer (Chief Executive), G Cleary (Manager Utilities & Roading), J Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support), S Markham (Manager, Strategy and Engagement), J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager), K Simpson (3 Waters Manager), C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager), B Rice (Senior Transport Engineer), C Wood (Senior Policy Planner), D Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager), F Scales (Senior Project Engineer), and A Smith (Committee Advisor).

The meeting adjourned at 2.55pm and reconvened at 3.15pm for refreshment.

1. APOLOGIES
Moved Councillor Blackie seconded Councillor Atkinson

THAT an apology for lateness be received and sustained for Councillor Brine and an apology for absence for Councillor Barnett.

CARRIED

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
There were no conflicts of interest recorded.

3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS
Mayor Ayers acknowledged the recent passing of two local gentlemen.

Lawthor Johnson
Lawthor Johnson from Ohoka, passed away on 26 September, in his 91st year. Lawthor was a former Eyre County Councillor. He also served during the last term of the Council, which included approximately six months as a Rangiora District Councillor following Local Government amalgamation in 1989.

David Viles
David Viles died on 22 September. David served North Canterbury well, as Director and Chair of Prime Building, Executive Director of Enterprise North Canterbury and until recently, the Council’s appointed Director on Waimakariri Irrigation Ltd.

All those present stood and observed a minute’s silence.
4. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

4.1. Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 4 September 2018

Moved Councillor Gordon seconded Councillor Doody

THAT the Council:

(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 4 September 2018.

CARRIED

4.2. Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 4 September 2018

(refer to Public Excluded minutes)

MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising.

5. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

There were no deputations or presentations.

6. ADJOURNED BUSINESS

There was no adjourned business.

LATE AGENDA ITEM

Mayor Ayers sought approval of members for a late agenda item to be considered at this meeting.

Moved Councillor Gordon Seconded Councillor Meyer

THAT the Council agree to consider Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group – Terms of Reference, at this meeting. (Trim No. 180829098070)

CARRIED

This report is included as Item 7.5 of these minutes.

7. REPORTS

7.1. Delay of Refresh of the Waimakariri Zone Committee Community Members – Geoff Meadows (Policy Manager)

G Meadows presented this report, seeking approval of the Council to delay refreshment of the Zone Committee community members until June 2019. Normally refreshment is done on an annual basis in partnership with Environment Canterbury Council and Ngai Tahu. However, it is intended to delay the refreshment process until June 2019 as the Committee is part way through its draft Zone Implementation Programme Addendum (ZIPA) consultation process and it is not considered an appropriate time to undertake a refreshment process. Council approval is required to delay this process.
Moved Councillor Atkinson seconded Councillor Stewart

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180918108059
(b) **Approves** the delay in refreshing the Community Members of the Waimakariri Zone Committee until 30 June 2019.

CARRIED

Councillor Atkinson agreed that this was a sensible reason for the refresh process to be delayed until next year.

Councillor Stewart endorsed the comments of Councillor Atkinson and this recommendation, noting it would be challenging for new people to get up to speed with the process to date and it would make no sense to change the membership at this point.

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

B Rice presented the report which sought Council’s approval to consult on the proposed changes to speed limits on Rangiora-Woodend Road, Boys Road, Northbrook Road and Gressons Road.

The report had been considered by all the Community Boards who supported the recommendations. Some of the Community Boards had questioned whether the proposed speed limit of 60kph on Rangiora-Woodend Road in the current urban area was appropriate. There was discussion as to whether 50kph or 60kph was more appropriate and B Rice advised that work would be required to alter the layout and environment to make it look and feel like a 50kph environment. This would then be presented to the Council and would also be likely to be affected by changes that are being planned by NZYA to address safety issues on SH1 at Woodend. Staff are proposing to further review the speed limits and road environments once NZTA have confirmed their design plans. For these reasons it is recommended the current consultation be on the basis of a 60kph limit.

The consultation process will include information going out on the Council’s website, newspaper notices and flyers to the directly affected properties. It is also proposed to have an open day in Woodend which will take place alongside the planned NZTA event regarding SH1 safety improvements. This is to be confirmed and all elected members will be updated.

Councillor Williams asked what the difference would be between Woodend with a 50kph speed limit, compared to say River Road in Rangiora, and Williams Street, Kaiapoi, past the Kaiapoi Golf Club. B Rice said that one of the ‘lessons learned’ is that there is not good compliance with the speed limit on these roads with the road layout and arrangements there at the moment. If a 50kph limit were to be considered road narrowing, possibly some cycle lanes and kerb build outs would be needed. The nature of that section of road will become very different if NZTA alter the Rangiora-Woodend Road/SH1 intersection (for example a roundabout or traffic lights).

Councillor Gordon asked if any plans were in place to deal with safety issues at the Boys Road/Tuahiwi Road/Rangiora-Woodend Road intersection (five cross roads). This safety issue has been raised many times as a concern. B Rice said staff are looking at options. There has been some minor work done to date, with road markings to straighten vehicles up initially. The next stage would be some right hand turning bays, which could probably be achieved without land acquisitions, but any further changes may involve some land acquisition. It is
proposed that there would be an update report coming back to the Community Boards early in 2019.

Councillor Doody, referring to the traffic speed statistics included in the report, expressed concern at the speeds that drivers are travelling at on these roads and asked if there were some other measures that the Council could be using to try to keep drivers’ speed down. B Rice said that there will always be a minority of drivers who travel at these excessive speeds, and will not adhere to any speed limit signs.

Moved Councillor Gordon seconded Mayor Ayers

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180919108756.

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

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

(c) Notes the consultation on this proposal will be carried out between 8th October and 4th November 2018.

(d) Notes the Community Boards will be updated at the end of the consultation process.

(e) Notes that any submissions on the proposal will be taken into account before the speed limit change is presented to the Council on 4th December for approval.

CARRIED

Councillor Gordon thanked B Rice for taking this matter to the Boards and that this is an important section of roading, crossing a number of ward boundaries and that there are a lot of people using the road. The safety of drivers at the cross roads at Tuahiwi remains a concern for Councillor Gordon. He looks forward to a further report back to the Council in December on the results of the consultation.

Mayor Ayers said that it is important that this go out to the wider community for consultation, having already gone to the Community Boards.

7.3. **Review of the Local Alcohol Policy 2018 Recommendations of the Hearing Panel – Councillors N Atkinson (Chair), W Doody and J Meyer**

N Harrison presented this report, extending an apology for L Beckingsale. This report provides the recommendations of the Hearing Panel which heard submissions on the Local Alcohol Policy in July. The Hearing Panel was
chaired by Councillor Atkinson, with panel members Councillors Doody and Meyer. There were 24 submissions received which broadly sought changes to make the Policy more practical. N Harrison highlighted some of these adjustments to the proposed Local Alcohol Policy 2018 – including change of opening hours for on-licences from 8am to 7am (this aligns with off-licence opening hours), include extended hours for New Year’s Eve without the need to apply for special licences and changes to closing hours to 1am for the nights before public holidays. The process from here is that if the Council accepts the recommendations of the Hearing Panel, this provisional Local Alcohol Policy would be notified on the 26 October followed by a period of 30 days when an appeal can be made to the Alcohol Regulatory Licensing Authority. If there are any appeals these would need to be addressed by the Licensing Authority. Once any matters were resolved the Council would be in a position to adopt the Policy which would then be in place for six years, or until such time as the Council wished to review it again.

Moved Councillor Atkinson seconded Councillor Doody

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180820093718.
(b) Adopts the Provisional Local Alcohol Policy 2018 for publication on 26 October 2018.
(c) Notes the Provisional Local Alcohol Policy will come back to Council for adoption, once the appeal process is complete under Section 90 of the Act. Council must then give notice of the adoption of the Waimakariri District Council’s Local Alcohol Policy, and may then bring it into force on a day stated by Council resolution.
(d) Notes the current Local Alcohol Policy 2015 continues to guide the District Licensing Committee until the review process is complete.

CARRIED

Councillor Atkinson, as Chair of the Hearing Panel, noted that the changes were made to make the Policy fair for everybody and easy to understand. Councillor Atkinson spoke on ‘child friendly’ events and the issuing of licences to sell alcohol at these. The Hearing Panel believes there needs to be a lot more work on what is classed as a ‘children friendly’ event before any rules are introduced. Councillor Atkinson suggests this is one aspect where there could be an appeal on the LAP.

Councillor Atkinson thanked staff, particularly L Beckingsale, and the panel for the work that went into this. This Policy is for our district, and in the view of the Hearing Panel, this Policy is working well for our district. Councillor Atkinson encouraged colleagues to support this recommendation and is interested to hear any feedback.

Councillor Doody thanked Councillor Atkinson as Chair of the Hearing Panel in this process, whose knowledge of the hospitality industry was helpful for the panel and provided a better understanding. Thanks were also extended to Councillor Meyer, who completed the Hearing Panel team.

Mayor Ayers extended thanks to the Hearing Panel.
7.4. **District Road Network – Term Service Contract 2015-18 – Extension of Service Period to 2019 – Ken Avant (Roads Project Engineer) and Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager)**

J McBride presented this report, seeking approval to extend the Contract for District Road Maintenance by one year to 31 October 2019. Sicon currently hold this contract for road maintenance with the initial three year period expiring on 31 October 2018 and which allows for two one year extensions of the service period. The contractor requested an extension to the service period on 19 July 2018.

J McBride noted that there have been some issues with the roading network over the winter but overall Sicon have been working well and it is not considered that there are any significant risks with extending this contract for a further year. Sicon know the district’s roading network well.

Councillor Williams said there have been a lot of complaints about the roading network, not just over winter, but in summer months as well and asked if there has been any indication of an improvement to the service provided by Sicon. Though the audit indicates that everything is okay with the roads, Councillor Williams said the general public are not happy. J McBride said that the road network overall is in a reasonable condition and Council benchmarking shows that and there is more benchmarking to be done in the New Year. Sicon have committed to improvements in service, following the issues over the winter months.

Councillor Atkinson questioned the cost of having to re-tender the contract if the Council did not agree with this recommendation. J Palmer responded that contractual law needs to be considered and the Council would need to have reasonable grounds not to extend the contract. The performance of the contractor has been assessed as satisfactory and therefore they have a right to an extension. There have been issues with some of the work under the contract, but G Cleary commented that these issues have been dealt with and there have been improvements in those areas. Sicon have been performing to the standard of the contract. G Cleary acknowledged that this matter should have been brought to the Council earlier and in future this would be the case. If the decision was made not to extend the contract there could be a shortened extension of the contract negotiated. Councillor Atkinson questioned the contractual arrangement and questioned the point of having a one year roll-over clause and then just issuing the contract for these years. G Cleary said at any time where there is non-performance there are measures in place to end the contract. Legal advice received in the past, has advised that provided the contractor is achieving the standards set in the contract, the roll over clause should be honoured. There is an opportunity for either party to exit the contract at the roll over time, if things are not working out.

Moved Councillor Meyer seconded Councillor Gordon

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180822095061.

(b) **Approves** the extension of Contract 15/31- District Road Maintenance Services for one further year to 31 October 2019.

(c) **Notes** that there is one further extension to the service period will be available following this, extending to 31 October 2020.

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

Councillor Meyer noted that there have been challenges in this district, but also noted that many districts have issues with roading maintenance. This contract is not new and Councillor Meyer has confidence in Sicon undertaking their
contract, and taking on board any issues that the Council staff are passing on to them. It was also noted that the water table in a lot of places this year is extremely high, which is challenging when a road is on top of this.

Councillor Gordon, said in general Sicon are doing a fair job and supports this recommendation. Personally he is extremely disappointed in the work of Sicon and the level of service provided and there needs to be a significant improvement. Councillor Gordon highlighted the improvements to the Cones Road/Carrs Road corner which failed on the day it was sealed and it has now been four months since this was undertaken. This should be a priority now that the weather is right for this work. Councillor Gordon expects better performance from Sicon and believes they need to be put on notice on the service they provide. This needs to be a top priority and this is what the Council pays the contractor for.

Councillor Atkinson said it is the Council who sets the bar, and if there are issues with the performance, this is a Council issue and suggests that if the Council is not happy with the level of service being provided then the bar needs to be set higher.

Councillor Williams noted that overall the roading network is good in the district, but it is the repairs that are being done which are not up to standard and questioned if these were being done properly. These are having to be done several times. Some of these repairs are done in the summer months also, where water is not an issue.

Councillor Doody noted that the Council needed to be careful what standards were being asked for, as this would be added expense in the future.

Deputy Mayor Felstead, on balance, noted that on Friday he had received a complaint about a pothole in a road and had done a Snap Send Solve, and this was fixed very promptly.

Mayor Ayers noted that the ‘three plus one plus one’ system of contract allows for a review of the service provided.

In reply, Councillor Meyer said this is a difficult matter and there is a goal to be achieved.

CONSIDERATION OF LATE REPORT

7.5. Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group – Terms of Reference – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)

C Roxburgh presented the report seeking approval of the Council for the Terms of Reference for the Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group. As a matter of summary, in May this year Council approved the deferment of the upgrade of the Garrymere water supply following strong feedback from the community and agreed to form the Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group. The purpose of the group is to consider and recommend a preferred approach to provide an upgrade to the Garrymere Water Supply that is a safe supply and also meets legislative requirements. The group will consist of scheme members, members of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board, Councillors Williams and Gordon, staff members, representatives of Canterbury District Health Board and G Cleary as an ex-officio member.

Having the Terms of Reference is a key step in moving forward with the Advisory Group. There will then be a request for community members who wish to be on the Group, and if there are significant numbers of applications a postal vote will be held.
C Roxburgh noted the report includes a proposed project timeline, which shows quite a condensed programme, with the project due to be completed by June 2019.

Councillor Atkinson referred to the Terms of Reference, item 2.3 and sought clarification on the issue of others not being a resident or ratepayer of the Garrymere scheme attending the meetings. It was suggested that if it was agreed by the members of the Advisory Group, there could be other people invited to the meetings.

Deputy Mayor Felstead noted the Terms of Reference refers to having 4 – 6 volunteer community representatives on the Advisory Group from the Garrymere water supply scheme, but the Policy on Water Supply Advisory Groups suggests having 4 -8 community members. After some discussion it was agreed this figure for the number of community members could be amended accordingly.

Councillor Stewart asked about the level of nitrate in this water supply and what it is projected to reach. C Roxburgh said this is currently low but was unable to provide the exact figure. It was noted that this scheme is not a nitrate priority area/hot spot in the district.

Moved Councillor Williams Seconded Councillor Gordon

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report no. 18082909807
(b) Approves the proposed Terms of Reference for the Garrymere Water Supply Advisory Group, with the amendment to the number of community members to be 4 -8.
(c) Approves staff inviting nominations for the group from property owners connected to the Garrymere water supply scheme.
(d) Circulates this report to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board for their information.

CARRIED

8. HEALTH AND SAFETY

8.1 Health and Safety Report to Council October 2018 – Jim Palmer (Chief Executive)

Mr Palmer presented this report for information on Health and Safety matters. There have been three relatively minor injury events in the past month.

Council staff are working with Safeplus who are conducting the required audit of the Council’s health and safety performance. These audits have previously been undertaken by ACC. Safeplus is the alternative provider of this service.

A Wellbeing Committee has been formed by the Council, which has developed a strategy and there is a series of events and actions to support wellbeing. These include such things as fitness, diet, sleeping habits and fun events.

Moved Councillor Atkinson seconded Deputy Mayor Felstead

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 180919108753
(b) **Notes** that there are no significant Health and Safety issues at this time, and that WDC is, so far as is reasonably practicable, compliant with the PCBU duties of the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015.

**CARRIED**

9. **MATTER REFERRED FROM COMMUNITY BOARDS**

Refer to Item 7.2 in this agenda for the report to Council on this item.

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

(This matter was considered at the September round of Community Board meetings, as follows:

- Oxford-Ohoka Community Board 6 September, report no. 180815092344
- Woodend-Sefton Community Board 10 September, report no. 180829098531
- Rangiora-Ashley Community Board 12 September, report no. 180829098530
- Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board 17 September, report no. 180809089699

All Boards supported the following recommendation:

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180809089699.

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

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

(c) **Notes** the consultation on this proposal will be carried out between 8th October and 4th November 2018.

(d) **Notes** the Community Boards will be updated at the end of the consultation process.

(e) **Notes** that any submissions on the proposal will be taken into account before the speed limit change is presented to the Council on 4th December for approval.
Moved Mayor Ayers seconded Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Council

Receives this information and notes this matter was dealt with earlier in the agenda.

CARRIED

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

10.1. Minutes of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on 21 August 2018

10.2. Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri Youth Council held on 28 August 2018

10.3. Minutes of a meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group held on 3 September 2018

Moved Councillor Meyer seconded Councillor Doody

THAT the information in items 10.1-10.3 be received.

CARRIED

11. COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

11.1. Minutes of a meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board held on 6 September 2018

11.2. Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board held on 10 September 2018

11.3. Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board held on 12 September 2018

11.4. Minutes of a meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board held on 17 September 2018

Councillor Williams noted his concern with some organisations applying for Community Grants from every Community Board and questioned whether these groups should be applying to the Council through the Long Term Plan process, rather than applying for the smaller amounts from each Community Board. Mayor Ayers suggested this matter could be workshoped in the future and J Palmer noted that this has been discussed previously but can be revisited if the Council wish to do so.

Mayor Ayers noted there had been submission hearings on the Draft Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan last week and deliberations were held early today.

Moved Mayor Ayers seconded Councillor Gordon
THAT the information in items 11.1 to 11.4 be received.

CARRIED

12. CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

13. MAYOR'S DIARY

13.1. Mayor’s Diary 28 August – 24 September 2018

Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead seconded Councillor Williams

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report no. 180921109749.

14. COUNCIL PORTFOLIO UPDATES

14.1. Iwi Relationships

Runanga are close to having elections for their new Executive and Chair. The current Acting Chair Gabrielle Huria is not seeking re-election. Mayor Ayers recently attended the 100 year celebration of the Ratana Church. Ratana is a significant influence in the local hapu.

Mayor Ayers noted that staff have been working on the issue of housing and servicing of these in the MR873.

Aroha Reriti-Crofts has attended a recent Citizenship Ceremony and will be attending the next two scheduled ceremonies in November and December. Subject to her availability, it is something that the Mayor will endeavour to make happen again in the future. Mayor Ayers also noted that the Council Waiata Group always sing at the Citizenship Ceremonies and lead everyone in the National Anthem.

14.2. Canterbury Water Management Strategy

Councillor Stewart noted that the Draft ZIPA has been released for public feedback and Councillor Stewart noted the many hours of work that herself and the community members of the Zone Committee have put into this document. This is a very comprehensive document. Some issues have been articulated in the document including the protection of drinking water supplies. This has also been addressed by the Council’s 3 Waters staff. There is also concern with private wells often on lifestyle blocks. Another issue is the way in which any new raised minimum flow would come into force. Councillor Stewart had thought that this would come into force when the Plan Change became operative, but this is not the case, and it will progressively come into force as existing consents expired. Noting that the particular catchment of concern for this district is Silverstream Kaiapoi, where many of the existing consents do not expire until 2035 and some out as far as 2050. This will mean quite a long time away for a potential solution which is of personal concern for Councillor Stewart.

There are many feedback sessions available for the public across the district and Councillor Stewart has attended some of these to date. There have been significant concerns raised at these sessions.

Councillor Stewart is pleased that this Council’s staff are looking at how the Council will respond to the significant number of recommendations in this document that involve both this Council and Environment Canterbury. The
expectations in the community are high and Councillor Stewart believes the 3 Waters team are well placed to lead this sort of work.

14.3. **International Relationships**

Deputy Mayor Felstead noted the Passchendaele Commemoration Day on Friday 12 October, with a ceremony to be held at the Kaiapoi Cenotaph, commencing at 11am.

Councillor Gordon and Deputy Mayor Felstead will be visiting China, for a two day Global Business conference, all expenses paid by the Chinese hosts and will report back on their return.

Mr Palmer added that one of the Rangiora Library staff, Jason Clements, who is a talented poet, is visiting three destinations in China in relation to his connections in the poetry and art world and is extending his visit to include Enshi. He will be presenting some poetry and making valuable connections with our sister city in respect of cultural matters.

14.4. **Regeneration (Kaiapoi)**

Councillor Blackie noted that matters concerning Regeneration will considered in the public excluded part of this meeting.

15. **QUESTIONS**

(under Standing Orders)

There were no questions.

16. **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS**

(under Standing Orders)

There was no urgent general business.

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

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Moved, Councillor Atkinson seconded Mayor Ayers

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of:</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of Council meeting of 4 September 2018</td>
<td>Confirmation of minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17.2 Report of Fraser Scales (Senior Project Engineer), Duncan Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager) and Mark Andrews (Civil Engineer)  
Contract 18/34 Kaiapoi East Enabling Works and Beswick Stormwater Management Area  
Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7  
Section 48(1)(a)

17.3 Report of Daniel Thompson (Special Projects Manager) and Kalley Simpson (3 Waters Manager)  
Contract 17/11 Central Rangiora Sewer Capacity Update  
Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7  
Section 48(1)(a)

17.4 Report of Cameron Wood (Senior Policy Planner) and Trevor Ellis (Development Planning Manager)  
Draft Settlement Pattern Update (Future Development Strategy) for Greater Christchurch  
Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7  
Section 48(1)(a)

REPORTS REFERRED FROM THE AUDIT AND RISK COMMITTEE MEETING OF 18 SEPTEMBER

17.5 Report of Jolanda Simon (Chief Information Officer) and Jeff Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)  
Multi-Year Technology One licensing Contract  
Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7  
Section 48(1)(a)

17.6 Report of Jeff Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)  
Procurement of Maturity Assessment and Contract Management Assessment  
Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7  
Section 48(1)(a)

17.7 Report of Jeff Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)  
Tranche 10 Electricity Tender  
Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7  
Section 48(1)(a)

17.8 Report of Jeff Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)  
Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trustee Appointment  
Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7  
Section 48(1)(a)

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.1 – 17.8</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

CLOSED MEETING

The public excluded portion of the meeting went from 4.10pm to 4.19pm.

OPEN MEETING
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18. **NEXT MEETING**

The next scheduled meeting of the Council is on Tuesday 16 October 2018 commencing at 3.15pm.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 4.20pm.

CONFIRMED

________________________
Chairperson

________________________
Date

**BRIEFING**

At the conclusion of the meeting a briefing was held to discuss 3 Waters resourcing and scope of activity. K Simpson and G Cleary were present for this Briefing.
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The Draft Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan Submissions Hearing Panel have received and considered public submissions and are now recommending the adoption of the reviewed ‘Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan – 2028 and Beyond’.

1.2. This report provides a summary of the submissions received through the four week period of public consultation during August and September, and documents the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan Hearing Panel’s subsequent views and recommendations following public submissions on the 5th September and then further deliberations on 2nd October.

1.3. Key changes to the Draft Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan as a result of the submissions process include:

- Adding the word ‘Kaiapoi’ to the vision statement. ‘Kaiapoi – New Zealand’s Best River Town – Live. Shop. Dine. Relax’
- Minor changes to the front cover to highlight pedestrian activity between the river and Mixed Use Business areas.
- Removal of all references to draft and provision of feedback.
- Greater reference to trees, gardens and landscaping, and refining of related statements within the Plan.
- Inclusion of opportunities for provision of public art within Town Centre developments.
- Greater refinement of the transport components of the plan to include more reference to emerging transport technologies and future modes of public transport.
- Mention of the need to provide appropriate planning for core utilities in future Town Centre Developments.
- Small updates and refinements to the Outline Development Plans in the appendices section.
- Addition of wording further enabling/supporting the development of a key market space within the South Mixed Use Business area.
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 181001113553

(b) Notes the summary of public submissions received, and the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan Hearings Panel’s recommendations.

(c) Adopts the attached Final Draft version of the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan – 2028 and Beyond (Trim 181017121695) as the finalised version of the Plan.

(d) Circulates a copy of this report to the Community Board’s for their information.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 In 2011 the Waimakariri District Council developed and adopted the 2011 Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan which responded to the Town Centre recovery challenges faced by the Kaiapoi community and the wider District following the 2010 and 2011 Canterbury Earthquakes.

3.2 The actions and projects set out in the 2011 Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan were anticipated to be delivered over a ten (10) year period. However the Council’s accelerated programme of works resulted in the large majority of these actions being completed within the first six years of the Plan.

3.3 A further driver for the review of the 2011 Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan has been the planning and divestment responsibilities given to Council for the Mixed Use Business Regeneration Areas through the Waimakariri Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan. It was determined appropriate that the planning for the almost eight (8) hectares of Mixed Use Business land be considered alongside the future growth requirements for the existing Kaiapoi Town Centre areas.

3.4 With these drivers in mind, Council staff began discussions with the Kaiapoi Community Board, Regeneration Steering Group and Council, and undertook planning for the review of the 2011 Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan early in 2017. Following the development of an appropriate Project Brief and Project Plan, reporting structures and key project groups were established. The appointment of four project consultants in the fields of geotechnical engineering, urban design, property economics and transport were also made.

3.5 A significant part of this review project was the development of a Key Stakeholder Reference Group, and the involvement of this group in an iterative series of ‘Inquiry by Design’ (IBD) workshops. The Stakeholder Reference Group included representation from the Kaiapoi business and property development community, Kaiapoi Promotions Association, Enterprise North Canterbury, Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board,
The group was supported by the appointed project consultants and key Council staff.

3.6 The three full day IBD workshops were informed by a number of background reports and expert advice from project consultants, which provided background information and identified the various challenges and opportunities. The workshops provided the basis for the ‘Master Planning’ of the Mixed Use Business Areas, and also considered growth opportunities and linkages with the existing Town Centre Areas.

3.7 In July 2018 Council approved public consultation of the Draft Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan – 2028 and Beyond. On August 6th public consultation of the Plan began for a four (4) week period. During this period, the following promotional and engagement activities occurred:

- Advertising in three local newspapers
- Interview/coverage on a national radio programme
- Council website and social media promotions
- An article on the Stuff website
- More than 200 Draft Plans dropped into businesses in the Kaiapoi Town Centre
- Copies of Draft Plans left in waiting areas of local medical centres, restaurants etc.
- Two ‘drop in sessions’ at the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre
- A presentation to 130 local business people at an ENC networking function
- A ‘mail out’ of Draft plans to many district and regional stakeholders
- A presentation to Environment Canterbury staff
- Hard copies of Draft Plans made available at all Council Libraries and Service Centres, and delivered to Regenerate Christchurch.
3.8 Public submissions could be made by way of email to the Council’s Business and Centres Manager, online via the Council’s website, or by completing a ‘tear off’ form at the back of the Kaiapoi Town Centre plan Consultation Document. At the completion of the four week consultation period, Council had received 26 submissions on the Draft Plan. Five of the submitters opted to present their feedback on the Plan to the Hearings Panel on the 26th September. The Hearings Panel then reconvened to deliberate on the submissions on the 2nd October.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1 Council staff have reviewed each of the public submissions and have made the following recommendations relating to each. The following table also documents the Hearing Panel’s recommendations from their deliberation meeting on the 2nd October.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission</th>
<th>Submission Point</th>
<th>Staff Recommendation</th>
<th>Hearings Panel Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter Judkins</td>
<td>Would like a kinetic sculpture that moves naturally and is powered, for example, by the wind or the observer. Believes this would be an ideal ‘point of difference’ for Kaiapoi.</td>
<td>Staff believe the addition of some kind of sculpture or art work would be appropriate, and would be happy to make an appropriate addition to the plan accordingly.</td>
<td>The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation and commented that Council had yet to form the Trust. The Panel discussed a number of ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard McDonald</td>
<td>Has provided reference to a book ‘The Water Will Come’. Submission advises that building platforms will need to be two meters higher than existing land to future proof the investment from 2040 forward.</td>
<td>Staff believe that the flood risk and known natural hazards have been considered through the development of the Draft Plan, and a number of appropriate mitigation concepts have been included into the Plan accordingly.</td>
<td>The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Annette Adams | • Would like a crossing at Ranui Mews for Pensioners.  
• Would also like to see more flowers, and less flaxes, and more seats near shopping areas. | • Staff will investigate a crossing in this location, and can alter the detail of Project 26 (pedestrian connectivity) if appropriate.  
• Staff can ensure this feedback is incorporated into Project 21 (Landscape Planning). | The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation and noted another crossing would mean there were four on the main street. |
<p>| J. Miller | • Would like to see a greater number and variety of retailers in the Town Centre. | • Whilst recognising that retailers will have their own decision making drivers and criteria, Council and Enterprise North Canterbury can work with developers to try an attract a greater | The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation and commented that the Plan would try to conducive to a variety of retailers. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board</th>
<th>Wishes to see adjectives such as ‘vibrancy’ and ‘vitality’ used more throughout the document.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suggests 'strapline' has the word 'Kaiapoi' added to the beginning. 'Kaiapoi - New Zealand’s Best Rivertown'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suggests front cover imagery reflects pedestrian based walkway along the river on the south side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requests a review of parking data and better signage to car parking areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requests removal of Figure 7 as the KTCB does not believe this is reflective of the plan itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is concerned about Public Transport (Park and Ride) being proposed for the West areas, and believes medium/high density residential developments are more appropriate in South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would also like to see picnic/playground and taxi areas near the river, and bus shelters with seats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range of retailers as development occurs. (Reference to Projects 13 and 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project 15 (Design of Public Spaces) provides an opportunity to consider public amenities within the Mixed Use Business Areas. Project 8 (Public Transport Interchange) and is likely to consider bus services in Kaiapoi. The Council Roading Unit should also be made aware of this feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff recommend further inclusion of these terms within the document where appropriate.  
Staff believe this is appropriate and recommend adding the word 'Kaiapoi'.  
IBD workshops favoured a continuation of a 'shared space'. Detailed design of any particular develop which allowed vehicle access to the rear could result in alteration to the shared space. Staff recommend leaving this until a specific development proposal is realised.  
Project 19 (Car Parking) provides an opportunity to review/renew car parking data with the view to improve provision as development occurs. Staff recommend leaving current information in the Plan in the interim.  
Staff believe Figure 7 provides context and illustrates how planning evolved. Staff believe that it is still reasonably accurate as a principle and recommend keeping it in the Plan.  
Staff acknowledge the various alternative opportunities for parking and public transport that exist, and recognise that future developments will have a bearing on these  

The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation.  
The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation.  
The Panel acknowledged that any future development would potentially have a bearing on the nature of the movements across this area, but requested that vehicles be removed from the front cover image.  
The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation.  
The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation and commented that it was an early sketch which demonstrated thinking and was not definitive.  
The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation and commented that it did not mean development could not happen, and that there may not be park
and West. The Board wishes Council to lead negotiation related to public transport with partner agencies.

- Recommends Figure 9a should be amended to reflect ‘fill’ right to the stop bank, and Figure 9b should be removed completely.

- The Board supports a public-private partnership for development of the Mixed Use Business Areas. And also supports development of a ‘market square’ development in the South behind the library.

- Recommends Project 8 (Transport) considers future modes of Transport and Project 10 includes connectivity between Williams Street and East Mixed Use Business Area.

- Recommends a complete redesign of the Market Area shown in the South Mixed Use Business Area.

provisions. As projects 13 (Kaiapoi West Activities) and 19 (Car Parking) evolve appropriate decisions can be made in conjunction with the Community Board and Council. Staff recommend leaving the Plan as it is currently for the time being.

- A number of different flood and hazard mitigation solutions were identified for various types of building typologies during the Plan’s development. Staff would suggest the appropriate solution should be determined through the detailed design process of any given future development. Hence, staff recommend no change to the Plan at this time.

- Staff note strong feedback in relation to a ‘market/town square’ in a focal/central point of the Town Centre. The ODP could be amended to reflect this. Staff recognise that a Public Private Partnership is one viable option for development of the Mixed Use Business Areas. Staff note that there are also a number of other mechanisms for delivery of projects and believe Projects 14 (Delivery Mechanism), Project 15 (Public Spaces) and 16 (District Plan Changes) provide vehicles for achieving these aspirations.

- Staff agree there is an opportunity to further define these Projects and recommend further defining of the project scope/description accordingly.

- As described above, minor changes to the ODP ensuring appropriate development opportunities can be realised. Staff acknowledge that the nature of any particular development proposal could have a significant and ride facility for a period of time.

and ride facility for a period of time.

- The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation noting that specific solutions may be dependent on specific developments.

- The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation, noting the strong support for a public private partnership (PPP) and that this was one possible mechanism for development, but reluctant to position Council to this exclusively through the Plan. The Panel agreed that a change to the Plan to include or identify more specific provision for a ‘market space’ in the South Mixed Use Business Area was appropriate.

- The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation.

- The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation, noting the further market place provision described above.

- The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation.
| Michael de Hamel  
**Trim**  
180905101520 | Would like to see the final Plan specifically show support for trees throughout the Town Centre. Specifically have trees added into sections of Pages 10, 21, 27, 34 and 37. | Staff are happy to review the document and insert mention of trees where appropriate. | The Panel requested for the Plan to make more specific reference to trees and landscaping in appropriate sections including the pages identified and Project 21 |

| Traffic - Scepticism that people will use the motorway to access north Kaiapoi and that motorists will continue to use Williams Street. Also questioned whether Williams Street has capacity to cope with increasing traffic from increased housing in NE Kaiapoi.  
Riverbanks - Complaint about the new South riverbank area regularly floods. Also claimed works costs $300,000. Riverbank areas should have been raised about 300mm before building. Don't waste money on things that will be hardly used.  
Consultation - Expressed cynicism that Council takes any notice of suggestions and comments | Staff acknowledge that evolving roading networks between Christchurch and the Waimakariri will result in changes to traffic movements. Staff would reflect that monitoring of ongoing traffic movements and networks will help to inform Project 8 (Public Transport Interchange) and Project 19 (Car Parking)  
Staff acknowledge the complaint, and believe the impact of flooding and related hazards has been considered through the development of this Plan.  
Staff acknowledge this perspective, but believe the public engagement and | The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation  
The Panel noted the riverbanks complaint was not a submission to the Plan.  
The panel noted this feedback. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canterbury District Health Board</th>
<th>Supports development and enhancement of the riverbanks, improvements to pedestrian and cycle access ways, the development of a new public transport interchange, and development of the Mixed Use Business Areas.</th>
<th>Acknowledged.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supports work towards making footpaths more accessible for mobility aids as the population ages.</td>
<td>Acknowledged and to be recognised/considered through Projects 10 (Kaiapoi South Pedestrian Connectivity), 12 (Kaiapoi South and East Connectivity), 15 (Public Spaces), 26 (Pedestrian Connectivity).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advises working with the property developer for 137 Williams Street to ensure accessibility to the new building is appropriate for all.</td>
<td>Staff acknowledge this opportunity. Work on connectivity with public spaces through the design has begun, and building related accessibility will be assessed through the building consent processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourages Council to adopt a 'Smoke Free Town Policy' alongside the existing Green Spaces and Public Spaces Policies of WDC.</td>
<td>Staff recognise the work undertaken through the Green Space and Public Spaces policies as appropriate progress towards a smoke free environment. Staff would be happy to further investigate the possibility of further Smoke Free Policies should Council desire this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supports progressing District Plan changes for the Mixed Use Business Areas to enable the</td>
<td>Acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Farmers Market - The current location of the Farmers Market is too far away from the main shopping area, and hard for customers to find.

Footbridge - Looks expensive, and having to have an opening for just a few boats seems a bit over the top.

The consultation process for this project has been genuine.

Staff recognise the opportunity to work with the Farmers Market organisers to determine a more appropriate location as Town Centre development occurs.

Staff recognise this view, and acknowledge more work needs to be completed as part of Project 12 (Kaiapoi South and East Connectivity) to establish viability, options and timing.

The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation to leave this in the plan for the future and noted that the cost had not been discussed, and that the footbridge may not need an opening.

The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation

The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation

The Panel acknowledged the current policies already in place.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master Plan, and supports establishment of a implementation delivery mechanism with the use of integrated planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **MainPower New Zealand Limited**  
*Trim 180906102189 Submission Presented by Mark Appleman*  
- Advises that the Plan should include adequate provision for utilities in supporting future town centre development, recognition of the need to maintain and upgrade infrastructure, and the need for ongoing upgrades to networks.  
- And advises that amendments to the District Plan should be enabling of upgrades and maintenance to the current electricity network with reduced reliance on resource consenting. |
| **Environment Canterbury**  
*Trim 180906102222*  
- Generally supportive of the Plan with regards to recover, transport, brown fields development etc.  
- Provides caution with regards to development in high hazard areas, development that might restrict ability to maintain flood protection, activities on the Kaitapoi River in relation to the Navigation Safety Bylaw, Activities in the bed of the river that might trigger consent, public transport activities that might crossover with regional transport planning and activities.  
- Offers to work collaboratively with the Waimakariri District Council on any particular project within the Plan that might require Regional Council involvement. |
| **John Adair**  
*Trim 180904100527*  
- References Picton and Wellington in terms of waterfront developments.  
- Supports an elevated boardwalk on the South side of the river to engage more with the river. |
| **Staff are happy to add in some appropriate text to acknowledge the role utilities play in ongoing development of the Town Centre.**  
- The Development Planning Unit will consider the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan as part of their review of the District Plan. Staff also ensure this Unit receives this feedback from Mainpower New Zealand Limited. |
| **Acknowledged**  
- Staff acknowledge the advice provided by Environment Canterbury and have considered flood hazard and mitigation, activities on the water and other Environment Canterbury areas of responsibility. Staff are currently working with Environment Canterbury staff on a number of tasks including a technical report relating to Project 7 (Canal/House Boats).  
- Staff acknowledge Environment Canterbury’s offer, and will certainly take this up on all relevant projects. |
| **Acknowledged.**  
- Acknowledged, and reflected in the Plan already. |
| The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation by staff to maintain good working relationships with Mainpower.  
The Panel agreed that the District Plan Review should consider provision for core utilities.  
The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation.  
The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation. |
Also supports commercial activities with views over the river.
- Supports residential development in the Mixed Use Business Areas.
- Submitter is interested in discussing an opportunity for development of a motel on Raven Quay.
- Is supportive of creative remediation options and innovative building techniques.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trevor and Faye Tavendale</th>
<th>Supports creating a 'drawcard' for people to visit Kaiapoi.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourages the use of the Kaiapoi River for activities such as kayaking and punting. Also supports more seating and shelters alongside the river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourages ongoing maintenance of landscaped areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supports the concept of a second pedestrian bridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would like to see a pedestrian crossing back in central shopping area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would like more rubbish bins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would also like to see accommodation blocks built in central Kaiapoi, with a market area also set aside.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trevor and Faye Tavendale</th>
<th>Acknowledged.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledged comment regard activities on river. Staff recommend the addition of a new project relating to exploring opportunities for additional public amenities along the river bank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff will pass this feedback onto the appropriate operational teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Roading Unit advise that this is a possibility, dependant on development in the Town Centre. Representation of the Roading Unit is on the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan Activation Project Control Group to ensure appropriate assessments are undertaken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff recommend assessment of rubbish bins and other public amenities is undertaken through Project 15 (Public Spaces) and as development proposal are realised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledged, and reflected in the Plan already. Enabled through the proposed ODP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trevor and Faye Tavendale</th>
<th>Acknowledged by the Panel.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation to incorporate this in the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledged by the Panel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation and reflected on the previous discussion on pedestrian crossings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation and discussed the how the Waimakariri Residential Red Zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Would also like to see further development on western side of town near the Mandeville Pub.
- Also supports the concept of a park and ride, with a view that the rail between Rangiora (through Kaiapoi) and into Christchurch is likely and should be planned for.

Project 13 (Kaiapoi West Activities) provides an opportunity to further explore further development.
- Project 8 (Public Transport Interchange) provides opportunity for park and ride facilities, and protection of access on the West is being planned for.

Recovery Plan was silent on residential developments, acknowledging that a future ‘Mixed Use Business’ zoning would likely anticipate some form of Residential living. The current Business 1 zone was cited as an example, with residential living above commercial activity being permissible.

### David Blackwell

- Supports Kaiapoi as a local and regional destination
- Supports further retail development around the river on both sides of Williams Street.
- Would like to see ‘good direct access’ from Motorway, Adderley Terrace and Fuller Street into central Kaiapoi.
- Supports the Plans Vision but would like further efforts being made to encourage greater levels of development on Hilton Street west of Williams Street.
- Strongly supports the bus, rail and car parking provisions for West and West Mixed Use Business Area.
- Supports a second vehicle bridge across the river connecting Black Street to Charles Street.

- Acknowledged.
- Enabled and included within the Plan already.
- Acknowledge rationale for greater accessibility into the Town Centre, however there are a number of wider transport considerations. Council Roading Unit will be informed of this feedback for further consideration.
- Staff acknowledge this feedback. Hilton Street west of Williams remains enabled in terms of the Plan and current District Plan zoning. Staff are happy to work with/encourage respective property owners on future development proposals where appropriate.
- Acknowledged.
- Staff acknowledge this has been a theme discussed at various stages. During the recent IBD workshops this was not strongly supported. Staff do not recommend including this in this iteration of the Plan.

- Acknowledged by the Panel.
- Acknowledged by the Panel.
- Acknowledged by the Panel.
- The Panel reflected on wider Roading plans and work which may not be understood by the submitter and requested an appropriate response to the submitter detailing this.
- Acknowledged by the Panel.
- Acknowledged by the Panel.
- The Panel acknowledged that this has been discussed over recent years but reflected that there is difficulty in locating such a bridge and it is not likely to be something that is realised in the term of this Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kiwirail Holdings Limited</th>
<th>Submitter has noted the two controlled crossings in the Kaiapoi Town Centre and has provided information relating to assessment of level crossings for consideration.</th>
<th>Staff acknowledge the information provided and have passed provided information onto the Council's Roading Unit for further consideration where appropriate.</th>
<th>Acknowledged by the Panel.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Glenda Duffell           | • Encourages more retail in the area.  
                          • Is opposed to freedom camping in the Town.  
                          • Requests Council to review rates for providers of Air BnB type services within the district. | • Acknowledged. Plan currently provides opportunity for further commercial/retain development.  
                          • Freedom camping not included in the Plan, only Motor Caravan Association proposal is allowed for. Staff recommend maintain current provisions in Plan.  
                          • Sits outside of the scope of the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan. Feedback from submitter will be provided to the appropriate Council management staff. | The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation. |
| Kaiapoi on Williams Motels Ltd | Submission Presented by Jacqui Jeffrey | • Recommends the development of a market square as a community hub and focal point in the Town Centre.  
                          • Supports arts, cultural and farmer’s market activities within the Town Centre.  
                          • Recommends open space (with attractive connections) for events and carnivals within the Town Centre.  
                          • Is concerned for the character and design of the Town as it develops and wishes these aspects to be incorporated in future developments. | • Staff acknowledge the strong support for a public/community space that allows for market type activities and community connection. Staff recommend minor changes to the ODP to ensure provision is made.  
                          • Acknowledged.  
                          • Acknowledged. In addition to the ‘market space’ provisions that can be enabled through the ODP, Project 15 (Public Spaces) also provides opportunity for such spaces to be considered. Staff note provision of such spaces in the recreational areas being developed in the Regeneration areas.  
                          • Council staff continue to work with developers to ensure appropriate design. Various character and design factors can be included | The Panel agreed with the staff recommendations, and reflected on the previous discussion on a ‘market space’. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Acknowledged Details</th>
<th>Panel Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chris &amp; Sharron King</td>
<td>Supports the development of a range of commercial and community facilities. Supports ongoing development of walking and cycle ways and interaction with the river banks. The NZMCA North Canterbury Area is in support of NZMCA seeking to meet membership demand for a park in a town that more members want to visit.</td>
<td>Acknowledged. Plan enables and includes opportunities for commercial and retail developments to occur. Acknowledged. Supported through Project 1 (Riverbanks Development), and Project 15 (Public Spaces). Acknowledged and included in the Plan.</td>
<td>The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZMCA North Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180910103512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Moore</td>
<td>Would like the better placement of three sculpture pieces in central Kaiapoi. These are the red letterbox sculpture, the painted giraffe and the steel sculpture behind the giraffe.</td>
<td>Acknowledged. Staff would be happy to work with appropriate stakeholders and Council teams to include this into appropriate project work streams.</td>
<td>The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation and discussed to landscaping components of the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180910103512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Wright</td>
<td>Would like to see shop frontages on Williams Street tidied up. Would like to see shared space on Ravens Quay changed to pedestrian only.</td>
<td>Staff are happy to work with property owners as upgrades and development occurs. Staff acknowledge this feedback. IBD workshop process favoured a shared space. Staff recommend maintaining the current provision.</td>
<td>Acknowledged by the Panel. The Panel reflected on the previous discussion about removing vehicles from the picture on the front cover.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180910103512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheryl Johnson</td>
<td>Would like to see a centralised town centre rather than further 'ribbon development'. Would like to see the town have a name such as the &quot;river town&quot; or the &quot;historic town&quot;</td>
<td>Acknowledged. Plan provides for expansion east to west along river, rather than for expansion north and south along Williams Street. Acknowledged. Staff note slogan for Plan which states 'New Zealand’s Best Rivertown’</td>
<td>The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation and commented that there had been work to slow 'ribbon development’ within Kaiapoi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180910103512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie Leary</td>
<td>Would like to see further tidy up of river and more Christmas lights.</td>
<td>Project 1 (Riverbanks Enhancement) and other current river related work noted. Project</td>
<td>The Panel agreed with the staff recommendations and discussed a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Trim** 180910103512 | 23 (Town Centre Amenity Features) considers ongoing feature lights and decorations. Council currently has another project outside of the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan focused on Christmas Decorations.  
- Feedback noted. Detail of future signs and other design features to be considered as projects progress.  
- A number of projects within the plan consider pedestrian improvement and linkages. Feedback relating to pedestrian linkages around the Hilton Street roundabout will be provided to the Councils Roading Unit.  
- Staff are happy to support market organisers where appropriate to increase the amount of activity occurring in the Town Centre. Project 17 (Activation Strategy) also provides an opportunity for such events to be enabled.  
- Acknowledged. Feedback can be included into development of Project 15 (Public Spaces)  
- Acknowledge feedback, but out of scope for the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan.  
- Staff agree. Project 19 (Car Parking) enables further investigation and implementation of strategies to address current deficiencies.  
- A technical report informing Project 7 (Canal/House Boats) and other river activities is underway. Some controls for activities on the water are in place through the Harbour Master Navigation Safety Bylaw. Staff technical report currently being drafted by staff which advises on regulatory frameworks, ownership, possible service provisions, and key stakeholder views related to Project 7 (Canal/House Boats). |
| • Would like to see carvings on signs.  
• Would like to see pedestrian improvements, particularly at roundabout on Williams/Hilton Street intersection.  
• Would like to see monthly stalls/entertainment up the main street.  
• Would like more seating along Williams Street including on the Bridge.  
• Believes the Food Forest area will need to be bigger.  
• Believes car parking improvements are required.  
• Would like more rules for activities/users on the river. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Supports</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Panel Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Marti</td>
<td>• Supports commercial development along the river banks.</td>
<td>Recommend further controls should be considered as part of the District Plan Review. Acknowledged. Plan enables and includes opportunities for commercial and retail developments to occur along the river bank.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Allen</td>
<td>• Supports further commercial development along the river banks.</td>
<td>Acknowledged. Plan enables and includes opportunities for commercial and retail developments to occur along the river bank.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry A Jones &amp; Mary Jones</td>
<td>• Would like to see the dump station for motorhomes improved</td>
<td>Staff will make the appropriate Council team aware of this feedback for their consideration. Acknowledged.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Pinkham</td>
<td>• Supports a market square and well defined centre.</td>
<td>As described above, minor changes to the ODP ensuring appropriate development opportunities (which includes a market area) can be realised. Staff acknowledge that the nature of any particular development proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation and commented that the Council already provides camping area at Kairaki and Woodend Beaches which are relatively close.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission Presented by Martin Pinkham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Supports a wide range of hospitality along the riverbank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would like to see a well-positioned and highly functional transport hub – Preferably on the West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supports development of a good parking plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Medium to high density housing in the western precinct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Believes there has been no meaningful attempts to survey the local community on what it wants, nor survey the community on key aspects of the proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would like to see a Public Private Partnership entered into for the development of the Mixed Use Business Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Believes current flood mitigation work is insufficient and would like to see a ‘fill solution’ used for the South Mixed Use Business Area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>could have a significant influence on this space, and therefore do not recommend redesigning the aspirations images used in the ‘masterplan’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Acknowledged. The Plan enables and includes opportunities for commercial and retail developments to occur along the river bank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Acknowledged. The Plan enables and includes opportunities for such a transport hub to occur on the west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project 19 (Car Parking) provides opportunity for car parking to be fully assessed and appropriate improvements to be planned and implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This was not strong supported through the IBD workshops, but the Plan does allow for such development should a developer wish to pursue such an activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff acknowledge the feedback, and the suggested improvements made during this submissions presentation. Staff note the consultation and engagement processes as illustrated in section 3.7 of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff agree that Private Public Partnerships are a possible mechanism to enable appropriate development and will certainly be open to pursuing such arrangements where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff accept that a ‘fill solution’ is one possible option for the South Mixed Use Business Area. Staff also note that there are a number of other possible solutions that have been proposed, each with their advantages and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>engagement could be referred to the new Communications Manager. The Panel also noted that there was some consultation fatigue in Kaiapoi following events over the last 6-7 years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
challenges. Staff recommend that the plan leaves options open, with a view to working with developers on flood mitigation solutions for specific proposals.

| Catherine Kappelle  
(Cure Boat Club)  
Trim 180910103321 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would like to see greater variety of retailers in Kaiapoi to reduce need for Kaiapoi people to leaving Rangiora for shopping purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports further development of organised greenspaces along the river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports connection between north and south via a walking bridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports rowing as a long standing activity on the river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is uncertain about the concept of house/canal boats being on the river, would like to see strict controls in place if this were to proceed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whilst recognising that retailers will have their own decision making drivers and criteria, Council and Enterprise North Canterbury can work with developers to try an attract a greater range of retailers as development occurs. (Reference to Projects 13 and 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledged. Supported through Project 1 (Riverbanks Development), and Project 15 (Public Spaces).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledged, and currently enabled through the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A technical report informing Project 7 (Canal/House Boats) and other river activities is underway. Some controls for activities on the water are in place through the Harbour Master Navigation Safety Bylaw. Staff recommend further controls should be considered as part of the District Plan Review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Panel agreed with the staff recommendation.
4.2. A number of minor changes and updates have been made to the Draft Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan – 2028 and Beyond document, as a result of the Public Submissions process and resulting Hearing’s Panel recommendations. These changes are shown in attachment (i) (Final Draft of the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan).

4.3. The Management Team have reviewed this report.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

5.1.1. Throughout the development of the Draft Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan, a Stakeholder Reference Group has been engaged through a series of ‘Inquiry by Design’ workshops. This Stakeholder Reference Group included representatives from Kaiapoi businesses, local developers, members of the Waimakariri Youth Council, staff from Enterprise North Canterbury (ENC), the Kaiapoi Promotions Association, Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board Members and District Councillors, key project consultants, and Council staff. This group provided considerable though and perspective throughout the development of the Draft Plan.

5.2. Wider Community

5.2.1. Public consultation occurred for a period of four (4) weeks from August 6th 2018, and included an extensive engagement plan. Section 3.7 of this report provides a summary of the consultation and engagement activities that occurred over that period. 26 public submissions were received as a result, and this report documents those views, and the resulting Council staff and Hearing’s Panel recommendations.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.1.1. The following table provides an overview of the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan Review Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Funding Source</th>
<th></th>
<th>$100,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Town Centre Improvement Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Regeneration Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Capitalisation of Mixed Use Business Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Expenditure</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft KTC Plan Development – As at September 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>$325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further Forecast Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$330,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forecast Over Spend $30,000

6.1.1. Expenditure to September related to the Draft Plan development includes work on the FENZ proposal (including the additional Inquiry by Design workshop and additional transport consultancy work). This is the reason for the over spend in this.
budget of around $30,000. Additional funding is funded from ‘Unallocated’ portion of the Kaiapoi Town Centre budget.

6.1.2. The majority of projects outlined in the Attached Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan have not been allocated budget. Staff are currently working on forecast budget implications and will include this information in the Council’s Annual Plan process.

6.2. **Community Implications**

6.2.1. The attached Draft Plan articulates a number of projects aimed at catering for future growth of the Kaiapoi Town Centre. Further community engagement and consultation is likely throughout a number of the projects identified within the Plan.

6.3. **Risk Management**

6.3.1. Staff anticipate limited risk associated with the recommendations in this report.

6.3.2. Financial risks associated with the recommendations in this report are articulated in the Financial Implications section (6.1).

6.4. **Health and Safety**

6.4.1. There are no specific anticipated health and safety implications resulting from the recommendations should they be supported. All relevant Council health and safety policies and procedures will be followed during the course of any normal activities that are required as a result of these recommendations.

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**

No specific legislative implications have been identified with regards to this report.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

*Businesses in the District are diverse, adaptable and growing*

- There are growing numbers of businesses and employment opportunities in our District.
- There are sufficient and appropriate places where businesses are able to set up in our District.

7.4. **Delegations**

7.4.1. Council has delegated responsibility for adoption of Town Centre Plans and Strategies.

7.4.2. It is anticipated that the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board will provide ongoing monitoring for the delivery of the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan – 2028 and Beyond.
Kaiapoi Point of Attraction. While the “Tuhoe” was here I am sure this would have been a reason for many people to make the trip out from Christchurch and visit this river community. With the loss of the “Tuhoe” we have lost this feature. I am suggesting that Kaiapoi could benefit from the commissioning of a new “Point of Attraction.”

A Kinetic Sculpture. A kinetic sculpture is a three dimensional sculpture that moves naturally and is powered, for example, by the wind or the observer. Several cities in NZ have sculptures powered and which move according to the wind. I have “Googled” and not found a water powered kinetic sculpture.

World First. I am suggesting that Kaiapoi could install a world first! A kinetic sculpture powered by our river. Not just a water wheel, but something that also is moved by the tide. If we get it right, it could be a tourist destination, not just for Kiwis but for overseas tourists. Might even get onto overseas news broadcasts.

Sculpture Size. The sculpture could for instance be a 10 metre high figure of a person, perhaps of a sailor that might have sailed in Kaiapoi in the early days when shipping access was the prime means of access to this area.

Tide Movement. The sailor could have an arm holding his cap, activated by the tide, so his would progressively raise and lower his cap as the tide rose and fell.

Tide Direction. The kinetic sculpture could also have, perhaps, a parrot on his shoulder which would rotate with the tide. The parrot would point to the West as the tide came in and point to the East as the tide went out.

Night Time Lighting. The Kinetic Sculpture could incorporate solar powered LED lighting to illuminate the figure at night time.

Location. The figure would be located on the southern river bank, near the new landscaping recently carried out adjacent to the Kaiapoi library. People would be able to view the attraction from the new cafe development on the north side of the river as well as from the area adjacent to the library, visible perhaps from inside the library and also visible from the Williams Street Bridge.

Kaiapoi Benefit. I hope Kaiapoi people would feel an element of pride in their sculpture. The sculpture would benefit local businesses and providing the lighting is adequate, could also bring people into restaurants at night time. Because of the relatively slow movement of the tide, it could lead to the situation where people would come to Kaiapoi, view the sculpture and then stay around to see the progressive movement of the arm/ cap and the changing direction of the tide.

Cost. The initial cost would be significant and there would be on-going maintenance required. Consent issues might be a significant cost.

Design. While I have suggested it could be a purely kinetic sculpture, it may be more efficient to cheat and use electronics to drive the movements. The effect would be the same.

Believes that the ‘red zone area’ would make a great area for a sound shell with plenty of parking.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Annette Adams</td>
<td>Submission Form</td>
<td>180810090107</td>
<td>A crossing at Williams Street “Ranui Mews”. Pensioners cannot the road safely. More flowers, less flaxes. Agrees with the Plans Visions and Objectives. Would like more seats for elderly to sit on at shopping centre. Comments that flowers make people smile, coffee makes customers warm, and small trees give oxygen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>J. Miller</td>
<td>Submission Form</td>
<td>180815091885</td>
<td>Easy access for wheelchairs and shop riders and wide walking frames. Baby clothing shop. Good footpaths and roads. Would like to see Taxis and picnic areas near he river. Believes the Plans Vision and Objectives are o.k. Would like to see more shops including a shoe shop, a picture theatre, another hardware shop, a butcher, fruit and vege shop. Would also like to see more car parking. Would also like to see bus shelters with seats. And another park for children to play at. Also more rubbish bins outside most food shops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>180830098851</td>
<td>KTCB Full Submission Attached. Main points include: The Board wishes to see adjectives such as 'vibrancy' and 'vitality' used more throughout the document. Suggests 'strapline' has the word 'Kaiapoi' added to the beginning, 'Kaiapoi - New Zealand’s Best Rivertown'. Suggests front cover imagery reflects pedestrian based walkway along the river on the south side. Request removal of all references to the possible pedestrian bridge, and parking data and graphs. And requests a review of parking data and better signage to car parking areas. Requests removal of Figure 7 as the KTCB does not believe this is not reflective of the plan itself. Transportation - The Board is concerned about the location of the Park and Ride (West), and believes that medium/high residential living in the West and South is more appropriate. The Board supports the public transport options and connection between Western MUB area and rail option near Hilton Street. The Board notes concern about reliance on public transport partners and believes Council should lead negotiation with such partners. Geotechnical and Flooding - The Board believes Figure 9a should be amended to show fill right to the stop bank, and that Figure 9b should be removed completely. Property and Market Economics - The Board recommends a public/private partnership be formed for the development of ‘the Mixed Use Business Area’ to increase sustainability and reduce property fragmentation. The Board advocates for a ‘market square’ to be located behind the current library in the South Mixed Use Business Area. Pages 26 &amp; 27 - The Board recommends project 8 (Public Transport) considers future modes of transport. And project 10 (Pedestrian Connectivity) includes connectivity between Williams Street and East Mixed Use Business Area is assured. Page 37 - The Board recommends a complete redesign of the 'red' market area shown in the South Mixed Use Business Area. Page 38 - The Board believes the laneway shown in East Mixed Use Business Area should be Jones Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Michael de Hamel</td>
<td>180905101520</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7 | Drop In Session Feedback (Collated by Martin Pinkham) | 180917107274                 | No      |      | Traffic - Scepticism that people will use the motorway to access north Kaiapoi and that motorists will continue to use Williams Street. Also questioned whether Williams Street has capacity to cope with increasing traffic from increased housing in NE Kaiapoi.  
Riverbanks - Complaint about the new South riverbank area regularly floods. Also claimed works costs $300,000. Riverbank areas should have been raised about 300mm before building. Don't waste money on things that will be hardly used.  
Consultation - Expessed cynicism that Council takes any notice of suggestions and comments from public.  
Farmers Market - The current location of the Farmers Market is too far away from the main shopping area, and hard for customers to find.  
Footbridge - Looks expensive, and having to have an opening for just a few boats seems a bit over the top. |
| 8 | Canterbury District Health Board | 180905101576               | No      |      | Supports development and enhancement of the riverbanks, improvements to pedestrian and cycle access ways, the development of a new public transport interchange, and development of the Mixed Use Business Areas.  
Supports work towards making footpaths more accessible for mobility aids as the population ages.  
Advises working with the property developer for 137 Williams Street to ensure accessibility to the new building is appropriate for all.  
Encourages Council to adopt a 'Smoke Free Town Policy' alongside the existing Green Spaces and Public Spaces Policies of WDC.  
Supports progressing District Plan changes for the Mixed Use Business Areas to enable the Master Plan, and supports establishment of a implementation delivery mechanism with the use of integrated planning. |
| 9 | MainPower New Zealand Limited | 180906102189                | Yes     | 1.00pm | Supports the plan as a mechanism for utilities companies being able to forward plan future demand and therefore upgrades to their networks.  
Advises that the Plan should include adequate provision for utilities in supporting future town centre development, recognition of the need to maintain and upgrade infrastructure, and the need for ongoing upgrades to networks.  
Highlights the need for resource consenting for development that cannot meet standards set out in the District Plan. And advises that amendments to the District Plan should be enabling of upgrades and maintenance to the current electricity network with reduced reliance on resource consenting. |
| 10 | Environment Canterbury      | 180906102222                | No      |      | Strongly supports the Plan where it relates to the recovery and rebuild of greater Christchurch, in particular objectives for urban form, key activity centres and business land development.  
Supports the plans direction around public transport and brown fields development.  
Supports the Plans choice and diversity given to both residential and business development.  
Supports the use of environmentally sustainable construction and design within the Mixed Use Business Areas.  
Provides caution with regards to development in high hazard areas, development that might restrict ability to maintain flood protection, activities on the Kaiapoi River in relation to the Navigation Safety Bylaw, Activities in the bed of the river that might trigger consent, public transport activities that might crossover with regional transport planning and activities.  
Offers to work collaboratively with the Waimakariri District Council on any particular project within the Plan that might require Regional Council involvement. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Comments and Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>John Adair</td>
<td>Submission</td>
<td>180904100527</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Would like to see Kaiapoi be better than pre-earthquakes. References Picton and Wellington in terms of waterfront developments. Support an elevated boardwalk on the South side of the river to engage more with the river. Also supports commercial activities with views over the river. Supports bringing people back into the Town Centre through residential development in the Mixed Use Business Areas. Submitter is interested in discussing an opportunity for development of a motel on Raven Quay. Is supportive of creative remediation options and innovative building techniques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Trevor and Faye Tavendale</td>
<td>Submission</td>
<td>180905101191</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Supports creating a 'drawcard' for people to visit Kaiapoi. Encourages the use of the Kaiapoi river for activities such as kayaking and punting. Also supports more seating and shelters alongside the river. Encourages ongoing maintenance of landscaped areas. Supports the concept of a second pedestrian bridge. Would like to see a pedestrian crossing back in central shopping area. Would like more rubbish bins. Would also like to see accommodation blocks built in central Kaiapoi, with a market area also set aside. Would also like to see further development on western side of town near the Mandeville Pub. Also supports the concept of a park and ride, with a view the rail between Rangiora (through Kaiapoi) and into Christchurch is likely and should be planned for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>David Blackwell</td>
<td>Submission</td>
<td>180905101283</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Supports Kaiapoi as a local and regional destination Supports further retail development around the river on both sides of Williams Street. Would like to see 'good direct access' from Motorway, Adderley Terrace and Fuller Street into central Kaiapoi. Supports the Plans Vision but would like further efforts being made to encourage greater levels of development on Hilton Street west of Williams Street. Strongly supports the bus, rail and car parking provisions for West and West Mixed Use Business Area. Supports a second vehicle bridge across the river connecting Black Street to Charles Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kiwirail Holdings Limited</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>180906101758</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Submitter has noted the two controlled crossings in the Kaiapoi Town Centre and has provided information relating to assessment of level crossings for consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Glenda Duffell</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>180910103512</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>What do you think are the priorities for the Kaiapoi Town Centre? To encourage more retail in the area What would make the Kaiapoi Town Centre more attractive and compelling to visit? A mix of retail, great food places which we already have, things for kids to do inside and out - not many wet weather options currently Do you agree with the draft Plan's proposed vision and objectives? Mostly Is there anything else you would like to see included in the Plan? Do you have any other comments, questions, or concerns?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am strongly against the Council providing a freedom camping area in the town. As a hospitality provider we pay very high commercial rates to provide accommodation in Kaiapoi. Kaiapoi is well serviced with motor camps, some of which are very reasonable, there are also freedom camping areas at the Waimak. Along with other areas provided by the camping and caravan association close by. I object to our rates A: providing this facility B: paying to keep the area rubbish and problem free. There are also a large number of Airbnb’s in the district and I urge the council to investigate the rates these providers are paying so everyone is on a level playing field.

| 16 | Jacqui Jeffrey  
Kaiapoi  
Farmers Market | Online | 180910103512 | Yes | 1.45pm | What do you think are the priorities for the Kaiapoi Town Centre?  
The town centre needs a space that can be used as a community hub and becomes a visitor focal point. Kaiapoi has the potential to become a boutique destination because of it’s short distance from Christchurch and Rangiora and it’s small town feel. For the survival of the town, Kaiapoi needs to have a sense of vibrancy and a point of difference. We need to leverage our satellite position by creating a town centre that is unique, vibrant, and attractive to visit.

What would make the Kaiapoi Town Centre more attractive and compelling to visit?
Kaiapoi can become a hub for cultural and creative activities by having purpose built and easily accessible spaces for creativity. Many people, when visiting a town or for a day out, will attend a cultural event, craft or farmers market. Cultural and creativity-based programs are an effective way to address social exclusion and community renewal. Any spaces created will need to be supported by the council, community boards and wider community by actively encouraging groups to use them and making them easy to access/use. Only then will people use the spaces, will create fun things to happen in Kaiapoi and will it as a place where events will be developed, supported and grown to the point where they give back to the town. Support for creative enterprise is an essential component of building a creative economy, and reinforcing Kaiapoi’s boutque flavour. Our town centre needs to be unique, inviting and vibrant. Kaiapoi is a boutique location and as such we need spaces available to showcase artistic, creative and exciting things. We have some great ideas coming out of Kaiapoi like “Fire and Ice” but creating these around the current town centre layout is difficult. A community hub near the town centre where exciting events and markets can happen will encourage casual visitors to the area, as well as encourage locals to visit and linger in the main shopping area. This will have economic benefits to existing businesses, create opportunities for small market based business, and allow for the wider community to connect.

Do you agree with the draft Plan’s proposed vision and objectives?
Yes, I agree with the vision and objectives.

Is there anything else you would like to see included in the Plan?
More focus on connectivity between spaces and areas in Kaiapoi, in particular, Williams Street and other close township areas. The connections need to be attractive and lead to somewhere. In South Kaiapoi, ideally, that “somewhere” would be a open space with options for carnivals, markets and events as they could remain connected to the town centre. This connection would also provide a greater town centre space, providing more opportunities for businesses and more reasons for people to visit and linger in the town centre.

Do you have any other comments, questions, or concerns?
Kaiapoi is in danger, because of the rebuild, of becoming a cardboard cut out town with little character because all the buildings are going to be the same age (modern, glass structures). While this is an architectural feature, it doesn’t differentiate the town from Christchurch or Rangiora in a visual way. We need to be providing a unique point of difference and the council in some way need to be influencing this. Developers will provide the buildings, plans and tenants which means they have a huge influence on the design of our town without need for any concern for the functionality of the town and the community.

| 17 | Chris & Sharron King  
NZMCA North Canterbury Area | Online | 180910103512 | No | - | What do you think are the priorities for the Kaiapoi Town Centre?
Establishing Kaiapoi as a Destination and provide a wide range of commercial and community facilities

What would make the Kaiapoi Town Centre more attractive and compelling to visit?
A variety of shops, cafes, restaurants and activities for everyone and easy to access. Enhance the riverside location by developing the riverbanks with walkways, cycle ways and boating activities.

Do you agree with the draft Plan’s proposed vision and objectives?
Yes

Is there anything else you would like to see included in the Plan?

Do you have any other comments, questions, or concerns? The NZMCA North Canterbury Area is in support of NZMCA seeking to meet membership demand for a park in a town that more members want to visit. For NZMCA to acquire a site will ensure the site can be managed appropriately and does not become a free-for-all freedom camping area. For the Council this means fostering a strategic partnership with an experienced and reputable club. For the Kaiapoi community: Supporting local and regional economic strategies, e.g. increased revenue for a range of local businesses (particularly during the off-peak and shoulder seasons). Supporting local contractors to assist with the development and maintenance of the site. Potential to work with NZMCA members to help improve the local area for the benefit of the full community.

18 Jan Moore  Online  180910103512  No  - What do you think are the priorities for the Kaiapoi Town Centre?  What would make the Kaiapoi Town Centre more attractive and compelling to visit?  Do you agree with the draft Plan’s proposed vision and objectives?  Is there anything else you would like to see included in the Plan?  Do you have any other comments, questions, or concerns?  I wouldn’t like the better placement of three sculpture pieces in central Kaiapoi. These are the red letterbox sculpture, the painted giraffe and the steel sculpture behind the giraffe. All three of these sculptures are not shown to their best advantage as they are partially obscured by other signs which are too close to them.

19 Linda wright  Online  180910103512  No  - What do you think are the priorities for the Kaiapoi Town Centre?  What would make the Kaiapoi Town Centre more attractive and compelling to visit?  The shops along the main Street look shabby. Money needs to be put in to brighten up shop frontages. Look at new regent street in chch for example  Do you agree with the draft Plan’s proposed vision and objectives?  Is there anything else you would like to see included in the Plan?  The road between the library and the river needs to be pedestrian only. That one way road is dangerous and ruins the town to river ambiance  Do you have any other comments, questions, or concerns?  

20 Sheryl Johnson  Online  180910103512  No  - What do you think are the priorities for the Kaiapoi Town Centre?  I would like to see a town centre that is centralised and not too drawn out as in ribbon development. The river forms an amazing centre for the town and it is relatively unique.  What would make the Kaiapoi Town Centre more attractive and compelling to visit?  I think the town needs a name. The “river town” or the “historic town”. We don’t need to reinvent the wheel on this - something that’s been used before is fine. Studies show that travellers deviate to go visit somewhere with a name.  Do you agree with the draft Plan’s proposed vision and objectives?  Yes. On the whole they’re good.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Natalie Leary</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>180910103512</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Andrew Marti</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>180910103512</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>John Allen</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>180910103512</td>
<td>Yes 1.30pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Is there anything else you would like to see included in the Plan?**

- 

**Do you have any other comments, questions, or concerns?**

I like the intended use for the red zone. I think a club caravan park is an excellent idea for the area. I like the proposed sports ground also.

What do you think are the priorities for the Kaiapoi Town Centre?

It would be great to clean up the river. Not just in front of the new brewery going up. Lights especially at Xmas. There are many solar lights available so no power is needed. Improvements on signs with abit of carving should be great to see coming and going out of Kaiapoi.

Redesign the roundabout by MacDonald’s to be more people friendly. Too busy with roundabout, bus route and trains. Not too sure how this could be achieved but do know that this can cause distraction for the pedestrian crossing.

What would make the Kaiapoi Town Centre more attractive and compelling to visit?

Same as above. Once a month have stalls and entertainment up the main street. This should include all the businesses. E.g. Some of them didn’t get lanterns outside their shops. Design seating and small tables up the main street. Even on the bridge. On a nice day, it would be nice to sit, use the w-fi that’s free and enjoy nice days.

Do you agree with the draft Plan’s proposed vision and objectives?

The Kaiapoi Food Forest has made an impact, not only in Kaiapoi but worldwide. Once it’s up and established, it won’t be big enough. It’s a pity the golf course wasn’t included in the Red Zone area. If they sold the land, they would’ve been very wealthy and more houses could’ve gone up on the golf course. Money needs to be spent on Murphy Park. This was discussed a few years ago but wasn’t followed through. The car park is a health and safety hazard and needs to be addressed. Agree with the BMX track and dog park. Haven’t made up my mind with the others.

Is there anything else you would like to see included in the Plan?

Some of things I would like to include in the plans, are mentioned above. I would like to see more planning for the rowers and motor boats on the river. They seem to be a rule to themselves. No consideration for anyone else on the river. Signage could be a start.

Do you have any other comments, questions, or concerns?

It’s a bit sad to see that Kaiapoi is the poor cousin to Rangiora and get treated as such. You can spend money on prettying everything up but no point if people are not going to come here. Many places to eat but don’t have a view. If you consider the distance the river travels through Kaiapoi, how many businesses are on the river? Mmm, exactly.
What would make the Kaiapoi Town Centre more attractive and compelling to visit?
1. Improving the connection between the Town Center with the Kaiapoi River environment and the activities which occur on it. 2. Continue with and where possible develop further environmental improvements to the built environment in the town to make it an attractive place to be in and frequent.

Do you agree with the draft Plan’s proposed vision and objectives?
1. Having read through the plan, I agree with the objectives, guiding principles, and projects for the development of Kaiapoi’s Business Area.

Is there anything else you would like to see included in the Plan?
1. When proceeding forward with the implementation of the plan a number of issues will need to be borne in mind, two of which I have amplified upon in the next section, (last 2 points).

Do you have any other comments, questions, or concerns?
1. I am very impressed with the quality of the ‘Draft Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan 2028 and Beyond’ that has been compiled. 2. Spending by our members using the proposed New Zealand Motor Caravan Association Park which is shown as being established in the Kaiapoi East Mixed Use Business Area will provide considerable support to the businesses currently domiciled in the Town Centre Area, and those yet to be established in the new Mixed Use Business Areas in the future. 3. Advantage should be taken of the fact that rents for built commercial infrastructure, are likely to be cheaper than in Christchurch and other larger centres, this fact being used where possible to attract destination type businesses, e.g. microbrewery etc., that attract the general public and tourists to travel to Kaiapoi. In turn such ‘destination type businesses’ will assist in attracting supporting type businesses e.g. restaurants etc. A good example of this is the large second hand store at Mayfield which is reasonably well known throughout Australasia. Such attractions will have the effect of slowing leakage to other centres. 4. It will be important to ensure that any house boats which are allowed to be berthed on the side of Kaiapoi River, if indeed this finds favour with a section of the community, are of a reasonably good standard of repair so as not to detract from the standard of the overall improvements being made to the area.

What do you think are the priorities for the Kaiapoi Town Centre?
A market square and well defined centre. A wide range of hospitality along the riverbank Medium to high density housing, especially in the western precinct. A well-positioned and highly functional transport hub.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>26</th>
<th>Catherine Kappelle  (Cure Boat Club)</th>
<th>Submission Form</th>
<th>180910103321</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **What would make the Kaiapoi Town Centre more attractive and compelling to visit?**
A market square and well defined centre. A wide range of hospitality along the riverbank. A good parking plan.
Do you agree with the draft Plan's proposed vision and objectives?
Vision is fine. Objectives are fine, but the plan fails to deliver on meeting objectives.
Is there anything else you would like to see included in the Plan?
Medium to high density housing in the western precinct.
Do you have any other comments, questions, or concerns?
There has been no meaningful attempts to survey the local community on what it wants, nor survey the community on key aspects of the proposals.

**What do you think are the priorities for the Kaiapoi Town Centre?**
A function useful town centre that caters to everyday needs of all Kaiapoi residents, not just boutique/extras or yet more coffee and restaurants. The kind of retail and service mix that keeps the wider Kaiapoi community using Kaiapoi, not town or Rangiora.

**What would make the Kaiapoi Town Centre more attractive and compelling to visit?**
Restful, organised green spaces along the river. Retail and amenities as above. Kaiapoi residents (and wider community) need to identify Kaiapoi as their place/space and preference. Ownership, value of heritage/historical.

**Do you agree with the draft Plan's proposed vision and objectives?**
Useful connection from south to north via walk bridge. Kaiapoi river currently presents a problematic part of the bigger water conservation. Already has valued use. (Rowing has been part of the town for 150 years)

**Is there anything else you would like to see included in the Plan?**
- It's not a big river yet we have pontoons on one side, and proposed houseboats on the other. Where is the evidence that houseboats will be successful on a back where tide turns to mud – entire channel. Is harrowing enough with rowing use. What are the implications for water availability? Will there be strict consent/size conditions for these boats? (Effluent piped out?).

Still like the concept of houseboats, but only with strict control of width, maintenance etc. Who pays to set up the infrastructure required? River is our greatest asset and least looked after. – Not sure the houseboats will enhance.
Introduction

This memo summaries the submissions received during the four week public consultation period on the Draft Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan – Between 6th August and 2nd September 2018.

During the public submissions period, the following promotional activities were completed to generate awareness of the opportunity to provide feedback on the Draft Plan:

- Advertising in three local newspapers
- Interview/coverage on a national radio programme
- Council website and social media promotions
- An article on the Stuff website
- More than 200 Draft Plans dropped into businesses in the Kaiapoi Town Centre
- Copies of Draft Plans left in waiting areas of local medical centres, restaurants etc.
- Two ‘drop in sessions’ at the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre
- A presentation to 130 local business people at an ENC networking function
- A ‘mail out’ of Draft plans to many district and regional stakeholders
- A presentation to Environment Canterbury staff
- Hard copies of Draft Plans made available at all Council Libraries and Service Centres, and delivered to Regenerate Christchurch.

Submissions were received by way of direct email to the Project Manager, from completed and submitted ‘tear off’ forms included in the Consultation Documents distributed, from feedback collected at the ‘drop in’ sessions, and through the online feedback tool on the Councils’ Website. In total, 26 submissions were received and collated by Council staff.

Accompanying this Memo to the Hearings Panel is a table which collates and summarises all 26 submissions, a copy of each of the individual submissions, and a table which collates all of the online submissions received.

Summary of Submissions Against Key Questions

The following table provides a summary feedback against the five questions asked on the feedback form included with the Draft Plan Consultation Document, and on the Councils’ Online submissions tool.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission Question</th>
<th>General Summary and Themes From Responses</th>
<th>Staff Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What do you think are the priorities for the Kaiapoi Town Centre?                   | • Submitters regularly commented on making Kaiapoi a ‘destination’ with a ‘point of difference’.  
  • One common theme noted in feedback referred to the creation of more retail, including formal ‘market space’ opportunity at the core of the Town Centre.                        | • Staff agree with this point. It seems to be covered in the Draft Plan, but staff will seek opportunities to highlight this within the Plan.  
  • The Activation Strategy (Project 17) and Delivery Mechanism (Project 14) should consider this point.                                                                                                                              |
| What would make the Kaiapoi Town Centre more attractive and compelling to visit?    | • **Public Amenities** – A number of submitters commented on the need to consider amenities and design of the public realm within the Plan. This included footpath widths, good accessibility, landscaped areas, seating and rubbish bins etc.  
  • **Connection and Interaction with the River** – Comments included the importance of walking and cycle ways, well managed activities on/around the river, picnic areas, sculptures etc.  
  • **Connectivity and Transport** – There is general support for defining and confirming public transport opportunities, key town centre linkages and pedestrian/vehicle connectivity.  
  • **Arts, Culture and Heritage** – Support for activities and business ventures that link to Kaiapoi’s heritage and cultural significance was common through the feedback, as was the inclusion of artisan/boutique type businesses. | • Staff agree with the importance of considering public amenities and design of the public realm. These themes can be incorporated into numerous projects within the Plan.  
  • Staff generally agree with the feedback. The river is considered by the Draft Plan as a focal point.                                                                                                                                   |
| Do you agree with the draft Plan’s proposed vision and objectives?                  | • There was general support for the Draft Plan Vision and Objectives. A suggestion to add in the word ‘Kaiapoi’ into the tag line was received.  
  'Kaiapoi – New Zealand’s Best Rivertown'                                               | • Staff are pleased with the general support for the Draft Plan Vision and Objectives and recommend retaining these with the addition of the word ‘Kaiapoi’ in the tag line.                                                                 |
| Is there anything else you would like to see included in the Plan?                  | • The creation of a ‘hub’ or focal point in the town centre where people can congregate was a common theme.                                                                                                                                 | • Staff note that the ‘Master Plan’ is an aspirational representation of how the Mixed Use Business Areas might look. The underlying Outline Development Plan provides opportunity for the inclusion of such a focal point. Staff should consider this point through the Activation Strategy. |
| Do you have any other comments, questions, or concerns?                           | • A variety of comments were expressed, many relating to the themes and comments listed in the above commentary.                                                                                                                                 | • As described above.                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
Summarised Feedback of Other Comments

- **Utilities provisions** – Submissions noting the importance of providing for current and future utilities within Town Centre growth planning was received. Staff agree this is vital in supporting future development and allowing maintenance of utility assets within the Town Centre. There exist opportunities within a number of Draft Plan Projects to include such planning provisions.

- **Modification to Information in Document** – Some feedback was received with relation to alteration or removal of some of the information and projects within the project. In some instances there was conflicting advice on particular matters. Staff acknowledge the feedback and will review the identified areas of the report. Staff note that some information within the Draft Plan provides context for various directions and projects and therefore require consideration.

- **Activation Mechanism and Strategy Support** – General support was received with regards to the development of an ‘Activation Strategy’, and for an associated implementation mechanism. Staff note these projects are identified within the Draft Plan, and upon the plan’s adoption should be furthered.

- **Pedestrian Crossing in Middle of Williams** – A number of submitters commented on the need for a crossing to be re-established in the centre of the main Williams Street shopping area on the south side of the bridge. Staff would be happy to have further discussions with Roading Unit colleagues and the project’s Transport Consultant to investigate this request further.

- **Impact and Interaction of Motorway and New Transport Corridors** – A number of submitters commented on the impact of the new motorway and transport corridors between Christchurch and Kaiapoi. Comments on potential opportunities for linkage from the Northern Motorway and Kaiapoi were also received. Staff would be happy to have further discussions with Roading Unit colleagues and the project’s Transport Consultant about these submissions with a view to recommend any possible alterations to the Draft Plan should they be deemed appropriate.

- **General Support for Caravan/Camping Opportunities** – A few submissions were received on camping and caravan opportunities. There was general support for the ‘Caravan Park’ concept/project. However there was feedback discouraging ‘freedom camping’, and in support of ensuring open use of such a caravan facility, rather than membership only use. Staff view ‘freedom camping’ as out of scope for this particular plan. Staff note the New Zealand Motor Caravan Associations previous involvement in the Waimakariri red Zone Recovery Plan, and also the other ‘open’ camping ground opportunities within the District.

- **House/Canal Boats** – Whilst a number of submitters commented on river activities, only a few commented on House/Canal Boats specifically. Staff are currently investigatory work in relation to House/Canal Boats (Project 7) and plan to provide the Community Board and Council with the results of this work within the coming months.

- **Consultation Process** – Two submitters commented on the process of public consultation the Draft Plan, expressing some disappointment in the level of engagement that has been made. Staff believe that a reasonable effort has been made to make the public and key stakeholders aware of the Draft Plan, and to encourage feedback. Staff note the actions identified at the beginning of this memo as evidence of the promotion of this Draft Plan and public consultation process.
**Recommended Next Steps**

Following the presentation of submissions to the Draft Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan Hearings Panel, the following steps are proposed:

1. Hearings Panel deliberation of submissions on the 2nd October.

2. Final Draft Plan with identified alterations(updates) developed for approval and adoption by Council on 6th November.

3. Finalisation and implementation of Plan – Following Council’s November Meeting.
MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE DRAFT KAIAPOI TOWN CENTRE PLAN HEARING PANEL TO HEAR SUBMISSIONS ON THE DRAFT KAIAPOI TOWN CENTRE PLAN, HELD IN MEETING ROOM 1, RUATANIWHA KAIAPOI CIVIC CENTRE, 176 WILLIAMS STREET KAIAPOI ON WEDNESDAY 26 SEPTEMBER 2018 COMMENCING AT 1PM.

PRESENT

Mayor Ayers, Councillors A Blackie and J Meyer

IN ATTENDANCE

S Hart (Business and Centres Manager), D Huisman (Media & Visual Communications Coordinator), V Thompson (Business and Centres Advisor) and E Stubbs (Governance Secretary).

APPOINTMENT OF PANEL CHAIRPERSON

E Stubbs opened the meeting and called for nominations for a Chairperson for the Hearing Panel

Moved J Meyer seconded A Blackie

THAT Mayor Ayers be appointed as Chairperson of the Draft Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan Hearing Panel.

CARRIED

Mayor Ayers assumed the Chair.

1. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest.

3. HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS TO THE KAIAPOI TOWN CENTRE PLAN REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Appleman &amp; John Scheele</td>
<td>Mainpower New Zealand Limited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J Scheele (Resource Management Group Ltd) spoke on behalf of Mainpower.

J Scheele brought the Panel’s attention to that the Draft Kaiapoi Town Plan (the Plan) was silent on the role of utilities including phone, 3Waters and electricity supporting future business and retail development. Within that context there was the need for installation, maintenance and the upgrade of utilities.

Further to that, Mainpower was aware of the District Plan review process, in terms of Waimakariri District Council (WDC) there was some uncertainty around utility rules. The view of Mainpower was...
rather than have rules with conditions and restraints that created the need for unnecessary resource consents, the rules should be enabling and have flexibility thereby assisting with regeneration outcomes.

Questions

Mayor Ayers commented that the submission was clear in its purpose to point out that while the Plan looked at what was on the surface, the importance of overhead and underground services should be recognised. He noted the unfortunate placement of a Mainpower kiosk a number of years ago. He asked how Mainpower believed the process could be improved. M Appleman agreed the placement of the kiosk had been a suboptimal outcome and commented that it was important that Mainpower engaged and worked with council. J Scheele commented on the importance of urban design and the careful consideration of placement of utilities to ensure safety. How to implement the design guidelines of the District Plan was always fundamentally difficult and required consultation between Mainpower and Council.

Councillor Blackie referred to Mainpower’s comment that the Plan was silent on the role of utilities and asked what Mainpower would like to see in that space. J Scheele advised that they would like to see a section that acknowledged that in order to facilitate the change in land use for the Plan, there needed to be facilities and utilities to supply that change in land use. Further to that, M Appleman commented that he was keen to see a one utility type space including Mainpower/Telecom that developers could go to ensure services were in alignment. D Ayers asked M Appleman if he was aware of that model, where services were coming together, was being used elsewhere. M Appleman replied no, however it would assist developers.

Chris Greengrass  
Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board

C Greengrass spoke to the submission noting that the Board had been directly involved in the enquiry by design process. There were a number of items the Board wanted to raise.

Front Cover - the Board believed the front cover was outdated. The area for the market should be visible. They had been under the impression the walkway/cycle way alongside the river was not a shared road and therefore the vehicles shown on that thoroughfare should be removed. The name on the front should read Kaiapoi - New Zealand’s best Rivertown. The pedestrian walkway should be on top of the stop bank to enable users to appreciate the river. The river looked good with the included watercraft.

Page 20 – the board were widely supportive of the public transport options but were concerned about the collaboration with other partners and believe that the Council needs to lead in negotiation with any other partners.

The Board continues to identify the Market Town Square behind the Ruataniwha centre as keystone for the town centre.

Page 26 – the proposed interchange must accommodate both current and future modes of transport. The Board had believed that the Mixed Use Business Area East retail area was to have been bigger to be a central part of the town centre.

Page 40 - Mixed use Business Area East, the Board endorsed medium residential density and sought confirmation that medium
residential density remained as the designation as it was not identified in the Outline Development Plan on page 40.

The Board had concerns about the swale in the centre of town as swales were messy and required maintenance.

Questions

J Meyer referred to the Kaiapoi South – Williams Street pedestrian connectivity and asked if the Board had comments on the size of the walkway. C Greengrass replied they would like to see it extended to line up with the ANZ bank. The Board supported the pedestrian bridge across the river.

A Blackie asked about the Farmers market and C Greengrass replied that the Board would like to see plenty of room for market purposes.

Mayor Ayers asked if the Board had considered the interim use of the land and C Greengrass replied that the Board had been focused on the future. The Board had been pleased to see the Christmas carnival making use of that land.

C Greengrass commented that the new Williams St/Smith St/Beach Rd roundabout in Kaiapoi was working well and feedback from residents indicated that they were happy.

John Allen New Zealand Motor Caravan Association (NZMCA)

J Allen introduced himself as a representative of the New Zealand Motor Caravan Association which had a growing membership of 83-84,000 members. He believed the Plan should turn itself to the river where it could, as it was a point of difference for the town. He suggested two story buildings alongside the river be considered to enhance the view.

J Allen was impressed by the quality of the Plan and hoped it would enable Kaiapoi to become a ‘destination’ town. He suggested Kaiapoi should not try to compete with ‘shopping’ towns like Rangiora, Northlands and Northwoods Supacentre and provide a more boutique shopping experience.

J Allen suggested that care be taken with houseboats which could be seen as cheaper accommodation.

J Allen advised that in 2012 $650 million was spent by people in motorhomes around the communities of New Zealand providing a mutual beneficial relationship. He noted that motorhome tourists travelled through all seasons. A 2012 survey from Murchison showed motorhome tourists spent $117 daily in local shops. Around New Zealand there were over 45 NZMCA motor friendly towns. The NZMCA Board saw advantages to Kaiapoi as a town including the Waimakariri River and local beaches.

Questions

Mayor Ayers noted the reference to motor friendly towns as Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board had raised that option.

Councillor Meyer commented that as a district Waimakariri did not have many freedom campers and asked if NZMCA sites were closed to freedom campers. J Allen replied yes the sites were for members only to prevent any issues and freedom campers would be turned away.

D Ayers referred to the potential NZMCA site within the Kaiapoi...
urban area and asked if there were other towns around New Zealand with sites in the town. He asked if NZMCA completed landscaping. J Allen replied there were definitely other urban area sites. The Association completed landscaping and had an environmental policy that included planting and beautification of reserves. Currently they were planting a three hectare site in Weardon for carbon credits. Camps in urban areas did not cause problems. J Allen could provide the environmental care code policies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jacqui Jeffrey</th>
<th>Kaiapoi Farmers Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J Jeffrey advised that she ran the Kaiapoi Farmers market and would like a new home for that market. J Jeffrey commented that pre-quakes the market did well but was now at a tipping point and required a more visible home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Jeffrey’s vision for Kaiapoi was for a central place that felt ‘alive’ and where people would like to stop in the car to get out and have a browse and something to eat. Currently that was lacking in Kaiapoi, which she saw as a separated town. A central place that was available for markets and community events provided a central focus. She saw a market not taking away from commercial activity but boosting it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Jeffrey had spoken to Cure Boating Club who believed that having something on the river that connected to a central location would provide flow through the town.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Jeffrey commented that the Arts were strong in Kaiapoi and an ‘Arts Quarter’ could be a point of difference to the town and build on that reputation of a strong Arts community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Questions**

Mayor Ayers asked if J Jeffrey could provide an example of a small town where people were drawn to stop. J Jeffrey replied that the Nelson markets were successful and were a reason for people to visit. She believed markets would bring the old town feel back to Kaiapoi. She suggested concepts like the humorous street names in Bulls were a concept that made the town unique and a reason to visit. The Temuka Square was an example of a place that drew people to stop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Martin Pinkham</th>
<th>Individual Submission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M Pinkham took the opportunity to elaborate on points made in his submission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation process – M Pinkham agreed that the concept plan was made widely available however believed consultation could have been made easier for public to comment. For example short social media surveys around response to a public square rather than answering the very broad questions in the consultation document.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Market square – noted that a market square was not specifically included in the current proposal however it was the point of difference that Kaiapoi needed. For thousands of years towns had been based on market squares. The existing Farmers Market on Charles Street was not in the right place. A market and other events would complement the retail offering and would provide a catalyst for the retail sector to develop without the traffic issues of Williams Street. M Pinkham had included sketch plans including some areas shown with a roof which was common in Europe. He envisaged the market would be fringed by retail. He acknowledged the Council may be reluctant to be involved in management, but suggested that could be undertaken through...
Public Private Partnership (PPP).

Riverbank promenade – the promenade could be a second point of difference for Kaiapoi. He noted in the draft this had been presented as a roadway however service access could be provided from the edge of the promenade. The Cure Club development needed to complement the riverbank development.

Transport Hub – the transport hub was imperative for visitors and residents and Council should retain land in the vicinity. M Pinkham did not believe Park and Ride facilities were required if good public transport network was available in town. As ECan had detailed Park and Ride facilities should be located at places like the Tram Road / Main North Road intersection.

Flood Mitigation – M Pinkham acknowledged there were issues that needed to be resolved however the options raised were impractical. LIDAR data showed the railway line and the stop banks were almost at the same level and there was only one metre difference between the top of the stop bank and the Hilton Street roundabout. M Pinkham believed there was no technical reason why Kaiapoi South could not be filled. It would require lifting of part of Hilton Street but was a feasible solution. It was disappointing this had not been explored by the consultant. To be economically feasible the whole of the Kaiapoi South would need to be completed as one project.

Kaiapoi West / Kaiapoi East /Kaiapoi South
Medium residential - Pinkham noted there had been a number of requests for medium to high density development to be incorporated in the Regeneration Plan. There was a need to increase density of people living near shopping and transport hubs and to live without having to rely on a car. Urban planning groups have identified the Kaiapoi West area as the ideal place for medium to high density residential. It should not be carparking. The same applied to the North East corner of Kaiapoi East. While development was not core council activity in order for them to be developed to a high standard they should be offered to the market as complete blocks.

Commercial structure for implementation – with the land being owned by Council there were challenges but also opportunities to creating a high quality town centre. There had been a move away from small tenancies to major ownership. Council should take previous learnings from the impediments of fragmented ownership. Council needed to recognise it did not have the expertise or capital for high quality development and that objectives for the Kaiapoi CBD could be met by establishing a 50 / 50 PPP.

In conclusion M Pinkham advised he would like to see the Council:

- Amend the Plan to clearly identify a Market Square in Kaiapoi South.
- Amend the Plan to clearly define the role of the Riverside Promenade in Kaiapoi South.
- Amends the Plan to designate a significant part of the areas between Hilton Street and the Railway as a multi-mode Transport Hub.
- Amend the Plan to show all of the Kaiapoi South area as being filled to create a platform for future development.
- Amend the Plan to clearly identify all of the Kaiapoi West and the north east part of Kaiapoi East as a Medium/ High density residential area.
• Prepare an Implementation Plan that includes establishing a Public Private Partnership to develop the Kaiapoi Town Centre.

Questions
Councillor Blackie referred to Area 13 – Kaiapoi West and asked if M Pinkham agreed with mixed density business and possible rest home for that location noting that with the cost of remediation there was the possibility that no developer would come forward. M Pinkham commented he believed there was a fundamental flaw in calculation of the development cost. 600m$^2$ lots had been used rather than 300m$^2$ lots. In the case of the smaller lots there was a good return, and he did believe there was a market.

Mayor Ayers asked if there was a reason why the Market Square was not suited to the promenade and M Pinkham replied the market required wind shelter from the buildings.

Mayor Ayers referred to M Pinkham’s suggestion there should be medium to high density housing in old red zone abandoned areas and asked what he thought the politics to present that to the public should be. M Pinkham commented there were politics involved and it had been a traumatic process for people. While many people had moved on from that it was a difficult issue to be treated with sensitivity. He noted that decisions around the red zone were controlled by another party, not the council.

The Hearing Panel adjourned at 2.15pm, and will reconvene at Tuesday 2 October for deliberations.
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report is to inform the Council of budget adjustments that are necessary to the 2018-19 programme as a result of 2017-18 projects which were not completed as at 30 June.

Attachments:

i. Schedule of Carry over adjustments 2018-19 (TRIM: 181012119180)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 181003115088.

(b) Approves the budgets for the 110 changes to the 2018-19 capital programme;

(c) Notes the capital works programme will increase by $12.8million to $85.3million;

(d) Notes 19 of these projects were completed between July and September 2018;

(e) Notes that all projects are forecast to be completed this financial year, excluding multi-year projects/programmes.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The Council budget is generally approved in June of each year for the year commencing 1 July. The 2018-19 budget was approved on 19th June. Asset managers must forecast in early May which projects they consider will be completed by the end of the financial year. Any projects expected not to be completed are carried into the budget that is approved in June. Given the budget is dependent on forecasts there are usually a number of projects not completed as expected.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. At the September meeting the Capital projects report for June 2018 (Trim 180906101922) was presented. As at June 2018 151 (56%) of 271 projects were completed. Seventy two projects had already been carried over into 2018-19 as part of the Long Term Plan process. This report recommends budget changes be made to the 2018/19 LTP financial year where
the budget has either increased or decreased due to work able to be carried out as forecast.

4.2. There are a further 55 projects which were not completed by 30 June and were not carried over into 2018-19. The budgets for these are required to be carried over so that the projects are formally accounted for and monitored within the 2018-19 capital program. This report details these projects and the budget revisions necessary to the 2018-19 capital budgets.

4.3. Summary of budget changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Revised Budget ($'000)</th>
<th>Long Term Plan Budget ($'000)</th>
<th>Budget Change ($'000)</th>
<th>Number of Projects changed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>8,938</td>
<td>7,786</td>
<td>1,152</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>10,246</td>
<td>9,620</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>8,283</td>
<td>5,780</td>
<td>2,503</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roading</td>
<td>19,033</td>
<td>11,245</td>
<td>7,788</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>12,981</td>
<td>13,133</td>
<td>(152)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ Recovery and Regeneration</td>
<td>19,316</td>
<td>18,666</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>3,133</td>
<td>3,054</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3,055</td>
<td>2,930</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>85,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>72,479</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,821</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4. Analysis of Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget Change ($'000)</th>
<th>Number of projects changed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New projects requested in reports to Council 2018-19</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget reductions –project partially completed in 2017-18, projects not required or budget shifted</td>
<td>(3,152)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18 Projects carried over which were not included in 2018-19 budget</td>
<td>9,421</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects with budget adjustments</td>
<td>6,113</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,820</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5. Of those projects carried over, 19 projects, valued at $3.3 million have been completed between July & September.

4.6. Attachment Trim 181012119180 provide a listing of each project together with the original budget, change, revised budget and the reason for the carryover of works being requested.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

The works requested to be carried over have been consulted on through-out various times and were included into the Annual and Long Term Plans.

5.2. Wider Community

Not applicable

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

Projects which were not completed will have a short term impact on debt, as the debt will not have to be raised as quickly as expected and partly the reason why $130million of debt was raised against $149million budgeted in the 2017/18 Annual Plan. The effect on rates is that rates are higher than they would have been if all project completion was accurately predicted. This effect will be minimal as the projects will be completed this financial year and rates will be needed for financing loans as the projects are completed.

6.2. Community Implications

6.3. Risk Management

Risk is associated with the delay of projects with the main consequences being:

- Necessary work not being completed could result in not achieving levels of service.
- Price fluctuations due to the current economic environment.
- Further costs which may be incurred in future earthquakes e.g. Council self-insures bridges in conjunction with NZTA funding.

Projects which were not completed and are carried over to 2018-19 may impact on the workload for staff this year as there are more projects to be completed than forecast. Under the delegation to the Audit & Risk Committee, the impact on projects, capacity and forecasts will be reported to the Audit & Risk committee in November.

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, however the quantum of the Carryover being a net figure of $12.4million is significant.
7.2. **Legislation**
This report has been prepared and provided with reference to the financial provisions relating to the Local Government Act 2002 Subpart 3 – Financial Management and Financial Reporting Standards.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**
This report contributes to the outcome:

“There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision-making by public organisations that affect our District
- Public organisations make information about their plans and activities readily available.
- Public organisations make every effort to accommodate the views of people who contribute to consultations.”

7.4. **Delegations**
Delegation S-DM 1022 provides that the Audit & Risk Committee has jurisdiction to “Monitor implementation of the Annual Plan quarterly”. This report has been sent directly to Council due to the timing of the report.
### Schedule of Carry over adjustments 2018-19

**NOTE:** This schedule shows only projects which have changed, not all projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Full year revised budget</th>
<th>2018-19 Long Term Plan Budget</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Changes from reports to council 2018-19</th>
<th>Spent to 31 August 2018</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WATER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 Rangiora Water Supply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100904.000.5105</td>
<td>Lehmanns Rd/Rd S Connection</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>28,381</td>
<td>Council work completed in June, however final practical completion was issued in July.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100906.000.5105</td>
<td>E/O Southwest Rangiora Supply Main - Stage 1</td>
<td>314,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>314,000</td>
<td>147,617</td>
<td>Construction throughout Townsend fields was largely complete in June, however additional budget was required to engage the portion to be constructed by the Water Unit. Completion in October.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>302 Woodend Water Supply</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100812.000.5103</td>
<td>New Mains - Eliminate Deadends</td>
<td>71,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>71,000</td>
<td>4,908</td>
<td>Delayed due to delays with the subcontractor. Completion was July 2018.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>305 Waikuku Beach Water Supply</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100679.000.5105</td>
<td>Source Capacity Upgrade</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>(150,000)</td>
<td>15,584</td>
<td>The project was partially capitalised so reduce original budget carried over.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>306 Fernside Water Supply</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100507.000.5105</td>
<td>Connection to Mandeville</td>
<td>296,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>296,000</td>
<td>296,791</td>
<td>Fernside merged to Mandeville. The project connect to Mandeville is not completed. The total project costs were expected at $296k (the budget approved was $395k).</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>309 Kaiapoi Water Supply</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100032.000.5103</td>
<td>Pipe Replacement</td>
<td>109,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>The 2017-18 Annual Plan budget for pipe replacement was $430k. Unused budget carried over was $181k.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100032.000.5104</td>
<td>Pipe Replacement</td>
<td>324,973</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>24,973</td>
<td>155,298</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101219.000.5103</td>
<td>Dave St Water Main Renewal</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101219.000.5104</td>
<td>Dave St Water Main Renewal</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101220.000.5103</td>
<td>Akarioa, Bream &amp; Hodgson St Water Main Renewal</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>as above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101220.000.5104</td>
<td>Akarioa, Bream &amp; Hodgson St Water Main Renewal</td>
<td>86,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>86,000</td>
<td>as above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101221.000.5104</td>
<td>Porter, Evans &amp; Otagi St Water Main Renewal</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101222.000.5104</td>
<td>North East Kaiapoi Renewals</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100817.000.5105</td>
<td>North East Kaiapoi Boost Main</td>
<td>630,000</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>279,951</td>
<td>Second stage of works being designed by Project Delivery Unit. To be completed later in 2018.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101121.000.5103</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Well Head Improvements</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>2,776</td>
<td>Increase approved by Council to allow for the full required scope to be completed. Trim 180621068890.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>695,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>312 Waimakariri Water Race Supply</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100990.000.5104</td>
<td>H&amp;S Upgrades - Browns Rock Intake</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>12,411</td>
<td>Late carry over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>314 Oxford No 1 Rural Water Supply</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10044.000.5104</td>
<td>Pipeline Replacement</td>
<td>128,500</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>19,308</td>
<td>Construction to begin October 2018. Part of the Parish Rd and Rockford Rd works</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Full year revised budget</td>
<td>2018-19 Long Term Plan Budget</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Changes from reports to council 2018-19</td>
<td>Spent to 31 August 2018</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100048.000.5103</td>
<td>Additional source</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>Newly approved budget. Trim 180724082339.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100048.000.5104</td>
<td>Additional source</td>
<td>570,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>Newly approved budget. Trim 180724082339.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100048.000.5105</td>
<td>Additional source</td>
<td>1,676,098</td>
<td>1,904,098</td>
<td>(228,000)</td>
<td>Project partially capitalised. So reduce budget by amount already capitalised/used.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>(209,500)</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315 Oxford No 2 Rural Water Supply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100719.000.5104</td>
<td>Ashley Gorge Trunk Main</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>Newly approved budget. Trim 180717079353.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100719.000.5105</td>
<td>Ashley Gorge Trunk Main</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>Newly approved budget. Trim 180717079353.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317 Summerhill Water Supply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100941.000.5105</td>
<td>Source Upgrade - 2nd Well</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>(75,000)</td>
<td>47,426 Project partially capitalised. So reduce budget by amount already capitalised/used.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320 West Eyreton Water Supply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100829.000.5105</td>
<td>Source Upgrade - 2nd Well</td>
<td>152,500</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>(37,500)</td>
<td>21,363 Project partially capitalised. So reduce budget by amount already capitalised/used.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>916,973</td>
<td>235,000</td>
<td>Number of projects 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: this schedule shows only projects which have changed, not all projects.
### Schedule of Carry over adjustments 2018-19

**NOTE:** This schedule shows only projects which have changed, not all projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Full year revised budget</th>
<th>2018-19 Long Term Plan Budget</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Changes from reports to council 2018-19</th>
<th>Spent to 31 August 2018</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>350 Rangiwa Sewer Operating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100529:000:5115</td>
<td>Rangiwa WWTP Inlet Works - Construction</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>152,475</td>
<td>Carry over was understated by $266k. $50k allocated to PJ101253.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101253:000:5115</td>
<td>Septage Facility - Design</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100758:000:5115</td>
<td>WRPA E/O - 225 Dia Gravity Main</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>76,700</td>
<td>143,300</td>
<td></td>
<td>194,662</td>
<td>Carry over understated. Mostly complete but work will continue in the 2018/19 financial year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100833:000:5111</td>
<td>Health &amp; Safety Improvements</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Late carry over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100834:000:5114</td>
<td>Rangiwa to Kaiapoi Trunk Main Flange replacement</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>36,986</td>
<td>Late carry over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>540,000</td>
<td>76,700</td>
<td>463,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353 Woodend Sewer Operating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100094:000:5114</td>
<td>Wetland Plant Investigations</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>44,143</td>
<td>Late carry over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100835:000:5113</td>
<td>Health &amp; Safety Improvements</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Late carry over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359 Tuahiwi Sewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101066:000:5115</td>
<td>Tuirihia Pump Station &amp; Reticulation Upgrades - Design</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,762</td>
<td>Late carry over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101067:000:5115</td>
<td>Tuirihia Pump Station &amp; Reticulation Upgrade - Construction</td>
<td>105,852</td>
<td>81,852</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$82k is for 18/19. $24k adjustment was to recognise unused budget from 17/18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>125,852</td>
<td>81,852</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363 Kaiapoi Sewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100840:000:5113</td>
<td>Health &amp; Safety improvements</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Late carry over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369 Oxford Sewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100722:000:5114</td>
<td>Pipeline replacement</td>
<td>82,000</td>
<td>223,250</td>
<td>(141,250)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Budget shift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100723:000:5114</td>
<td>Upgrade aerators</td>
<td>622,500</td>
<td>481,250</td>
<td>141,250</td>
<td></td>
<td>132,132</td>
<td>Budget shift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100965:000:5113</td>
<td>Review Resource Consent</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Original carry over understated. Project is underway. Consent variance application has been submitted to Environment Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>722,500</td>
<td>709,500</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Sewer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>625,300</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of projects 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Schedule of Carry over adjustments 2018-19

**NOTE:** this schedule shows only projects which have changed, not all projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Full year revised budget</th>
<th>2018-19 Long Term Plan Budget</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Changes from reports to council 2018-19</th>
<th>Spent to 31 August 2018</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100118.000.5123</td>
<td>Under Channel Piping</td>
<td>117,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>57,000</td>
<td>59,965</td>
<td>Late carry over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100977.000.5123</td>
<td>Townsend Rd/Westbelt Stormwater Pipe - LoS</td>
<td>735,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>735,000</td>
<td>551,007</td>
<td>Contract has been awarded to Truline Civil. To be completed end of September 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100985.000.5125</td>
<td>Townsend Rd/Westbelt Stormwater Pipe - Growth</td>
<td>245,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>245,000</td>
<td>183,669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100996.000.5123</td>
<td>Sump Inserts and Fish Plaques</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>Late carry over $20k plus another $20k originally budgeted in 2018/19 but was mistakenly removed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101089.000.5123</td>
<td>Southbrook / South Belt</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,157</td>
<td>Late carry over.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101158.000.5124</td>
<td>Future Renewal Works</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>(230,000)</td>
<td>Budget not required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,157,000</td>
<td>290,000</td>
<td>867,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100127.000.5125</td>
<td>East Woodend Upgrade McIntosh Drain</td>
<td>37,600</td>
<td>45,600</td>
<td>(8,000)</td>
<td>342,172</td>
<td>Budget carried over was overstated due to partial capitalisation in 17/18.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100128.000.5125</td>
<td>East Woodend Detention Pond</td>
<td>356,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>356,000</td>
<td>The project was near completion last year. Costs incurred was in WIP so need to carry over budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100557.000.5125</td>
<td>East Woodend Internal reticulation</td>
<td>342,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>342,000</td>
<td>369,837</td>
<td>The project was near completion last year. Costs incurred was in WIP so need to carry over budget.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100999.000.5123</td>
<td>Stormwater Minor Improvements</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>6,457</td>
<td>Late carry over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101000.000.5123</td>
<td>Sump Inserts and Fish Plaques</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Late carry over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>775,600</td>
<td>65,600</td>
<td>710,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101004.000.5123</td>
<td>Pump Station Renewals</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>34,520</td>
<td>$10k from P1000131.000.5123.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101031.000.5123</td>
<td>Underchannel piping</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>(20,000)</td>
<td>Of the $20k, $10k goes to P1000130 and $10k goes to P1000875.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101032.000.5123</td>
<td>Underchannel piping</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>Late carry over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100133.000.5123</td>
<td>McIntosh Drain Upgrade</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>5,460</td>
<td>Budget originally deferred to 20/21 and was required to move back to 18/19.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100605.000.5123</td>
<td>Flood Response Kaiapoi Urban Drainage</td>
<td>157,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>157,000</td>
<td>242,751</td>
<td>The project was near completion last year. Costs incurred was in WIP so need to carry over budget.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100875.000.5124</td>
<td>Flap gates Renewals</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>$10k from P1000131.000.5123.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101006.000.5123</td>
<td>Sump Inserts and Fish Plaques</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>Late carry over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>497,000</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>312,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100561.000.5123</td>
<td>Drainage Upgrade Non Scheduled</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>3,561</td>
<td>Late carry over. Work assigned to Project Delivery Unit, but resource not available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101010.000.5123</td>
<td>Stormwater Minor Improvements</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Late carry over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101011.000.5123</td>
<td>Sump Inserts and Fish Plaques</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Late carry over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contract has been awarded to Truline Civil. To be completed end of September 2018.
## Schedule of Carry over adjustments 2018-19

NOTE: this schedule shows only projects which have changed, not all projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Full year revised budget</th>
<th>2018-19 Long Term Plan Budget</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Changes from reports to council 2018-19</th>
<th>Spent to 31 August 2018</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Complete by 30 September</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>429 District Drainage</td>
<td>Flood Response Ohoka Rural</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>290,101</td>
<td>Late carry over</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429 District Drainage</td>
<td>Flood Response Rangiora</td>
<td>453,000</td>
<td>453,000</td>
<td>154,284</td>
<td>Late carry over</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>579,000</td>
<td>579,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Drainage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,503,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of projects 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401 Refuse Disposal</td>
<td>Garelys Pit roads and fencing</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>31,718</td>
<td>Late carry over</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Solid Waste</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>50,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of projects 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE: this schedule shows only projects which have changed, not all projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Full year revised budget</th>
<th>2018-19 Long Term Plan Budget</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Changes from reports to council 2018-19</th>
<th>Spent to 31 August 2018</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>270 Subsidised Roading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100337.000.5134</td>
<td>LED replacement</td>
<td>73,924</td>
<td>40,349</td>
<td>33,575</td>
<td>102,569</td>
<td>Late carry over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288 Unsubsidised Roading - Works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100742.000.5134</td>
<td>Footpath Reconstruction</td>
<td>805,311</td>
<td>683,311</td>
<td>122,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unspent budget required to be carried over.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291 Subdivisional Share Cont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100770.000.5135</td>
<td>Woodend East ODP</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>The original carry over was understated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292 ODP Dept Contrib Funded Projs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100189.000.5135</td>
<td>West Rangiora ODP</td>
<td>508,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>228,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$228k of carry over from 17/18 was shifted to 22/23 in the Annual Plan. Per Joanne the budget is now required for 18/19.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100190.000.5135</td>
<td>Silverstream New Arterial Rd ODP Dev Contin</td>
<td>644,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>644,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>46,111</td>
<td>Carry over unspent budget to complete project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100191.000.5135</td>
<td>Silverstream Collector Rd (Adderley-Island)</td>
<td>835,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>(365,000)</td>
<td>1,056,581</td>
<td></td>
<td>The budget carried over was $1m to 18/19 and $902k to 19/20 per the Annual Plan. However project progressed faster so the total unused budget was $635k. Essentially we are moving $902k to 18/19 and reduce $1.9m budget to $635k being budget unspent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100748.000.5135</td>
<td>West Belt Extension to Townsend Rd</td>
<td>3,751,500</td>
<td>501,500</td>
<td>3,250,000</td>
<td>2,149,228</td>
<td>The original carry over was understated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101016.000.5135</td>
<td>Smith Street/Williams Street Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>612,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>612,000</td>
<td>279,014</td>
<td>Late carry over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>6,150,500</td>
<td>1,781,500</td>
<td>4,369,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293 Roading District Dev Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100196.000.5135</td>
<td>West Rga Improvement - Lehmans to River Rd</td>
<td>1,005,600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,005,600</td>
<td>442,231</td>
<td>Late carry over required to complete property purchases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100199.000.5135</td>
<td>West Kaila Silverstream New Arterial Rd</td>
<td>681,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>681,500</td>
<td>45,270</td>
<td>Carry over unspent budget to complete project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100750.000.5135</td>
<td>Westbelt extension to Townsend Rd</td>
<td>1,283,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,283,000</td>
<td>735,177</td>
<td>Late carry over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101042.000.5135</td>
<td>West Rangiora Roading Improvements</td>
<td>203,175</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>203,175</td>
<td></td>
<td>Newly approved since Annual Plan adopted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>3,173,275</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,970,100</td>
<td>203,175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Roading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of projects</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Schedule of Carry over adjustments 2018-19

**NOTE:** this schedule shows only projects which have changed, not all projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Full year revised budget</th>
<th>2018-19 Long Term Plan Budget</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Changes from reports to council 2018-19</th>
<th>Spent to 31 August 2018</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100283.000.5014</td>
<td>Toilet Renewals</td>
<td>438,000</td>
<td>453,000</td>
<td>(15,000)</td>
<td>15,918</td>
<td>Budget carried over was overstated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100564.000.5013</td>
<td>Silverstream Reserve</td>
<td>73,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>73,000</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>Late carry over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>511,000</td>
<td>453,000</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community &amp; Recreation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446 Public Conveniences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100296.000.5033</td>
<td>Crime Camera System Replacement</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,795</td>
<td>Original carry over understated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>86,800</td>
<td>15,300</td>
<td>71,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495 Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100162.000.5023</td>
<td>Resource Purchase</td>
<td>397,710</td>
<td>452,710</td>
<td>(55,000)</td>
<td>67,897</td>
<td>$55k shifted to operational budget (online subscription) in 18/19.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,528,000</td>
<td>4,350,000</td>
<td>178,000</td>
<td>191,467</td>
<td>Multi year project, need to carry over the budget.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 Community Buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100310.000.5224</td>
<td>Hegan Estate</td>
<td>74,900</td>
<td>66,900</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Late carry over but only part of the 17/18 budget was required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,528,000</td>
<td>4,350,000</td>
<td>178,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Community &amp; Recreation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(152,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of projects 15
### Schedule of Carry over adjustments 2018-19

**NOTE:** this schedule shows only projects which have changed, not all projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Full year revised budget</th>
<th>2018-19 Long Term Plan Budget</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Changes from reports to council 2018-19</th>
<th>Spent to 31 August 2018</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earthquake Recovery and Regeneration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100214.000.5104</td>
<td>Kaiapoi East Re-routing Water EQ Recovery</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>9,396</td>
<td>The project was completed under budget and some late invoices were still coming through. Discussed with Garry Boot: unused budget required for 18/19 is around $12k.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100983.000.5104</td>
<td>Servicing Houses in Regeneration Area</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>331,000</td>
<td>(331,000)</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>Project budget no longer needed therefore removed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>331,000</td>
<td>(319,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>242 Sewer Earthquake Recovery</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100224.000.5114</td>
<td>Courtenay Downs Sewer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>(100,000)</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>The budget has been transferred to EQ regeneration unit to build a viewing platform at Charles St Pump Station.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100984.000.5114</td>
<td>Servicing Houses in Regeneration Area (New Project 57)</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>(183,000)</td>
<td>33,426</td>
<td>The amount carried over exceeded budget unused at year end. Budget reduced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>320,000</td>
<td>(283,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>243 Earthquake Recovery</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100243.000.5014</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Town Centre Renewal</td>
<td>1,478,000</td>
<td>1,821,000</td>
<td>(343,000)</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>The amount carried over exceeded budget unused at year end. Budget reduced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101031.000.5014</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Town Centre Feature Lighting</td>
<td>75,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75,500</td>
<td>66,054</td>
<td>Project not completed therefore carry over unspent budget for costs in 18/19.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,553,500</td>
<td>1,821,000</td>
<td>(267,500)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>244 Drainage Earthquake Recovery</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100371.000.5124</td>
<td>Kaiapoi East Services</td>
<td>142,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>142,000</td>
<td>121,015</td>
<td>Project not completed therefore carry over unspent budget for costs in 18/19.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100470.000.5124</td>
<td>Dudley Drain</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>276,000</td>
<td>(276,000)</td>
<td>8,374</td>
<td>Project completed. May have late invoices later. Unused budget = $143k.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100471.000.5124</td>
<td>Jones Street Pipework</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>Late carry over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100985.000.5124</td>
<td>Box Shields Link Pipework (Part of Project 43)</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>104,036</td>
<td>Late carry over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>378,000</td>
<td>276,000</td>
<td>102,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Schedule of Carry over adjustments 2018-19

**NOTE:** this schedule shows only projects which have changed, not all projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Full year revised budget</th>
<th>2018-19 Long Term Plan Budget</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Changes from reports to council 2018-19</th>
<th>Spent to 31 August 2018</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>245 Roading Earthquake Recovery</td>
<td>100262.000.5134 Courtenay Area Roading EQ Recovery</td>
<td>305,000</td>
<td>- 305,000</td>
<td>46,021</td>
<td>Project not completed carry over unspent budget to 18/19.</td>
<td>46,021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100268.000.5134 Kaiapoi East Access Road</td>
<td>801,400</td>
<td>245,000 556,400</td>
<td>521,175</td>
<td>The Annual Plan budget was a new budget for 18/19. $556k budget adjustment was 17/18 unused budget required to be carried over to 18/19.</td>
<td>521,175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100742.000.5014 Rangiora Cark Park Building</td>
<td>1,637,500</td>
<td>1,396,000 41,500</td>
<td>62,089</td>
<td>The carry over was understated in the Annual Plan.</td>
<td>62,089</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub Total** 2,743,900 1,841,000 902,900

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Full year revised budget</th>
<th>2018-19 Long Term Plan Budget</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Changes from reports to council 2018-19</th>
<th>Spent to 31 August 2018</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>246 Recreation Earthquake Recovery</td>
<td>100280.000.5013 Seismic strengthening - comm buildings</td>
<td>213,000</td>
<td>160,000 53,000</td>
<td>79,308</td>
<td>Carry over in the Annual Plan was understated. The Rangiora Library project budget 17/18 has been transferred to P100280 in 2018/19.</td>
<td>79,308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Full year revised budget</th>
<th>2018-19 Long Term Plan Budget</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Changes from reports to council 2018-19</th>
<th>Spent to 31 August 2018</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>541 Red Zone Regeneration</td>
<td>100894.000.5014 Restoration of red zone areas capital works</td>
<td>4,445,000</td>
<td>3,984,000 461,000</td>
<td>1,217</td>
<td>$361k late carry over adjustment plus $100k shifted from EQ sewer to build a viewing platform on a Pump Station.</td>
<td>1,217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal EQ recovery and regeneration** 649,600

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Full year revised budget</th>
<th>2018-19 Long Term Plan Budget</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Changes from reports to council 2018-19</th>
<th>Spent to 31 August 2018</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163 Camping Grounds</td>
<td>100201.000.5224 Camp improvements</td>
<td>166,000</td>
<td>89,000 77,000</td>
<td>106,076</td>
<td>The budget carried over in Annual Plan was $89k however the unused budget in 18/19 was $166k. Budget adjustment performed.</td>
<td>106,076</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100776.000.5223 Relocate ablution/kitchen block</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,700 1,700</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>late carry over</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal Property** 78,700

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Full year revised budget</th>
<th>2018-19 Long Term Plan Budget</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Changes from reports to council 2018-19</th>
<th>Spent to 31 August 2018</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119 Computer Services</td>
<td>100890.000.5572 AP Automation</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000 54,528</td>
<td>54,528</td>
<td>This project is going live in November 2018</td>
<td>54,528</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101018.000.5572 Phone System</td>
<td>107,400</td>
<td>107,400 135,359</td>
<td>135,359</td>
<td>The new phone system will be active in October</td>
<td>135,359</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101021.000.5572 Facilities Bookings</td>
<td>52,940</td>
<td>52,940 118,340</td>
<td>118,340</td>
<td>late carry over</td>
<td>118,340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101252.000.5572 Backscanning of paper records</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000 (50,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Budget moved to Opex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal Other** 125,340

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Full year revised budget</th>
<th>2018-19 Long Term Plan Budget</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Changes from reports to council 2018-19</th>
<th>Spent to 31 August 2018</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>110</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of projects changed</td>
<td>Changes from reports to Council</td>
<td>Number of projects reduced</td>
<td>Number of projects increased</td>
<td>Total Changes</td>
<td>12,381,388 438,175</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. The purpose of this report is to update Council on NZTA funding which is available for Footpaths Maintenance and Renewals which is available to Council for the first time in the 2018 to 2021 year period. This report should be read in conjunction with reports on Roading Contributions (Doc. 181025124661) and Urban Cycleways Projects (Doc. 181002114346).

1.2. Two reports was taken to Utilities and Roading Committee in August 2018 seeking approval for both the Roading Capital Works Programme and the New Footpath Programme for this year.

1.3. At the time the reports were presented, NZTA had indicated an intent to subsidise Footpath Renewals and Maintenance as part of the latest GPS however this had not been formally confirmed. Since then NZTA have confirmed that a FAR (financial assistance rate) of 51% will be available to Council for the 3 year period. Therefore there is $417,631 of surplus budget available each year, over the next three years.

1.4. As per the previous report for the New Footpath Programme (Doc. 180502047634), it is recommended that $80,000 of this available budget be used to construct new footpaths in both Harewood Road and Burnt Hill Road. The request for footpaths in these streets has come from residents concerned about safety and a lack of footpaths in the area and as such is considered a high priority.

1.5. It is noted that the current footpath renewal and maintenance budget has been set to meet the required levels of service for footpaths and it is not considered appropriate to accelerate the footpath renewal programme as this would mean that from an asset management perspective, the full useful life of footpaths would not be optimised.

**Attachments:**

i. Approval of the New Footpaths Programme Report – (Doc. 180502047634)

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 181024124660;
(b) Approves the reallocation funding for the construction of new footpaths in Harewood Road and Burnt Hill at an estimated cost of $80,000 (PJ 100746.000.5134);

(c) Supports the construction of the new footpaths being carried out under the Road Maintenance Contract on the basis this is the most cost effective method of completing this work as the contract rates are competitive and tendering costs which for straightforward work like this can be disproportionally high and would result in less footpath being constructed;

(d) Notes that it is proposed to reallocate savings from NZTA subsidising of footpaths as detailed in this report and also to Roading Development Contributions (Doc. 181025124661) and Urban Cycleways Projects (Doc. 181002114346);

(e) Notes that the Utilities & Roading Committee supported the inclusion of new footpaths in Harewood Road and Burnt Hill Road, subject to NZTA confirmation of 51% subsidy for Footpath Renewals and subsequent approval to reallocate budget by Council;

(f) Circulates this report to the Utilities & Roading Committee for information.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1. Included in the 2015 - 25 LTP was $100,000 per year for eight years for new footpaths in Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend and Oxford. Council has previously approved a programme for 2018 to 2021.

3.2. The funding was included to bring the footpaths in the main towns up to the agreed level of service. The agreed level of service is for a footpath on both sides of the road on Strategic, Arterial and Collector Roads and a footpath on one side of Local Roads.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. NZTA had previously indicated an intention to subsidise Footpath Renewals and Maintenance for the first time in 2018. At the time of our previous report the exact details were still to be confirmed however it was flagged that this was likely to result in a FAR (financial assistance rate) of 51% for Council.

4.2. The FAR (financial assistance rate) of 51% has now been formally approved.

4.3. The current budget for Footpath Renewals is $683,000 and Footpath Maintenance is $135,885 (total of $818,885). The 51% subsidy has resulted in $417,631 of additional budget being available.

4.4. A public meeting was held with residents of Harewood Road and Burnt Hill Road on 12 July 2018. A number of issues around safety were discussed at the public meeting and these included safe facilities for pedestrians as well as heavy vehicles using these roads. The resounding feedback from the meeting was that residents wanted to have a footpath along both roads to provide safe walking facilities for pedestrians.

4.5. It is therefore recommended that $80,000 of this be used to construct new footpaths in both Harewood Road (Burnt Hill Rd to Main Street) and Burnt Hill Road (Harewood Rd to Main Street).

4.6. A separate report will be taken to Council to address the reallocation of $337,631 being the remainder of the budget.

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

5.1. Groups and Organisations

Not applicable.

5.2. Wider Community

5.3. Feedback was sought from the Community Boards on the overall prioritisation process and the projects back in 2015. Burnt Hill Road and Harewood Road footpaths were included in this prioritisation process. The Boards generally supported the process at that time.

5.4. The request for footpaths in these streets has come from residents concerned about safety and a lack of footpaths in the area and as such is considered a high priority.

5.5. Residents in the streets programmed for new footpaths will be notified in advance of the work being carried out to give them an opportunity to comment on the proposed work.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.2. It is proposed to cover the funding of the new paths with surplus budget from the Footpath Renewals and Maintenance budgets. This budget is to be subsidised by NZTA for the first time in 2018/19 and as such has $417,631 of additional budget which can be reallocated.

6.3. The current budget for Footpath Renewals is $683,000 and Footpath Maintenance is $135,885 (total of $818,885). The 51% subsidy has resulted in $417,631 of additional budget being available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Category</th>
<th>Approved Budget</th>
<th>NZTA 51% Subsidy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Footpath Renewals</td>
<td>683,000</td>
<td>348,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpath Maintenance</td>
<td>135,885</td>
<td>69,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$818,885</td>
<td>$417,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget to be reallocated to new footpaths (As detailed in this report)</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget to be reallocated to Cycleways (As per report 181002114346)</td>
<td>$83,734</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget to be reallocated to Roading Financial Contributions (As per report 181025124661)</td>
<td>$228,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REALLOCATED</td>
<td>$391,734</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4. Reallocation of budget to Roading Financial Contributions and Cycleways budgets are covered in separate reports in the meeting agenda as noted.

6.5. New footpaths do not meet NZTA requirements for subsidy. However, some new footpaths may qualify for NZTA subsidy where there is high demand and/or it is to address a road safety issue. The proposed footpaths are unlikely to qualify for funding from NZTA.

6.6. Community Implications

6.7. Not applicable

6.8. Risk Management

6.9. The budget has been set based on an estimate and the work has not yet been priced, which could result in a cost over-run when formally quoted.

6.10. Health and Safety

6.11. As per standard tendering process of any physical works, the contractor will be assessed for Health & Safety and required to provide a Site Specific Health & Safety Plan for approval prior to work commencing on site.

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

The Land Transport Management Act and Local Government Act are relevant in this matter.

7.3. Community Outcomes

This report consider the following outcomes:

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

**Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable and sustainable**
- The standard of our District’s roads is keeping pace with increasing traffic numbers.
- Communities in our District are well linked with each other and Christchurch is readily accessible by a range of transport modes.

7.4. Delegations

Council has the authority to re-allocate budgets.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO:  RDG-08-09-01, RDG-32-51 /180502047634

REPORT TO: Utilities & Roading Committee

DATE OF MEETING: 21 August 2018

FROM: Joanne McBride, Roading & Transport Manager
Hari Pillay, Roading Design Engineer

SUBJECT: Approval of the New Footpaths Programme

SIGNED BY: (for Reports to Council, Committees or Boards)

Department Manager
Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to update the Utilities & Roading Committee on the New Footpaths Programme and to seek approval of the programme for the 2018/19, 2019/20 and 2020/21 years.

1.2. The report seeks approval to add three new footpaths into the programme, two in 2018/19 and one in 2019/20. These requests were received from the LTP process and also from a service request.

1.3. Included in the 2015 - 25 LTP was $100,000 per year for eight years for new footpaths in Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend and Oxford with Council previously approving a programme for the first three years. That programme is complete which means there is another five years of $100,000 per year available in the LTP.

1.4. It is proposed to seek approval for the programme for the next three years only at this stage, as this will enable a review of the programme as part of the 2021-2031 LTP. This will allow any new information to be fed into the prioritisation process.

1.5. Two submissions to the LTP were received for new footpaths in Rangiora. These footpaths are in Blackett Street and in Sandown Boulevard. These footpaths are not included in the new footpaths programme because these streets meet the current level of service which requires a footpath on one side of the road only on local roads; however there are special circumstances in both cases to warrant an exception and for them to be constructed.

1.6. Another submission was received requesting a new footpath on Main North Road at the north end of Woodend. This footpath has now been included in the new footpaths programme because Main North Road doesn’t meet the level of service. However, it does not feature in the next three years of the programme due to its high cost because of the large drain alongside the road and lower expected demand. Due to the development of Ravenswood in the vicinity it is recommended further investigations be carried out for possible inclusion in the 2021-31 LTP and this will need to be carried out in conjunction with NZTA plans for work in and around Woodend.

1.7. The current level of service and District Plan requirement for new developments is for a footpath on one side of the road only on urban Local Roads. It is recommended that the Utilities & Roading Committee supports referring the issue of whether footpaths are required on both sides of all urban roads to the District Plan and Regulation Committee for consideration.
1.8. NZTA have indicated an intention to subsidise Footpath Renewals and Maintenance this year. While the exact details are still to be confirmed it is likely that this will result in a FAR (financial assistance rate) of 51% for Council. Should the subsidy be approved then there would be $400,000 of additional budget available which could be used (in whole or part) to accelerate the new footpath programme. It is recommended that $80,000 of this be used to construct new footpaths in both Harewood Road and Burnt Hill Road and that this reallocation of budget be taken to Council for approval, subject to NZTA confirmation of the subsidy being granted.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180502047634:

(b) **Approves** the following programme for new footpaths over the next three years as per the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
<th>2020/21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Street (No. 136 to 152) – eastside to complete section started in 2017/18</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandown Boulevard (Huntingdon Dr to Preschool entrance)</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackett Street (Stephens St to Church St)</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harewood Rd (Burnt Hill Rd to Main Street)**</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnt Hill Road (Harewood Rd to Main Street)**</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinnerys Road (Welsford St to west entrance to Reserve) – east side</td>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weka Street (Park Ave to end)</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Belt (Newnham St – Railway) – north side</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Belt (No. 5 to Raymond Orr Meadows) – south side</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinnerys Road (Reserve east entrance to Woodglen Dr) – west side</td>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranfurly Street (Dale St to Cridland St) – east side</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totara Drive - east side</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronation Street (Buckleys Rd to end) – north side</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballarat Road (existing path to Hassall Street) – east side</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tui Street (Park Tce – Rata St) – north side</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodfield Place (start to end)</td>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be allocated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note - Harewood Rd and Burnt Hill Rd are subject to confirmation of NZTA subsidy and a subsequent Council approval.**
(c) **Notes** that the cost estimates are derived from the rates in the Council’s Road Maintenance Contract plus a contingency of 20%.

(d) **Supports** the construction of the footpaths being carried out under the Road Maintenance Contract on the basis this is the most cost effective method of completing this work as the contract rates are competitive and it avoids professional services and tendering costs which for straightforward work like this can be disproportionally high and would result in less footpath being constructed.

(e) **Notes** that the programme beyond 2020/21 will be confirmed and submitted to Council in 2020/21 for approval as part of the 2021-2031 LTP process.

(f) **Notes** that Blackett Street at this location is a local road and it already has a footpath on the north side of the road so it meets the current level of service; however, there is a children’s playground on the south side, the remainder of Blackett Street has a footpath on both sides and the road functions more as a collector road and so a path on both sides is justified.

(g) **Notes** that a footpath was required on one side of the road only on Sandown Boulevard and the need is high, therefore it is recommended that this footpath is constructed in the short term.

(h) **Notes** the submission requesting a new footpath on Main North Road at the north end of Woodend and agrees to investigate this further for possible inclusion in the 2021-31 LTP.

(i) **Supports** the inclusion of new footpaths in Harewood Road and Burnt Hill Road in the programme, subject to NZTA confirmation of 51% subsidy for Footpath Renewals and subsequent approval to reallocate budget by Council;

(j) **Supports** referring the issue of footpaths and whether they should be constructed on both sides of local roads to the District Plan Review Committee for further consideration;

(k) **Circulates** this report to the Community Boards and Council.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1. Included in the 2015 - 25 LTP was $100,000 per year for eight years for new footpaths in Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend and Oxford. Council previously approved a programme for the first three years. That programme has now been completed which means there is another five years of $100,000 per year available in the LTP.

3.2. The funding was included to bring the footpaths in the main towns up to the agreed level of service. The agreed level of service is for a footpath on both sides of the road on Strategic, Arterial and Collector Roads and a footpath on one side of Local Roads.

3.3. Footpaths completed under the approved programme are:

- **Rangiora**
  - South Belt (Buckleys Rd to Southbrook Rd) – South side
  - West Belt (Milesbrook Cl to Johns Rd) – west side
  - King Street (South Belt to Johns Rd) – parts of both sides

- **Oxford**
  - Main Street (End of footpath to Mill Rd) – north side
  - High Street (Weld St to Main Street) – east side
  - Rata Street (Tui St to end) – east side
Kaiapoi

- Courtenay Drive (Williams St to Stone St) – south side

3.4. The streets in the first two years of the programme were tendered as a package of work. The third year was completed by Sicon under the Road Maintenance Contract. The estimated cost of tendering this work and the expected rates for the work based on other projects meant not all of the footpaths would have been able to be completed within the $100,000 budget if it was tendered. This work is very straight forward and adding professional services costs to develop a specification and contract document and the tendering costs and then contract management costs meant a disproportionate portion of the budget was used up before construction started. By using the Road Maintenance Contract there are no tendering costs or additional professional services costs. Also contractor costs, such as traffic management can be more efficiently undertaken when part of a much larger contract. It is proposed to continue with this procurement method to maximise the available budget for constructing footpaths.

3.5. Two submissions were received on the LTP for new footpaths in streets that already meet the current level of service. It is considered these are worthwhile projects and an exception should be considered due to the special circumstances.

3.6. One is Blackett Street on the south side between Stephens Street and Church Street. The rest of Blackett Street has a footpath on both sides and there is a children’s playground in the section. This section of Blackett Street is classified a Local Road; however, the road functions more as a Collector Road. Blackett Street east of King Street is a Strategic Road. Another factor is Blackett Street is close to the town centre and so is likely to get more pedestrians. So on that basis it is recommended a new footpath is constructed to ensure there are footpaths on both sides of Blackett Street for its full length.

3.7. The other submission was for a footpath in Sandown Boulevard just west of Huntington Avenue outside the childcare centre. A path was only required on one side of the road and therefore it is recommended that the construction of a path outside of the Preschool is undertaken to ensure safe pedestrian access is available.

3.8. A submission was also received requesting a new footpath be constructed on the west side of Main North Road at the north end of Woodend to connect to the church. It also suggested coordination should happen with Ravenswood to ensure the footpaths are coordinated in a timely manner.

3.9. This part of Main North Road was not previously included in the new footpaths programme because it was outside of the 50km/h speed limit area and so not ‘urban’. NZTA have subsequently shifted the 50km/h speed limit further north so this area is now urban and has no footpaths. The footpath has been included and prioritised; however, it does not score highly for two reasons. Firstly, the only destination at this stage is the church and that means it would get limited use during most of the week. Also it is uncertain how many church goers would actually use the path. Secondly, the cost to construct a path would be high due to the location of the deep drain alongside the road.

3.10. When Ravenswood is developed and there is a road connection from the commercial area to Main North Road there is likely to be greater pedestrian demand along this section of Main North Road. It is therefore recommended that further investigation work be carried out to determine the best time to construct this path and to coordinate it with proposed NZTA the Ravenswood development with the view of including the path in the 2021-31 LTP. This should also be considered in relation to NZTA work proposed on SH1 in and around Woodend.
3.11. As previously reported a prioritisation method to rank the footpaths in the new footpaths programme in order of providing the greatest benefit has been developed and is described below.

3.12. The following factors have been taken into account.
   - Pedestrian Use: Based on the amount of residential housing and the different types of amenities within the area.
   - Environment: Based on how close pedestrians must walk to traffic and how fast/frequent the traffic flow is.
   - Connectivity: Based on whether the footpath is continuous and how important this is for pedestrians.
   - Affordability:
     - ≤ $15,000 High Score
     - $15,000 - $50,000 Medium Score
     - ≥ $50,000 Low Score
   - Community Views: Strong community feedback High Score
     - Some community feedback Medium Score
     - No specific community feedback Low Score
   - Scoring: High score = 3
     - Medium score = 2
     - Low score = 1

3.13. While the ranking process is used to help inform the decision as to which footpaths should be constructed and what priority they should be given, it is only a guide to decision making and other factors may be taken into consideration.

3.14. Although the number of footpaths in a road is not specifically shown as a criteria when deciding whether to construct a new footpath, the consideration of roads with no footpath is included in the environment and connectivity attributes. Roads with no footpath will tend to rank more highly in environment and connectivity.

3.15. Based on the ranking and on the cost estimates for each footpath the following programme is recommended for the next three years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
<th>2020/21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Street (No. 136 to 152) – eastside to complete section started in 2017/18</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandown Boulevard (Huntingdon Dr to Preschool entrance)</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackett Street (Stephens St to Church St)</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harewood Rd (Burnt Hill Rd to Main Street) **</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnt Hill Road (Harewood Rd to Main Street) **</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinnerys Road (Welsford St to west entrance to Reserve) – east side</td>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weka Street (Park Ave to end)</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
South Belt (Newnham St – Railway) – north side  Rangiora  $25,000
South Belt (No. 5 to Raymond Orr Meadows) – south side  Rangiora  $10,000
Chinnerys Road (Reserve east entrance to Woodglen Dr) – west side  Woodend  $50,000
Ranfurly Street (Dale St to Cridland St) – east side  Kaiapoi  $50,000
Totara Drive - east side  Oxford
Coronation Street (Buckleys Rd to end) – north side  Rangiora
Ballarat Road (existing path to Hassall Street) – east side  Rangiora
Tui Street (Park Tce – Rata St) – north side  Oxford
Woodfield Place (start to end)  Woodend
To be allocated  $5,000
Total  $100,000  $100,000  $100,000

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. The new footpaths programme started in 2015 and the first three years have been completed. All possible new footpaths have been assessed and prioritised. This prioritisation has not changed except for the addition of Main North Road as noted above. The highest ranking projects have been included in the proposed programme for the next three years.

4.2. Options are for the Utilities & Roading Committee to accept the prioritisation or it could request staff to consult more widely and reprioritise the programme. This option is not recommended as there were no submissions to the LTP requesting new footpaths that are not in the programme so it can be assumed the programme is generally accepted. There was one general submission relating to footpaths in Oxford and requesting those streets without footpaths get footpaths. The programme includes a number of streets in Oxford so this submission is satisfied.

4.3. For the two submissions requesting new footpaths in Blackett Street and Sandown Boulevard, these have been added into the footpath programme with funding from the existing new footpath budget. This will have the effect of pushing other projects further out in the programme.

4.4. It is noted that NZTA have indicated an intention to subsidise Footpath Renewals and Maintenance this year. While the exact details are still to be confirmed it is likely that this will result in a FAR (financial assistance rate) of 51% for Council.

4.5. The current budget for Footpath Renewals is $683,000 and Footpath Maintenance is $135,885 (total of $818,885). Should the 51% subsidy be approved then there would be $400,000 of additional budget available which could be used (in whole or part) to accelerate the New Footpath Programme.

4.6. It is recommended that $80,000 of this be used to construct new footpaths in both Harewood Road (Burnt Hill Rd to Main Street) and Burnt Hill Road (Harewood Rd to Main Street) and that this re-allocation of budget be taken to Council for approval, subject to NZTA confirmation of the subsidy being granted.
4.7. For the submission relating to Main North Road in Woodend the options are to include it in the new footpaths programme and prioritise it against other footpaths otherwise separate funding of the path as a special case would need to be considered. This is not recommended because the demand for such a footpath is unlikely to be high at this stage and further work is required to consider the connections to Ravenswood. This further work should occur before a decision is made on the timing of the construction of the path and should take into account NZTA plans for Safety Improvements in Woodend Town Centre as well as work north and south of Woodend.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.2. Not applicable

5.3. **Wider Community**

5.4. Feedback was sought from the Community Boards on the prioritisation process and the projects back in 2015. The Boards generally supported the process at that time.

5.5. No specific consultation has been undertaken on the proposed new footpaths programme however, feedback from LTP submissions has been considered as noted above.

5.6. Residents in the streets programmed for new footpaths will be notified in advance of the work being carried out to give them an opportunity to comment on the proposed work.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.2. There was $100,000 per year for eight years in the 2015/25 LTP for new footpaths. The first three years have been completed and there is now $100,000 per year for the next five years included in the 2018-28 LTP.

6.3. It is noted that there are a number of high cost footpaths in the priority list that won’t be able to be funded from the current budget allocation. Council will need to decide when considering the final two years of the programme in 2021 whether it wishes to fund these high cost and lower ranked footpaths

6.4. These high cost footpaths are:

- Queen Street, Oxford - $205,000. Note, has a footpath marked on the road with 30km/h speed limit so separate footpath may not be needed.
- Old North Road, Kaiapoi - $895,000.
- High Street (Victoria to Weld), Oxford - $240,000.
- South Belt (Country Ln to Park Bdy), Rangiora - $170,000.
- Chinnerys Road (west reserve entrance to east reserve entrance) - $85,000
- West Belt (River Rd to Kensington Ave) west side - $60,000. There is a footpath on the east side of the road with lower density housing on the west side.
- Main North Road (Chinnerys Rd to the Church), Woodend - $250,000.
6.5. The recommended new footpath in Blackett Street is estimated to cost $55,000 and the recommended new footpath in Sandown Boulevard is estimated to cost $6,000.

6.6. These new footpaths do not meet NZTA requirements for subsidy. It is noted that footpath maintenance will be subsidised by NZTA from 2018/19 onwards but this does not include new footpaths. However, some new footpaths may qualify for NZTA subsidy where there is high demand and/or it is to address a road safety issue. The footpaths in this programme are unlikely to qualify for funding.

6.7. **Community Implications**

6.8. Not applicable

6.9. **Risk Management**

6.10. Normal construction risks will apply.

6.11. **Health and Safety**

6.12. As per standard tendering process of any physical works, the contractor will be assessed for Health & Safety and required to provide a Site Specific Health & Safety Plan for approval prior to work commencing on site.

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**

The Land Transport Management Act and Local Government Act are relevant in this matter.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

This report consider the following outcomes:

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

**Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable and sustainable**
- The standard of our District’s roads is keeping pace with increasing traffic numbers.
- Communities in our District are well linked with each other and Christchurch is readily accessible by a range of transport modes.

7.4. **Delegations**

The Utilities & Roading Committee has the authority to approve work programmes for works that the Council has budgeted a general level of expenditure for.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR INFORMATION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: RDG-32-50 / 181002114346
REPORT TO: Council
DATE OF MEETING: 6 November 2018
FROM: Dan Lewis – UCP Project Manager
Joanne McBride – Roading & Transport Manager
SUBJECT: Urban Cycleways Project Completion Report

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report provides an update of the final costs of the Urban Cycleway projects. This report should be read in conjunction with reports on Roading Contributions (Doc. 181025124661) and New Footpaths (Doc. 181024124660).

1.2 The Urban Cycleway Projects include two paths:
   - Rangiora to Kaiapoi along Lineside Road known as the Passchendaele Cycleway (8km in length)
   - Rangiora to Woodend along Rangiora Woodend Road (4km in length)

1.3 The Passchendaele Cycleway was officially opened to the public on 3 March 2018 and the Rangiora to Woodend Cycleway opened on 23 June 2018.

1.4 The approved budget for the two projects was $2.5 million for both cycleways (combined) and the actual final cost was $2.804 million, being a total overspend of $324,000. The final cost has exceeded the Council approved contribution of $1,038,000 by $83,734 which equates to an 8% overspend.

1.5 NZTA have confirmed a FAR (financial assistance rate) of 51% will be available to Council for Footpath Maintenance & Renewals for the first time in 2018/19, therefore there is $417,631 of additional budget available each year, over the three year funding period.

1.6 It is proposed to reallocate $83,734 of this surplus budget to cover the budget shortfall.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 181002114346;
(b) Approves the reallocation of $83,734 from Footpath Renewals and Maintenance budget to the Cycleway budget (PJ 100749.000.5135).
(c) Notes that the total cost of the project is $2.824 million against the approved budget of $2.5 million.
(d) **Notes** that a further claim has been submitted to NZTA for funding of $77,056 (NZTA share) under the NLTF.

(e) **Circulates** this report to Utilities & Roading Committee and Audit & Risk Committee for information.

### 3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The Passchendaele Cycleway and Rangiora to Woodend Cycleway were included in the Government's Urban Cycleways Programme.

3.2 The paths provide cycle linkages between Rangiora and Kaiapoi and Rangiora and Woodend. This supplements the existing road link between the towns, and provides a safe and viable choice of transport modes other than private motor vehicles. They are consistent with national, regional, and district strategies.

3.3 The cycleways are 2.5m wide with an asphalt surface to provide a high level of service.

3.4 The funding for the cycleway projects comes from the following sources.

- The national Urban Cycle Programme (UCP) through NZTA – 100% subsidy.
- The National Land Transport Fund (NLTF) through NZTA – 51% subsidy.
- The Council with 50% funded from development contributions and 50% from rates by loan.

3.5 The approved Council budget was $2.5 million. This was based on a net cost to Council of $1,038,000.

### 4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. The final cost of the two cycleways has exceeded the Council approved budget of $2.5 million by $324,000, and the Council contribution share of $1,038,000 by $83,734 which equates to an 8% overspend.

4.2. In March 2017, a report was presented to Council seeking approval to design and tender the construction of the two cycleways. The report recommended no adjustments be made to the budget at that time as actual tender rates were likely to be lower than the estimate.

4.3. In August 2017 a further report was presented seeking approval from the CEO to award tenders for the construction of the cycleways. The table below has approved vs actual costs shown.
### Project Tender Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Tender Cost Approved $$</th>
<th>Actual $$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora to Kaiapoi Cycleway cost estimate</td>
<td>$1,601,597</td>
<td>$1,747,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora to Woodend Cycleway cost estimate</td>
<td>$1,051,952</td>
<td>$1,056,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Cost Estimate</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,653,549</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,804,206</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Improvements</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZTA Revenue (UCF)</td>
<td>$520,000</td>
<td>$520,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZTA Revenue (NLTF)</td>
<td>$1,077,910</td>
<td>$1,605,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further Claim Submitted to NZTA (NLTF)</td>
<td></td>
<td>77,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Cost to Council</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,035,639</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,121,734</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,824,482</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.4. During construction, additional costs were incurred that had not been allowed for in the previous project estimates. These items are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Costs</th>
<th>Cost Increase $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Error in the tender schedule</strong></td>
<td>$77,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A quantity error in the contract schedule was found.  The result was additional length of path and fence were constructed which had not been allowed for in the original estimate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KiwiRail related works (change in scope)</strong></td>
<td>$64,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KiwiRail were consulted during the design of the cycleway and a KiwiRail engineer approved the location and design of the path. However, during construction other KiwiRail staff became involved in the project and withdrew support resulting in design adjustments being required to ensure delivery of the path could be achieved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECAN Works (change in scope)</strong></td>
<td>$12,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As the cycleway utilises existing river protection stop banks, Environment Canterbury approved the design subject to raising the level of their stop bank to protect the future of the path. The approval was not secured until after the tender was awarded which resulted in additional fill quantities being required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Delivery fees</strong></td>
<td>$14,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General expenses to project including professional fees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$168,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.5. The construction of both cycleways are complete and the projects are within the defects liability period. Each contractor has a number remedial repairs to undertake before the End of Defects period certificates can be issued.

#### 4.6. Following the safety audits, there are a small number of improvements to be made. This includes additional street lighting on Kippenberger Ave, permanent cycle counting sites,
improved signage, markings & safety barriers. These improvements will be managed from
within existing budgets and have an estimated cost of $50,000.

4.7. At the time of tendering, all efforts were made to account for foreseeable risk within the
scheduled works. No contingency allowance beyond these items had been included within
the overall project estimates. In the future a project contingency should be added to better
allow for these project risks. This was not the case with this project.

4.8. It is also noted that the budget monitoring did not identify this overspend where it should
have. This has been cause in part by transition of staff and also due to project management
deficiencies. These issues will be closely monitored going forward.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

5.2. Overall these projects have been well received by the Community and well supported by
the Community Boards and Council. They benefit recreational and commuter cyclists as
well as recreational walkers by providing a high quality off road walkway / cycle links
between Rangiora and Kaiapoi, as well as Rangiora and Woodend.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.2. The funding for the cycleway projects comes from the following sources.
   - The National Urban Cycle Programme (UCP) through NZTA – 100% subsidy.
   - The National Land Transport Fund (NLTF) through NZTA – 51% subsidy.
   - The Council with 50% funded from development contributions and 50% from rates
     by loan.

6.3. The UCP funding was approved and fixed and based on the initial estimates. This funding
source is 100% subsidised.

6.4. The NLTF funding is a subsidy at 51% of the project cost less the UCP funding. NZTA
approved funding from the NLTF for both the Rangiora to Kaiapoi and Rangiora to
Woodend Cycleways.

6.5. The following table shows the project cost estimates and funding received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total cost</th>
<th>NZTA</th>
<th>WDC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Kaiapoi Cycleway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCF (100% Funding)</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLTP (51.3% Funding)</td>
<td>1,352,000</td>
<td>686,597</td>
<td>665,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total NZTA Budget</td>
<td>1,702,000</td>
<td>1,036,597</td>
<td>665,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure to date</td>
<td>1,747,598</td>
<td>1,059,989</td>
<td>687,609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.6. There is a further claim which has been submitted to NZTA for funding of $77,056 (NZTA share) under the NLTF.

6.7. It is proposed to cover the funding shortfall with surplus budget from the Footpath Renewals and Maintenance budgets. This budget is to be subsidised by NZTA for the first time in 2018/19 and as such has $417,631 of additional budget which can be reallocated.

6.8. The current budget for Footpath Renewals is $683,000 and Footpath Maintenance is $135,885 (total of $818,885). The 51% subsidy has resulted in $417,631 of additional budget being available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Category</th>
<th>Approved Budget $</th>
<th>NZTA 51% Subsidy $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Footpath Renewals</td>
<td>683,000</td>
<td>348,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpath Maintenance</td>
<td>135,885</td>
<td>69,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$818,885</strong></td>
<td><strong>$417,631</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget to be reallocated to new footpaths (As per report 181024124660)</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget to be reallocated to Cycleways (As detailed in this report)</td>
<td>$83,734</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget to be reallocated to Roading Financial Contributions (As report 181025124661)</td>
<td>$228,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REALLOCATED</strong></td>
<td><strong>$391,734</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.9. Reallocation of budget to New Footpaths and Roading Financial Contributions budgets are covered in separate reports in the meeting agenda as noted.

6.10. **Community Implications**

6.11. There is no negative implications on the Community associated with this project.

6.12. **Risk Management**

6.13. There is a risk NZTA may not approve the final claim for further funding. We consider this to be a low risk.

6.14. **Health and Safety**

6.15. 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**

The Land Transport Management Act and Local Government Act are relevant in this matter.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

This report consider the following outcomes:

*There is a safe environment for all*

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

*Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable and sustainable*

- The standard of our District’s roads is keeping pace with increasing traffic numbers.
- Communities in our District are well linked with each other and Christchurch is readily accessible by a range of transport modes.

7.4. **Delegations**

Council has the authority to reallocate budgets
1. SUMMARY

1.1. This report is to update Council on the Roading Financial Contribution Budget and to reallocate budget which is no longer required for Footpath Renewals and Maintenance budget. This report should be read in conjunction with reports on New Footpaths (Doc. 181024124660) and Urban Cycleways Projects (Doc. 181002114346)

1.2. A report was taken to Utilities and Roading Committee in August 2018 seeking approval of Seal Extensions and noting various developments where a Council contribution of funding would be required this financial year.

1.3. As developments progress through the year and further information becomes available, the funding contribution required by Council is confirmed and the table of contributions is updated.

1.4. Subsequent to the report being presented in August, the costs for urbanising Chinnerys Road as part of Ravenswood Development has been submitted to Council. The Council share of the cost to upgrade the road frontage including a share of the kerb & channel, footpath and stormwater reticulation has been confirmed as $298,507.93 excluding GST.

1.5. There are a number of other seal extensions and development commitments which will be carried out through the year and which Council will be required to fund.

1.6. A request has also been received to seal a section of Duffs Road under the Private 50% Cost Share Sealing Policy. Council share of the sealing is estimated at $8,000. It is recommended that Council supports the request for sealing of a 100m section of Duffs Road and grants an exemption to the 1km length policy and provides funding for the Councils 50% share to allow the sealing to go ahead, if the property owner come up with the 50% share.

1.7. NZTA have confirmed a FAR (financial assistance rate) of 51% will be available for Footpath Maintenance to Council for the first time in the 2018/19 year, and for the three year period. Therefore there is $417,631 of additional budget available each year over the three years. It is proposed to reallocate a portion of this budget to new footpaths (Doc. 181024124660) and to the Cycleways projects (Doc. 181002114346).

1.8. It is recommended that the $228,000 from Footpath Renewals and Maintenance budgets be reallocated to the Council Performed Works Budget to cover the predicted shortfall in this area.
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 181025124661;

(b) **Approves** the reallocation of $228,000 from the Footpath Renewals and Maintenance budgets to the Council Performed Works budget (PJ 100361.000.5133);

(c) **Supports** the Duffs Road property owner funding 50% of the cost of sealing a 100m section of the roads by agreeing to approve an exemption to the 50% cost share policy of 1km/year if they come up with their share of the funding;

(d) **Notes** the Council’s share of urbanising Chinnerys Road is $298,507.93 which will be paid to the Developer;

(e) **Notes** that further reports will be brought before Council as and when there is more certainty around future projects and costs;

(f) **Notes** that support has previously been given to Browns Road and North Eyre Road property owners north of the Eyre River, as well as Broad Road/Rangiora Leithfield Road property owners should they come up with a 50% cost share for sealing outside of their properties;

(g) **Circulates** this report to Utilities & Roading Committee for information.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1. The Roading Subdivision Contribution Budget is the funding source for financial contribution driven seal extensions and for 50% cost share seal extensions. It also funds other cost share projects where existing roads need to be upgraded in response to development, such as the urbanisation referred to above. The funding covers the cost of the benefit to existing ratepayers resulting from the work.

3.2. As this work is driven by developers it is difficult to budget accurately and in the past funding has regularly been carried forward at year end due to expected work not being completed.

3.3. Council normally doesn’t have control over when this work is carried out. The exception is Council managed projects and that is normally where financial contributions have been taken and Council completes the work, such as seal extensions.

3.4. A request has been received from a property owner in Duffs Road to seal a 100m section of the road. The sealing has been priced and the property owner has verbally agreed to the sealing.

3.5. In the 2018/19 year there is unallocated budget totalling $629,000. Likely commitments are as follows:

- Ravenswood contribution to the footpath / cycleway on the spine road. This will definitely occur in 2019/20 – Value to be confirmed however estimate $100,000;
- Ravenswood contribution for urbanisation of Chinnerys Road – $298,507.93. This has been invoiced by the developer;
- Ravenswood contribution for urbanisation of Rangiora Woodend Road – Value to be confirmed however estimate $300,000 and probably unlikely until 2019/20;
4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The issues to be considered are as follows:

4.2. The Roading Financial Contribution Budget is an allocation each year and as a high proportion of the work depends on developers and their timing often budget needs to be carried over at year end.

4.3. Current estimates indicate that the current budget will not be sufficient to cover the commitments for this financial year. Options are to only budget for the confirmed projects with a contingency to cover unknowns, or to budget an annual allocation each year based on knowledge and experience and accept that in some years the budget will be too high and in others it may be too low.

4.4. The approach taken previously has been to be conservative and only budget for confirmed projects, accepting that in some situations funding may have to be brought forward. This option avoids unnecessary carry overs at year end. It may result in funding having to be brought forward if projects advance more quickly or developments happen and the Council has to respond with a contribution. This will result in more staff time having to write more reports.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.2. No specific consultation has been undertaken on this however the view of the community has been monitored through Service requests and LTP submissions.

5.3. **Wider Community**

5.4. As above.
6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.2. The following table outlines the projects that will more than likely be completed in 2018/19 and 2019/20:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TIMELINES</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST $$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>2019/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation of Chinnerys Road</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cones Street Kerb &amp; Channel and footpath</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready Mix sealing of Browns Road</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehmans Road Swale Upgrade</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browns Road / North Eyre Road Sealing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Road/Rangiora Leithfield Road Sealing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duffs Road Sealing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimate for 2018/19</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenswood Shared Footpath / Cycleway</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation of Rangiora Woodend Road</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation of Parsonage Road</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecost Road Upgrade in conjunction with new school</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimate for 2019/20</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3. The current Financial Contribution budget is $629,000 and therefore the shortfall is $228,000.

6.4. It is proposed to cover the funding shortfall with surplus budget from the Footpath Renewals and Maintenance budgets. This budget is to be subsidised by NZTA for the first time in 2018/19 and as such has $417,631 of additional budget which can be reallocated.

6.5. The current budget for Footpath Renewals is $683,000 and Footpath Maintenance is $135,885 (total of $818,885). The 51% subsidy has resulted in $417,631 of additional budget being available.
### Budget Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Category</th>
<th>Approved Budget $</th>
<th>NZTA 51% Subsidy $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Footpath Renewals</td>
<td>683,000</td>
<td>348,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpath Maintenance</td>
<td>135,885</td>
<td>69,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$818,885</strong></td>
<td><strong>$417,631</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget to be reallocated to new footpaths (As per report 181024124660)</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget to be reallocated to Cycleways (As per report 181002114346)</td>
<td>$83,734</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget to be reallocated to Roading Financial Contributions (As detailed on this report)</td>
<td>$228,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REALLOCATED</strong></td>
<td><strong>$391,734</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Budget not reallocated</td>
<td>$25,897</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.6. Reallocation of budget to new footpaths and Cycleways budgets are covered in separate reports in the meeting agenda as noted.

**Community Implications**

6.7. The construction phase of the proposed projects have the potential to cause disruption to traffic. Staff will work with the Communications Team and ensure notification is carried out.

6.8. **Risk Management**

6.9. Normal construction risks will apply.

6.10. **Health and Safety**

6.11. As part of a construction contract the contractor will be required to submit a Site Specific Health & Safety Plan for approval, prior to work commencing on site.

### CONTEXT

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

The Land Transport Management Act is the relevant legislation in this matter.
7.3. **Community Outcomes**

This report considers the following outcomes:

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

**Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable and sustainable**
- The standard of our District’s roads is keeping pace with increasing traffic numbers.
- Communities in our District are well linked with each other and Christchurch is readily accessible by a range of transport modes.

7.4. **Delegations**

Council has the authority to re-allocate budgets.
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. This report is to update the Council on the sealing of unsealed roads and the issues associated as well as an update on the Roading Financial Contribution Budget.

1.2. The current Council policy for sealing unsealed roads is that they will be sealed in the following circumstances:
   - When the road meets NZTA criteria for sealing and is approved for subsidy
   - When financial contributions are at least 30% of the cost of the sealing
   - When property owners agree to contribute 50% of the cost of sealing. This has a limit of 1km per year.

1.3. There are no roads that currently meet NZTA criteria for sealing and it is unlikely any will in the foreseeable future.

1.4. Recent changes to the Resource Management Act have removed all financial contribution provisions and this will apply from 18 April 2022.

1.5. There are two roads with financial contributions that are reaching the 30% trigger. None of these have had property owner feedback or pressure to seal the roads at this stage. Feedback has been received from Riverside Road where the contributions are about 18% of the cost of sealing. Anecdotally the property owners may have been advised by Real Estate agents that the Council would be sealing the road.

1.6. Over the past 10 years most seal extensions have been driven by financial contributions and to a lesser degree from the 50% cost share. Both of these cases are funded from the Roading Financial Contribution Budget.

1.7. In the last year or two there has been an increase in the amount of sealing under the 50% cost share option. In the year (2017/18) the policy limit of 1km was met. There are currently requests for a number of reasonably large seal extensions under this option. These total approximately 5km with estimated Council share of $500k and if all or some were to go ahead then exemptions to the policy would need to be granted.
1.8. It is noted that while there are regular requests for sealing over the summer period when dust is a nuisance, most of these requests are isolated one off inquiries. Cases where a more widespread problem exits have been dealt with by working with the property owners to come up with a solution that fits within the current policy. Recent examples are Thongcaster Road/Browns Rock Road and Barkers Road. In those cases the Council paid 70% of the cost of sealing and that totalled close to $1m.

1.9. The only current unresolved widespread problem is Browns Road between North Eyre Road and the Eyre River. The property owners approached the Board last year looking to get the road sealed, due to dust from trucks involved in gravel extraction activities. Staff have been working with the Browns Road property owners and they seem resolved to the fact that if the road is to be sealed then they will have to contribute 50%. There are no financial contributions available.

1.10. The other requests for 50% cost share sealing are on Browns Road south of South Eyre Road and in Broad Rd/Rangiora Leithfield Road.

1.11. It is recommended that Utilities & Roading Committee supports the requests noted above and grants an exemption to the 1km length policy and provides funding for the Councils 50% share to allow the sealing to go ahead, if the property owners come up with the 50% share.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Utilities & Roading Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180511051675;

(b) **Approves** the price of $347,897.62 (Council share $174,000) from Ready Mix to seal sections of Browns Road south of South Eyre Road as detailed in the report;

(c) **Approves** an exemption to the 50% cost share policy of 1km/year to enable Ready Mix to seal the sections of Browns Road in the 2018/19 year;

(d) **Supports** the Brown Road and North Eyre Road property owners north of the Eyre River as detailed in the report to fund 50% of the cost of sealing the roads by agreeing to approve an exemption to the 50% cost share policy of 1km/year if they come up with their share of the funding and agrees to support in principle the option of a targeted rate to help them pay;

(e) **Supports** the Broad Road/Rangiora Leithfield Road property owners as detailed in this report to fund 50% of the cost of sealing the roads by agreeing to approve an exemption to the 50% cost share policy of 1km/year if they come up with their share of the funding;

(f) **Notes** that there is sufficient funding in the Roading Subdivision Share Budget over the next two years to fund the Council share of the sealing noted above;

(g) **Notes** that financial contributions will not be able to be taken after 18 April 2022;

(h) **Agrees** to only take financial contributions if they are likely to be used within 2 or 3 years until 2022 and work to develop alternative methods of mitigating effects from development to financial contributions;

(i) **Notes** that the Roading Subdivision Budget as detailed in the LTP will remain unchanged due to the likely commitments for 2018/19 being close to the $629,000 budgeted amount.

(j) **Circulates** this report to Council and the Boards.
3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1. Over the past 10 years a significant number of unsealed roads have been sealed. Ten years ago the length of unsealed road recorded in the Valuation was 647km. The current length is 575km. A reduction of 72km.

3.2. The traffic volume profile for the current unsealed roads is as follows:
- 0 – 50 vpd - 320km
- 51 – 100 vpd – 192km
- 101 – 150 vpd - 48km
- 151 – 200 vpd - 12.6km
- More than 201 vpd - 2.4km

3.3. The higher volume roads (greater than 150 vpd) are listed below:
- Browns Road (south of South Eyre Road) – 461 vpd
- Diversion Road (South Eyre Road to the end) – 362 vpd
- Waikoruru Road (Tuahiwi Rd – Camside Rd) – 229 vpd
- Bramleys Road (unsealed section) – 177 vpd
- Beatties Road (unsealed section) – 177 vpd
- Wolffs Road (for 2km south of South Eyre Road) – 176 vpd
- North Eyre Road (Browns Rd – 2km west of Browns Rd) – 175 vpd
- Two Chain Road (for 3km south of South Eyre Rd) – 172 vpd
- Carlton Road (Dixons Rd – to seal) – 169 vpd
- North Eyre Road (End of seal – Wolffs Rd) – 159 vpd
- Mill Road, Oxford (End of seal – Bush Rd) – 156 vpd
- Hicklands Road (unsealed section) – 154 vpd

3.4. Browns Road and Diversion Road are influenced by Ready Mix gravel extraction activities and Ready Mix help maintain both roads. For Browns Road they are required to seal sections of the road past houses under a recent Resource Consent to mitigate the effects of the trucks using the road. This is covered later in this report.

3.5. The above figures show the Council has a relatively low volume of unsealed road network and from a purely economic perspective the unsealed surface on these roads is the most appropriate and has the lowest whole of life cost compared to a sealed road carrying the same amount of traffic. However factors such as dust nuisance and the impact on peoples quality of life is not taken into account in the pure economic assessment.

3.6. It is noted that only about 3% of all travel in the district is on unsealed roads. It is not known what proportion of the population live on unsealed roads, however its will be low.

3.7. In response to issues with logging trucks in Northland, NZTA has come up with guidelines on when it might be appropriate to consider dust mitigation measures. This takes into account the number of vehicles and in particular heavy vehicles and the number and proximity of houses to the road. There are not any Waimakariri District roads which would currently meet the guideline trigger for dust mitigation.

3.8. A number of dust mitigation measures other than sealing have been trialled in the district such as ‘Otta’ seals and spray on dust suppressants. None of these have proven to be effective long term solutions. Sealing is considered the only proven long term solution to deal with dust nuisance. At around $200/m this is expensive, but it is permanent.

3.9. Current Council policy is that it will not fund dust mitigation measures except where the sealing of the road meets the Council policy for sealing. It will, however, work with property owners to provide advice and assistance where it can.
3.10. The current Council policy for sealing unsealed roads is that they will be sealed in the following circumstances:

- When the road meets NZTA criteria for sealing and is approved for subsidy.
- When financial contributions are at least 30% of the cost of the sealing
- When property owners agree to contribute 50% of the cost of sealing. This has a limit of 1km per year.

3.11. Over the past 10 to 12 years the following unsealed roads have been sealed. Also shown is their funding source. Please note this is not an exhaustive list and is based on the accuracy of the information available. There may be others that are not on this list.

- **Minor Improvements Programme.** (Note that urban seal extensions were funded under this programme. All urban unsealed roads are now sealed)
  - Spark Lane – 216m
  - Old North Road – 309m
  - Commercial Rd – 398m
  - Reid Memorial Ave – 290m
  - River Road - 1160m (Note that River Road was a one off approval from NZTA because it diverted trucks from West Belt, an urban street, and so there were safety benefits)

- **50% cost share policy**
  - Howsons Road – 300m
  - Bridge St – 400m
  - Burgesses Rd – 502m
  - Chapman Boundary Rd – 270m
  - Main Drain Road – 200m
  - Camside Rd – 260m
  - North Eyre Road (east of Earleys Road?)– 400m
  - North Eyre Rd (west of Poyntz Rd) – 200m
  - Waimakariri Gorge Rd – 300m
  - Quarry Rd – 400m

- **Financial Contributions (30% financial contributions, 70% Council funds)**
  - Recent projects:
    - Thongcaster Road (Depot Road to Browns Rock Road) – 4000m
    - Browns Rock Road (north of Thongcaster Road) – 1000m
    - Barkers Road (west of Swamp Road) – 2150m
    - North Eyre Road (East of McHughs Road) – 1800m
    - No 10 Road (section north of Tram Road) – 1100m
  - Older projects: Approx. 2006 to 2009 and prior to the GFC which resulted in a down turn in the 4ha market (some of this sealing was fully funded by the developer)
    - Barkers Rd (Loburn Whitrock Road to Swamp Road)
    - Boundary Road, Fernside (full length)
    - Parts of No 10 Rd, Pattersons Road, Wards Road and Dawsons Road.
    - Main Race Rd (east of Pesters road)

- **Council funded seal extensions in 2010/11** (Note that this was a one off approval with no NZTA subsidy made before the 2010 earthquake. Focus was on filling in gaps between sealed sections)
  - Moodys Road – 1000m
  - Pesters Road – 1000m
  - Kennedys Hill Rd – 876m
• **NZTA Subsidised seal extensions completed over the 2005/06/07 years** (Note that following this period NZTA funding for seal extensions became difficult to obtain due to changing priorities at a national level. No subsidised seal extensions have been approved in the past 10 years)

  - Pesters Rd (south of South Eyre Road)
  - Raddens Road (full length)
  - Station Rd (full length)
  - Loburn Terrace Rd (Station Road to Bradys Road)
  - Garrymere Rd (full length)

  3.12. In addition to the above a number of seal backs on unsealed roads from major sealed road intersections were completed.

  3.13. The Council often receives feedback or complaints about dust nuisance on unsealed roads. Most are in the summer months. Many of these are one off enquiries from single property owners on a road. It is explained to them that Council does not fund dust suppressant measures however they are informed of the 50% cost share option to seal the road. Most accept the explanation, while not necessarily agreeing with it, and we don’t hear from them again. Some show an interest in the 50% cost share option and request further information, such as cost. Some go ahead with the sealing.

  3.14. In a small number of cases a number of property owners from the same road approaches the Council or Community Board wanting some action to improve their road which normally indicates a wider spread problem. In these cases the Council works with the property owners to come up with a solution within the current policy. Recent examples are Thongcaster Road/Browns Rock Road and Barkers Road. Good outcomes were achieved in both cases. These roads had new subdivisions and the property owners knew the developers had paid contributions to seal the roads and so the expectation was the roads would be sealed. Also with many being new to rural living their expectations around road condition were high. Some of these expectations were justified as the subdivisions themselves generated more traffic and so the road condition deteriorate at a faster rate than other unsealed roads with no growth. However it cost the Council close to $1m for the 70% share to seal these roads.

  3.15. Browns Road between the Eyre River and North Eyre Road is another case where a group of property owners have approached the Community Board wanting some action and for the Council to seal the road. This issue came about because of increased truck movements on the road while gravel extraction activities were being carried out. While most of the trucks go to South Eyre Road the ones that go to North Eyre Road do generate a dust nuisance.

  3.16. It is noted that just south of the Eyre River on Browns Road the residents that live there have agreed to pay 50% of the cost of sealing past their property.

  3.17. Staff have been working with the residents on Browns Road between the Eyre River and North Eyre Road on options and have explained there are two approaches they could take to get the road sealed. They could use the 50% cost share policy or they could continue to ‘lobby’ the Council to seal the road. It appears from recent discussions with the residents that they are accepting of the fact that if they want the road sealed they are going to have to contribute to the cost. This view seems to be more widespread considering the number of enquiries about the 50% cost share policy and the number agreeing to pay.

  3.18. It is also noted that there were no submissions to the LTP requesting the sealing of unsealed roads either as a general submission or for a specific road. One submission requested a section of Carlton Road be upgraded due to its poor condition but did not mention sealing. This may or may not indicate a change in community views and the realisation sealing unsealed roads is expensive and probably not affordable considering the other pressures on Council funding.
3.19. Inspections of unsealed roads show most are in good condition most of the time. It is only extremes in weather that causes problems to road condition. Service request numbers and issues raised in them are also monitored to get a ‘feel’ for how the unsealed roads are performing. Service request numbers are fairly consistent with increases when there are extremes in weather.

3.20. **Current requests for 50% Cost Share Sealing**

3.21. There are currently three requests for 50% cost share sealing. They are:

- **Browns Road (south of North Eyre Rd)**, as noted above, the length is 1270m at an estimated cost of $250,000. Council share would be $125,000. Included in this request is the sealing of **North Eyre Road (east and west of Browns Rd)** for 650m at an estimated cost of $130,000. Council share would be $65,000.

  The total Council share would be $190,000, as would the property owners share.

  This is a significant amount for the Council and for the property owners.

  At this stage a firm price is being prepared for the property owners to consider and staff will meet with the property owners shortly to gauge whether they will agree to pay. They have indicated they may need to request a targeted rate to make it affordable for everyone. This will require specific Council approval for a Special Consultative Procedure.

- **Browns Road (two sections of road adjacent to houses south of South Eyre Road)**. This has been requested by Ready Mix so they can comply with their Resource Consent conditions for the quarry they are operating on Browns Road. Total length is 1850m and the price submitted by Ready Mix is $347,897.62. This is $188/m and is considered a fair market rate. Council share would be $174,000.

  Ready Mix have confirmed that they will be going ahead with this sealing and are requesting Council give an exemption to the policy to allow the sealing to take place this year.

  They also intend to carry out the work themselves and invoice the Council for the 50% share.

  It is noted that staff agreed in principal to this approach when discussing the Resource Consent conditions with Ready Mix but made it clear it was subject to Council approval.

- **Broad Road (north of Rangiora Leithfield Road) and Rangiora Leithfield Road (east of Broad Road)**. Total length is 1410m and the estimated cost is $282,000. Council share would be $141,000.

  The property owner's representative has requested a firm price and this is being prepared at the present time. They appear to be confident they can fund their share.

3.22. If all three go ahead then the Council cost would be in the order of $500,000 and the total length would be approximately 5km.

3.23. It is noted that all these roads carry quite low traffic volumes, except for the Brown Road section Ready Mix are proposing to seal. Most of this traffic is related to the quarry operation and dairying.

3.24. The option of sealing Marsh Road and Waikoruru Road as an alternative route to Southbrook had been previously raised. This option has been reviewed however is not considered appropriate as this would increase traffic in this area and pressure on the Llineside Road / Railway Road and Southbrook Road / Torlesse Street intersections. Additional to this, Boys Road which runs parallel to Marsh Road is sealed along the full length and considered a more appropriate route.
3.25. **Financial contributions**

3.26. Changes to the RMA in 2017 has removed financial contribution provisions and from 18 April 2022 Councils will no longer be able to require financial contributions as conditions of resource consents.

3.27. This means any mitigation due to adverse effects will need to be identified and carried out at the time of subdivision. This will result in only large developments on unsealed roads being required to carry out sealing. A number of small subdivisions over time may mean one of them might trigger sealing and that will most likely result in the Council having to make a contribution to cover the benefit to the existing ratepayers. This is similar to what happens now in urban areas where the Council normally pays half the cost of ‘urbanising’ existing roads adjacent to new developments.

3.28. It is unclear what will happen to financial contributions already held by Council at that time. They will need to be assessed to determine if they will actually be used and if not then they will need to be paid back to the developer.

3.29. There are two roads with contributions close to the 30% trigger. They are Swamp Road in Loburn north of Barkers Road and Campions Road. To date there have been no enquiries from the property owners requesting sealing. They are both relatively low volume roads.

3.30. The current policy trigger of 30% is quite low and quite generous. It is also not consistent with the 50% private seal extension policy where there are no financial contributions. As noted above this has resulted in a significant cost to the Council, which in reality only benefits a small number of ratepayers.

3.31. **Roading Subdivision Contribution Budget.**

3.32. The Roading Subdivision Contribution Budget is the funding source for financial contribution driven seal extensions and for 50% cost share seal extensions. It also funds other cost share projects where existing roads need to be upgraded in response to development, such as the urbanisation referred to in clause 3.26 above. The funding covers the cost of the benefit to existing ratepayers resulting from the work.

3.33. As this work is driven by developers it is difficult to budget accurately and in the past funding has regularly been carried forward at year end due to expected work not being completed. Council normally doesn’t have control over when this work is carried out. The exception is Council managed projects and that is normally where financial contributions have been taken and Council completes the work, such as seal extensions.

3.34. In the 2018/19 year there is unallocated budget totalling $629,000. Likely commitments are as follows:

- Ravenswood contribution to the footpath/cycleway on the spine road. This will definitely occur in 2019/20 - $100,000
- Ravenswood contribution for urbanisation of Chinnerys Road – Value to be confirmed. Will be invoiced in 2018/19.
- Ravenswood contribution for urbanisation of Rangiora Woodend Road – Value to be determined and probably unlikely until 2019/20.
- Cone Street Kerb & Channel and Footpath - Council share $30,000 and will occur in 2018/19.
- Urbanisation of Parsonage Road in conjunction with the development - Value to be confirmed however this work is currently being tendered so we are confident that this work will proceed in 2018/19.
- Ready Mix sealing of Browns Road as detailed above. This will definitely occur in 2018/19 - $174,000
• Broad Road/Rangiora Leithfield Road sealing as detailed above. Could possibly happen in 2018/19 - $141,000
• Browns Road/North Eyre Road sealing as detailed above. Unlikely to happen in 2018/19 - $190,000

The projects that will more than likely be completed in 2018/19 are:
• Ravenswood footpath/cycleway - $100,000
• Urbanisation of Chinnerys Road – say $50,000
• Cones Street Kerb and channel and footpath - $30,000
• Urbanisation of Parsonage Road – say $100,000
• Ready Mix sealing of Browns Road - $174,000
• Broad Road/Rangiora Leithfield Road sealing – 141,000
Total = $595,000.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. The issues to be considered are as follows:
• 50% cost share policy exemptions to allow the possible sealing of the three projects detailed in clause 3.20 above that exceed the policy requirement of 1km per year.
• The Roading Financial Contribution Budget.
• The stopping of financial contributions in 2022

4.2. Each of these issues are considered below with options and a recommended approach.

4.3. 50% cost share changes to allow possible sealing of the three projects detailed in clause 3.20 above.

4.4. Browns Road (two sections of road adjacent to houses south of South Eyre Road).

Of the three projects only one is confirmed to happen at this stage. That is the Browns Road project south of South Eyre Road where Ready Mix are required under the Resource Consent to seal two sections of the road in front of houses and totalling 1.85km. This exceeds the policy limit of 1km/year and so requires Council approval to grant an exemption to the policy to allow the sealing to take place. Ready Mix need to seal the full 1.85km length in the 2018/19 year in order to comply with the consent conditions so they can start operations. They have submitted a price to Council for approval and they propose to carry out the work themselves without competitively tendering the work.

It is also noted that the consent does not specifically require the Council to contribute to the cost however staff have agreed in principle to use the 50% cost share policy to recognise the fact the existing ratepayers on Browns Road will benefit from the sealing and so it is fair to contribute to the cost. This is consistent with previous practice.

4.5. Options are as follows:

Option 1 – Grant an exemption to the 50% cost share policy to allow the 1.85km to be sealed in the 2018/19 year and approve the price from Ready Mix for them to carry out the work.

This option is recommended on the basis that the sealing is necessary to mitigate a dust nuisance on existing houses on Browns Road and the full length of the sealing must be
carried out at the same time to meet the consent conditions. Also a Council contribution is justified because existing ratepayers on Browns Road will benefit from the sealing. Negotiating a price with Ready Mix avoids tendering costs and as the work is straightforward and low risk comparing the rates with fair market rates is straightforward and we can be confident Council is getting a reasonable deal. Also Ready Mix have a vested interest in getting the sealing done on time and to the correct quality as they will be the main users of the road. Also budget is available in existing budgets for the work as noted above.

Option 2 – Don’t grant an exemption to the 50% cost share policy and require Ready Mix to seal the 1.85km in two separate years so the policy requirement is met and require Ready Mix to get two more prices for the work, or to tender the work.

This option is not recommended on the basis it would unreasonably delay the Ready Mix operation and obtaining more prices is unlikely to result in a lower price and if another contractor did the work this would complicate the ongoing maintenance and quality responsibility. Also contract documentation, tendering and contract management costs would most likely outweigh any price differences.

4.6. Browns Road (south of North Eyre Rd) and North Eyre Road (east and west of Browns Rd)

4.7. Some property owners in Browns Road and North Eyre Road have been working together to get support to seal these roads. At this stage they are reasonably confident of getting full support however the cost per property is high at more than $10,000. As a comparison Thongcaster Road was $2,600 per property and Barkers Road around $1,500 per property so $10,000 will be a stretch for many. A firm price is currently being prepared for them to consider. They have mentioned the targeted rate option for payment and the feeling is it won’t go ahead without that option being available. That being the case it is highly unlikely the sealing would be able to be done in the 2018/19 year because of the time required to put in place a targeted rate. The length of road to be sealed is 1.92km so if done in one year the policy requirement of 1km/year would be exceeded so an exemption would be required.

4.8. Options are as follows:

Option 1 – Council to support the Browns Road and North Eyre Road property owners in their effort to get their road sealed by agreeing Council will support an exemption to the policy to allow the 1.92km to be sealed in one year and to support in principle a targeted rate, subject to the Special Consultative Procedure.

This option is recommended on the basis that the Browns Road and North Eyre Road property owners have and are putting in a lot of effort to gain support to get the road sealed. They need to be given credit for looking for a solution and not expecting the Council to fully fund the sealing, which was the expectation when they first approached the Community Board.

Option 2 – Don’t agree to grant an exemption to the 50% cost share policy and don’t give support in principle for a targeted rate.

This option is not recommended on the basis it would discourage the property owners continuing to find a solution themselves and it would most likely result in the property owners continuing to lobby the Council to seal the roads.

4.9. Broad Road (north of Rangiora Leithfield Road) and Rangiora Leithfield Road (east of Broad Road).

4.10. A property owner in Broad Road has been working with the Council to get these roads sealed and is working with the adjoining property owners to get their support. At this
stage he is reasonably confident of getting full support however the cost per property is high at around $10,000. As noted above and as a comparison Thongcaster Road was $2,600 per property and Barkers Road around $1,500 per property so $10,000 will be a stretch for many. A firm price is currently being prepared for them to consider. A targeted rate option for payment has not been mentioned in this case and it appears they are working on the basis of paying up front. If that is the case then they would be expecting the road to be sealed this summer and all in the 2018/19 year. The length of road to be sealed is 1.41km so if done in one year the policy requirement of 1km/year would be exceeded so an exemption would be required.

4.11. Options are as follows:

**Option 1** – Council to support the Broad Road/Rangiora Leithfield Road property owners in their effort to get their road sealed by agreeing Council will support an exemption to the policy to allow the 1.41km to be sealed in one year.

This option is recommended on the basis that the Broad Road/Rangiora Leithfield Road property owners have and are putting in a lot of effort to gain support to get the road sealed. They need to be given credit for looking for a solution and not expecting the Council to fully fund the sealing.

**Option 2** – Don’t agree to grant an exemption to the 50% cost share policy.

This option is not recommended on the basis it would discourage the property owners continuing to find a solution themselves and it would most likely result in the property owners lobbying the Council to seal the roads.

4.12. **The Roading Financial Contribution Budget.**

4.13. The Roading Financial Contribution Budget is an allocation each year and as a high proportion of the work depends on developers and their timing often budget needs to be carried over at year end. Options are to only budget for known and confirmed projects in the following year with a contingency to cover unknowns, or to budget an annual allocation each year based on knowledge and experience and accept that in some years the budget will be too high and in others it may be too low.

**Option 1** – Be conservative and only budget for known and confirmed projects in year 1 of the budget, accepting that in some years funding may have to be brought forward.

This option is recommended to avoid unnecessary carry overs at year end. It may result in funding having to be brought forward if projects advance more quickly or developments happen and the Council has to respond with a contribution. This will result in more staff time having to write more reports.

**Option 2** – Budget an annual allocation based knowledge and experience of what might happen in the year ahead.

This option is not recommended as it could result in a high level of carry over at year end.

4.14. **Roading Financial Contribution following changes to the RMA.**

4.15. The Council won’t be able to take financial contributions after 18 April 2022. Options are to keep taking them until then or to stop taking them now, unless we are confident they will be spent within a reasonable time, and look at how we deal with issues of development on unsealed roads.

**Option 1** – Stop taking financial contributions now, unless we are confident they will be spent within 2 or 3 years, and look at how we deal with issues of development on unsealed roads.
This option is recommended as many financial contributions the Council currently has will not be used so taking more will just add to that list. Other ways of dealing with the negative effects of development need to be investigated and that might mean looking at Development Contributions as an option for some circumstances.

**Option 2** - keep taking financial contributions until then April 2022.

This option is not recommended as many current financial contributions will not be used within the foreseeable future so taking more will just add to that list.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.2. No specific consultation has been undertaken on this however the view of the community has been monitored through Service requests and LTP submissions.

5.3. **Wider Community**

5.4. As above.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.2. See clause 3.33 above.

**Community Implications**

6.3. The construction phase of the proposed projects have the potential to cause disruption to traffic. Staff will work with the Communications Team and ensure notification is carried out.

6.4. **Risk Management**

6.5. Normal construction risks will apply.

6.6. **Health and Safety**

6.7. As part of a construction contract the contractor will be required to submit a Site Specific Health & Safety Plan for approval, prior to work commencing on site.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

The Land Transport Management Act is the relevant legislation in this matter.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**
This report consider the following outcomes:

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

**Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable and sustainable**
- The standard of our District’s roads is keeping pace with increasing traffic numbers.
- Communities in our District are well linked with each other and Christchurch is readily accessible by a range of transport modes.

7.4. **Delegations**
Utilities & Roading Committee has the authority to approve work programmes for works that the Council has budgeted a general level of expenditure for.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: RDG-32-25 / 181024124226

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 6 November 2018

FROM: Kathy Graham, Journey Planner / Road Safety Co-ordinator

SUBJECT: Request for three elected members to be appointed to a hearing panel to consider objections to a new bus shelter installation adjacent to 321 High Street, Rangiora.

SIGNED BY: (for Reports to Council, Committees or Boards)

Department Manager

Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to request Council appoint three elected members to a hearing panel to consider objections to the installation of a new bus shelter in High Street, Rangiora.

1.2. Council wish to erect a shelter outside 321 High Street, Rangiora where an existing bus stop is located. This stop is serviced by the only bus service between Christchurch and Rangiora, being the Blue Line service. Latest figures requested from ECAN show an average of 36 bus users per day (Mon-Fri) use this stop. This is one of the higher patronised stops in the district.

1.3. The property owner at 321 High Street, Rangiora has made a formal objection to the proposal.

The installation of bus shelters is governed by Section 339 of the Local Government Act 1974. Section 339 requires formal written notice to be delivered to the owner and occupier of properties where the bus shelter is proposed to give them the opportunity to formally object to the shelter. If they object their objection must be heard by Council before a decision can be made.

Attachments:

i. Copy of S339 Local Government Act 1974 (Doc 181024124184)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 181024124226:

(b) Appoints three (3) Councillors, Councillor John Meyer (Roading Portfolio), Councillor……………….. and Councillor……………….. to a hearing panel to consider the objection to the proposed installation of a new bus shelter at 321 High Street, Rangiora.

(c) Notes the hearing is proposed to be held in the first week of December 2018.
(d) Circulates this report to the Rangiora Ashley Community Board for information.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1. In late 2012 a process for installing a bus shelter in this location was started with a report being taken to the then Rangiora Community Board regarding the relocation of the bus stop to adjacent to 321 High Street due to the town hall closure and installing a bus shelter at this location.

3.2. In January 2013 Mindrum Holdings and the then tenant of 321 High Street, Matt Blair Motors, were given formal notice under S339 of the Local Government Act 1974 of the intention to erect a bus shelter at the same bus stop.

3.3. Both Mr H C Williams of Mindrum Holdings and Matt Blair, tenant, subsequently formally objected to erection of the bus shelter.

3.4. At that time no further action was taken in regard to installation of the bus shelter.

3.5. A further request to consider a shelter at the bus stop adjacent to 312 High Street, Rangiora was received by a member of the public via Environment Canterbury staff in May 2018. The existing bus stop currently only has a seat installed and provides no protection from weather conditions.

3.6. This stop is serviced by the only bus service between Christchurch and Rangiora, being the Blue Line. Boarding numbers requested from ECAN show an average of 36 bus users per day (Mon-Fri) use this stop. This is one of the district’s higher patronised bus stops, a factor that is considered when investigating bus shelter placement.

3.7. Timeline of correspondence related to this matter:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 Nov 2012</td>
<td>Report to Rangiora Community Board seeking support for bus shelter installation outside 321 High Street, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Jan 2013</td>
<td>Formal letter to Mindrum Holdings (HC Williams) and Matt Blair Motors, under S339 Local Government Act 1974 re bus shelter installation outside 321 High Street, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Jan 2013</td>
<td>Formal objection received by Council to bus shelter installation r from Matt Blair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Jan 2013</td>
<td>Formal objection received by Council to bus shelter installation from Mindrum Holdings (HC Williams)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Aug 2018</td>
<td>Formal letters to property owners at 321 High Street and two adjacent properties regarding proposal to install a bus shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Aug 2018</td>
<td>Formal objection received by Council to bus shelter installation from Mindrum Holdings (HC Williams)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. In August 2018 formal letters referencing S339 of the Local Government Act 1974 were sent to three property owners adjacent to the bus stop advising them Council was proposing to install a bus shelter at the existing bus stop. The three property owners contacted were:

- NZ Police – 309 High Street
- Mindrum Holdings – 312 High Street
- Hivic Properties No 2 Ltd – 333 High Street

4.2. A formal objection to the proposed bus shelter installation was subsequently received from Mr H C Williams, on behalf of Mindrum Holdings from 312 High Street, Rangiora.

4.3. Mr Williams has objected to the installation of the shelter and proposed the bus stop be moved further west to outside 355 High Street.

4.4. This location at 355 High Street has been assessed and is approximately 80-90metres west from the current stop. It is not considered suitable as it increases the distance from the central business area for bus users to access the bus. Alternative locations have been investigated for this bus stop to mitigate the objection to the shelter installation. As was the case in 2012 there are limitations on where the stop can be moved in the immediate area due to the surrounding road layout and existence of vehicle crossings. In addition it is desired to retain the stop as close as possible to the central business area of Rangiora.

4.5. Guidelines for bus stops advise the distance between urban bus stops should be close to significant passenger origin or destinations. The most efficient spacing between bus stops has some overlap between walking catchments. Spaces too close together will reduce the operating efficiency of the bus, increase bus travel times and cost more money to maintain. Stops too far apart will increase the walking distance to the bus stop, discourage passenger use and will make the service feel irrelevant. The ideal stop spacing is usually close to twice the distance passengers are willing to walk to the bus stop, i.e. if your pedestrian catchment is 400m, the ideal stop spacing along the route could be up to approximately 800m, depending on side street catchment configuration and overlap with other bus service catchment areas.

4.6. Staff recommend John Meyer the Roading Portfolio Holder be included on the hearing panel.

4.7. A proposed hearing date is in the first week of December 2018.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

The Draft Canterbury Regional Public Transport Plan, recently shared for public consultation, includes a priority of ‘more people using public transport’.

The 2018 Government Policy Statement on Transport’s strategic direction includes ‘supporting a mode shift for trips in urban areas from private vehicles to more efficient, low
cost modes like walking, cycling and public transport’.

Waimakariri District Council is a partner in Greater Christchurch initiatives around travel demand management (TDM) aimed at reducing reliance on vehicles for travel, particularly single occupant vehicles. TDM measures include improving public transport facilities such as infrastructure at bus stops.

5.2. Wider Community

Council receives regular requests for shelters to be installed at bus stops in the district. These are considered on a case by case basis, bus patronage numbers using that stop being one consideration.

The Council Walking & Cycling Strategy 2017-2022 priorities include:

- Promoting walking and cycling opportunities
- Integrating walking and cycling into public transport planning

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

All costs associated with installing the bus shelter can be met within existing budgets. The cost of purchase and install of a new bus shelter is approximately $16,000. There are no significant risks associated with installing this shelter.

6.2. Community Implications

The construction phase of the proposed projects have the potential to cause minor disruption to traffic. Staff will work with the Communications Team and ensure notification is carried out.

6.3. Risk Management

Normal construction risks will apply.

6.4. Health and Safety

As part of a construction contract the contractor will be required to submit a Site Specific Health & Safety Plan for approval, prior to work commencing on site.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

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

7.2. Legislation

Section 339 of the Local Government Act 1974 is the relevant legislation in this matter.

7.3. Community Outcomes

This report consider the following outcomes:

There is a safe environment for all

- Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised.
- Our district has the capacity and resilience to quickly recover from natural disasters and adapt to the effects of climate change.
- Crime, injury and harm from road crashes, gambling, and alcohol abuse are minimised.
Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable and sustainable

- The standard of our District’s roads is keeping pace with increasing traffic numbers.
- Communities in our District are well linked with each other and Christchurch is readily accessible by a range of transport modes.

7.4. Delegations

Council has the authority to re-allocate budgets.

The Rangiora Ashley Community Board has delegation to approve design and location of bus stops and shelters, however, do not have authority to hear objections through the hearing panel committee.

The Council has delegated authority to hear objections to proposed bus shelter installation through the hearing panel committee.

The Council, as the Road Controlling Authority, is required to convene a Hearings Panel to hear any objections on the shelter proposals under Section 339 of the Local Government Act 1974.

Kathy Graham
Journey Planner/Road Safety Co-ordinator
339 Transport shelters

(1) The council may erect on the footpath of any road a shelter for use by intending public-transport passengers or small passenger service vehicle passengers: provided that no such shelter may be erected so as to unreasonably prevent access to any land having a frontage to the road.

(2) The council shall give notice in writing of its proposal to erect any shelter under this section to the occupier and, if he is not also the owner, to the owner of any land the frontage of which is likely to be injuriously affected by the erection of the shelter, and shall not proceed with the erection of the shelter until after the expiration of the time for objecting against the proposal or, in the event of an objection, until after the objection has been determined.

(3) Within 14 days after the service of the notice, the occupier or owner, as the case may be, may object in writing to the council against the proposal.

(4) Where any person objects to the proposal in accordance with subsection (3), the council shall appoint a day for considering the objection and shall give notice to the objector of the time and place where the objection is to be heard. Any such time shall be not earlier than 7 days after the date on which the notice of objection was received at the office of the council.

(5) The council shall, at the time and place stated in the notice referred to in subsection (4), consider the objection, and after hearing any submissions made by or on behalf of the objector, may either dismiss the objection or decide not to proceed with the proposal or make such modifications to the proposal to which the objection relates as it thinks fit. The hearing of any such objection may be adjourned from time to time and from place to place.

(6) Where there are more objectors than 1, the council shall, as far as practicable, hear all objectors together and give each objector an opportunity of considering and being heard in respect of all other objections.

(7) No resolution under this section shall be passed until the council has considered all the objections of which notice has been given in accordance with this section.

(8) In this section the term road does not include an access way.

Compare: 1954 No 76 s 177A; 1956 No 64 s 199A; 1959 No 91 s 16; 1971 No 63 s 20

Section 339: inserted, on 1 April 1979, by section 2 of the Local Government Amendment Act 1978 (1978 No 43).

1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 This report seeks retrospective approval for a submission on the draft Regional Public Transport Plan that was lodged on 12 October 2018. The timing of the period for submission was such that a Council submission could not be confirmed in time but the Mayor and Deputy Mayor were engaged in the preparation of the submission.

**Attachments:**

i. WDC Submission on the Draft Canterbury Regional Public Transport Plan (181018122402)

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 181018122406.

(b) Approves the Submission attached to this report as the WDC Submission on the Draft Canterbury Regional Public Transport Plan

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 The Public Transport Joint Committee, established by the Greater Christchurch Councils in 2016, have been party to the development of a Draft Regional Public Transport Plan for the 2018-28 period. While this triennial update of the regional plan looks specifically at the next ten years, it also looks out strategically to the longer-term public transport (PT) needs of Greater Christchurch.

3.2 PT has experienced significant patronage loss post-quakes, but remains an important component of meeting the transport needs of residents and visitors; assist managing congestion and responding to new challenges such as minimising greenhouse gas emissions. For a number of reasons set out in the draft plan PT is at a turning point and in order for it to meaningfully contribute to the above objectives, a step change in investment, service levels and technologies is required.

3.3 This ambition aligns with what the Government recently signalled for rapid transit serving the nation’s three largest urban centres, as discussed in and around the release of its Policy Statement for transport. This comes at a time when transport generally is at the cusp of what promises to be significant disruptive change arising from technological and
service innovation. This added uncertainty makes long range strategic planning for PT both more challenging but also more necessary to determine the meaningful and affordable role the community seeks and is prepared to pay for.

3.4 Environment Canterbury PT planners briefed the 24 September All Boards meeting on Draft Plan proposals and Community Boards have prepared submissions, on the plan, in their own right.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The Draft Plan’s consideration of the PT needs and services in the District is brief. It indicates current high frequency routing to Kaiapoi, with lower frequency extensions to Rangiora and Woodend. In the future, a lower frequency rapid transit service might extend to Kaiapoi with continuation of lesser intensity services to Rangiora and Woodend. It foreshadows better intra-district services between Key Activity Centres connecting to commuter services within Christchurch.

4.2. The Plan notes that service reviews, to be undertaken in the first half of 2019, will provide opportunities for communities to participate more specifically in route and service planning. That said, it is appropriate to stand back at the overall district level and consider the draft plan’s proposals. The submission notes the importance of doing so in the context of the District Development Strategy’s identified growth distribution developed within the context of wider sub-regional growth management planning processes.

4.3. Given the scale of existing and prospective growth, the case for a more ambitious step into higher frequency services is made in the submission. Equally, a more significant investment in trialling and promoting demand responsive services, using new technology to assist patronage growth is recommended.

4.4. This responds to the needs of smaller and more dispersed communities and to the ‘aging in place’ characteristics of an overall growing, but aging population. To support that is an expressed desire for a closer working relationship in integrated land use and transport planning and a willingness expressed for WDC staff to collaborate in that regard.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

   No engagement with groups and organisations has been undertaken in preparing the submission. However, points made about enhanced and more flexible services reflect sentiments obtained through previous community consultation on transport related matters.

5.2. **Wider Community**

   As for 5.1

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

   There are no direct financial implications of this report. However in seeking enhanced service levels there are financial implications for district rating by Environment Canterbury to be considered through specific implementation plans and proposals.
6.2. **Community Implications**

Improved PT service levels can and do deliver higher community benefits in enhanced accessibility and lower cost travel to users as well as benefits accruing to all road users in lowering congestion, in turn giving rise to economic benefits. Environmental benefits of lower emissions are widespread. Community costs through rating subsidies are an ongoing feature of PT but when direct and indirect benefits of PT are considered, overall the net community gains are considered positive.

6.3. **Risk Management**

There are no specific direct risk implications of this report.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

There are no specific direct health and safety implications of this report. Reduced congestion and private car use does have net safety benefits.

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**

Provision for the preparation, review and consultation on Regional Public Transport Plans is made under Part 5 of the Land Transport Management Act 2003.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

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

- The Council makes known its views on significant proposals by others affecting the District’s wellbeing.

*Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable and sustainable*

- Communities in our District are well linked with each other and Christchurch is readily accessible by a range of transport modes.
- Public transport serves our District effectively.

7.4 **Delegations**

Not applicable. This is submission by the Council.
In the Matter of

The Draft
Canterbury Regional Public Transport Plan

Submission by

Waimakariri District Council

October 2018

Person for Contact: Geoff Meadows (Policy Manager)
1. Introduction

The Waimakariri District Council (WDC) welcomes this opportunity to comment on the Draft Canterbury Regional Public Transport Plan. As the document highlights, public transport (PT) in Greater Christchurch in particular is at a pivotal moment. A step change in many aspects of PT planning and delivery is needed as part of a strategy to ‘turn the curve’ on increasing congestion, while also better serving the transport needs of a rapidly changing community, and, responding to disruptive change in transport technologies.

WDC strongly supports the underpinnings of the Plan identified as the five priorities below as all being important factors to be taken into account in framing the required implementation approach:

- Improve the environment;
- More people using public transport
- Accessibility
- Innovation
- Affordability

WDC enjoys positive working relationships with Environment Canterbury among elected members and staff on a wide range of issues of concern to both organisations. This includes public transport services, and it looks forward to working closely with ECAN and other Strategic Partners in developing the detailed plans and activities associated with CRPTP implementation.

2. Key points of submission

Public Transport Routes and Service Levels

The Draft Plan indicates current high frequency routing to Kaiapoi, with lower frequency extensions to Rangiora and Woodend. In the future, a lower frequency rapid transit service might extend to Kaiapoi with continuation of lesser intensity services to Rangiora and Woodend. It foreshadows better intra-district services between Key Activity Centres connecting to commuter services in with Christchurch.

WDC believes appropriate provision for this into the future would be assisted by consideration of its recently completed District Development Strategy 2018-48*, (DDS), prepared in the knowledge that the almost complete Draft Greater Christchurch Future Development Strategy provides aligned wider context.

The DDS for example, indicates provision for growth in Rangiora and the Woodend/Pegasus area is significant, such that high frequency services to Rangiora in particular are increasingly warranted. This community of 18,000 now, the largest in Greater Christchurch outside of Christchurch City, and is projected to grow steadily towards 30,000 population over the long term - providing a logical start point for rapid transit.

Similarly, the Woodend/ Pegasus/Waikuku area currently with some 7,000 population has a zoned capacity for close to 13,000 population, comparable with Kaiapoi. Enhancing PT services as
communities grow assists establish the ‘public transport habit’ and we believe this approach should be factored into service planning.

We therefore strongly believe consideration should be given to extending the high frequency and rapid transit services to Rangiora in the first instance, as current investments such as HOV laning of the Waimakariri Motorway Bridge and the Northern Arterial are completed. Higher frequency services to Woodend/Pegasus/Waikuku are appropriate in subsequent years.

**Service Innovation & Changing Communities**

The Draft CRPTP signals we are on the cusp of significant change in transport technologies with profound implications for the way we travel and the corresponding demand for public transport services. At the same time Greater Christchurch communities are not just growing but changing significantly in composition as structural aging sets in and as ‘super diversity’ grows.

The document also indicates preparedness to invest in innovative, demand responsive services using differing vehicle sizes and types and frame flexible schedules and services assisted by online and social media applications.

WDC sees the need for sustained effort in understanding changing technologies, travel preferences, community needs and companion technologies that enhance service responsiveness. There needs, under the auspice and leadership of the Joint Committee, to be a preparedness to trial new types of technologies, services and schedules. Collectively we are probably not being ambitious enough in preparing for and responding to step change and we encourage the Committee to move farther and faster in this regard.

**Joined Up Planning and Delivery**

WDC believes there needs to be a closer working relationship between those responsible for land use planning and those focused on PT service planning. Too often, still, area and structure planning, subdivisional design and consenting processes are not joined up in these regards. We would value consideration of how this situation might be improved, and encourage the Committee to seek for the Greater Christchurch Partnership to more closely align land use and transport planning processes in these respects with corresponding delivery alignment.

WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: Gov-01-11 / 181025125056

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 6 November 2018

FROM: Sarah Nichols, Governance Manager

SUBJECT: 2019 Council Meeting Dates

1. SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to adopt a meeting schedule for 2019, up to the end of the Local Body Triennium term of 11 October 2019. The schedule is based on current timetabling patterns which have been adopted over recent years by the Council.

Attachments:


2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 181025125056.

(b) Adopts the following meeting schedule for the period from 15 January to 11 October 2019. (as outlined in Trim 181023123426).

Ordinary Council Meeting Dates commencing at 1pm on the first Tuesday of the month:


Council meetings relating to (Draft) Annual Plan and Annual Report including submissions and hearings:


(c) Adopts the following meeting schedule for the period from 15 January to 11 October 2019 for Standing Committees:

District Planning and Regulation Committee commencing at 1pm on Tuesdays:


Utilities and Roading Committee commencing at 4.00pm on Tuesdays:

Community and Recreation Committee commencing at 1.00pm on Tuesdays:
Audit and Risk Committee commencing at 3.30pm on Tuesdays:
District Licencing Committee commencing at 9am on Fridays:

(d) Notes the 2019 meeting dates of the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee have been set in conjunction with Environment Canterbury.

(e) Notes the Community Boards and Regeneration Steering Group will adopt their timetable at their meetings held during November 2018, as proposed in Trim document 181023123426.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 Each November the Council and Community Boards confirms its meeting schedule for the following year.

3.2 During 2018 ordinary Council meetings occurred at 1pm on the first Tuesday of the month, with four of the Standing Committees generally alternating in two pairs on the third Tuesday of each month. This has worked well and it is recommended to continue with this pattern.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. Since July 2014, specific monthly briefing (public excluded) non-decision making sessions relating to district wide matters have been brought before Council and this has proven to be effective for both members and staff. It is therefore proposed that these specific briefing sessions continue during 2019, commencing in March, generally on the second Tuesday of the month (as outlined on the attached meeting schedule). It is proposed that some specialist briefings will still occur after the related standing committee meetings. The District Planning and Regulation Committee will also hold monthly briefings from 1pm to 3pm, whilst full Council briefings will occur from 3.15pm to approximately 6pm.

4.2. The recommendation to the community boards is to continue with their current meeting pattern for 2019, as it dovetails with the timing of the Council and Committee meetings, ensuring availability of Councillors.

4.3. Each March the Council hold a Hui with Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga, alternating hosting between the Tuahiwi Marae and Council Chambers. This meeting is in addition to the alternate monthly meetings between the parties and provides an additional opportunity to discuss matters with a focus on the Council’s Annual Plan budgetary proposals and to continue to strengthen the relationship. In 2019 Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga will host the Hui and a proposed date of 21 March has been suggested to coincide with the Annual Plan consultation period, which is proposed to commence from 11 March 2019.

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

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

The established pattern of Council and Community Board meetings has generally worked well for members, taking into account other community commitments.

Community views were not sought for the timetabling. We are not aware of any adverse comments from the public on meeting times. However, there are some who may be disadvantaged with meeting times established during the day, due to work or family commitments. Submission hearings directly related to the Annual Plan are scheduled in the afternoon and evening to enable submitters the opportunity to speak outside of normal working hours.

5.2. **Wider Community**

Neighbouring Councils commence their meetings at 9.30am with no adverse effects on the community to our knowledge. Christchurch City and Hurunui District hold their main Council meetings on Thursdays. Selwyn District hold their main Council meetings on Wednesdays.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

Servicing of Council, Committees and Community Boards are met within existing Council Governance budgets.

A reduction of staff overtime may be applicable with an earlier starting time of Community Board meetings.

6.2. **Community Implications**

The most appropriate way for giving notice of meetings is to establish a meetings calendar. All Council, Standing Committees, Community Board meetings are publicly advertised in compliance with LGOIMA. Meetings are also advertised on the Council website and at Service Centres on in-house television screens. Additional notification of Annual Plan submission and hearing dates and process occurs to maximise public awareness of Council meetings and the opportunity to contribute to the decision making process.

6.3. **Risk Management**

Not establishing a meetings calendar and appropriate public notification of meetings would contravene the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

No health and safety aspects applicable.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

Local Government Act 2002 Schedule 7 clause 19 - A local authority must hold the meetings that are necessary for the good government of its region or district.
Meetings must be called and conducted in accordance with Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOiMA) and the standing orders of the local authority.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**
There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision-making by local, regional and national organisations that affect our District.

7.4. **Delegations**
The Council set meetings for Council and Committees. Each Community Board set individual meeting times.

Sarah Nichols  
Governance Manager
1. SUMMARY

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

Attachments:

i. Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties

ii. October 2018 Health and Safety Dashboard Report

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 181024124320

(b) Notes that there are no significant Health and Safety issues at this time, and that WDC is, so far as is reasonably practicable, compliant with the PCBU duties of the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1. The Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 requires that Officers must exercise due diligence to make sure that the organisation complies with its health and safety duties. Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties for WDC is outlined in Appendix 1.

2.2. An officer under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 is a person who occupies a specified position or who occupies a position that allows them to exercise a significant influence over the management of the business or undertaking. Councillors and Chief Executive are considered to be the Officers of WDC.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. There are 5 work-related incidents in this report, none of which is pending investigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Event description</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/09/2018</td>
<td>Near Miss</td>
<td>Chemicals found when there was a leaking pipe under the sink at Darnley Square Headworks.</td>
<td>The contributing factor was that Darnley square headworks was set up as a lab many years ago, and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Action and Prevention Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/10/2018</td>
<td>Property or Vehicle Damage</td>
<td>Digger strike on Telecoms Cable. Digging around a 50mm water pipe to repair a leak with a 1.8 ton digger. Digger hit telecom cable damaging 7 to 8 cables with in.</td>
<td>Both staff members have been trained in the use of cable locating equipment. Team don’t always have service plans on site for emergency maintenance work as the before you dig system does not supply plans immediately (something that unit needs to look at). Prevention of recurrence: refresher training with the locaters (complete). Team are approaching service providers to discuss the before you dig process and response/location of services work. No lost time but cost added to the job for the repair of the cable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/10/2018</td>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>Worker has had ongoing back issues for quite some time. WDC engaged Southern Rehab to conduct an ergonomic assessment of the department. The recommendation was to replace all desks in the area with non-standard, standing workstations. Worker’s desk was raised as a priority due to ongoing back problems. The desks have not yet been ordered and worker’s back went in to spasm/pain.</td>
<td>Ongoing desk and chair issues have aggravated back injury to the point of severe pain. The desk and chair set up have been an ongoing issue and even with taking regular breaks and micro pauses (role is 99% sedentary). Recurrence be prevented by providing a standing desk that can be altered as and when required and a new smaller chair with appropriate lumbar support. Worker has moved desk for the time being until the desk has been provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/10/2018</td>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>Feeding documents in to the scanner and leaning to the left. The documents got jammed and the scanner lid is quite heavy to lift. Twisted and leaned at the same time. Worker felt a pain/pull in lower back and hip (left side). Had been to the chiropractor and added another desk to workspace area to help reduce pain and over extending.</td>
<td>To prevent recurrence, provide adjustable desk, chair with smaller lumbar support – bring scanner closer. Adjustable desk (ordered), chair with smaller lumbar support (underway), move scanner closer (done) – have temporarily moved a non-adjustable standing desk prep files at.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/10/2018</td>
<td>Property or Vehicle Damage</td>
<td>Came across a car smouldering and catching on fire at Mitre 10 carpark. Worker pulled over to assist using my fire extinguisher and then undertook crowd control.</td>
<td>The person who truck was on fire was struggling to get his fire extinguisher out of the truck. Worker was first on the scene to help immediately got his fire extinguisher from the truck and started putting fire out. He could only manage to stop it until the fire brigade showed up.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2. The Health and Safety Team have completed a health and safety systems self-assessment audit in alignment with ACC Workplace Safety Management Practices standards. The full report of findings will be presented to the Audit and Risk Committee in November for their review.

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

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Groups and Organisations

4.1.1. The above reporting is shared with Management Team and the Health and Safety Committee in particular, for their review and comment.

4.2. Wider Community

4.2.1. The community has not been consulted with regard to this matter, as this is internal compliance reporting, relating to Health and Safety at Work.

5. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. Financial Implications

5.1.1. All financial implications for the upcoming year's health and safety activities have been accounted for within approved project costs (such as Promapp implementation), or via departmental budgets already allocated to health and safety.

5.2. Community Implications

5.2.1. Community implications have not been included in this report as this is internal compliance reporting, relating to Health and Safety at Work.

5.3. Risk Management

5.3.1. Risk Management is one of the key performance requirements of a functioning Health and Safety system, therefore an updated version of the Health and Safety Register Action Plan is a key aspect of this monthly report (see Attachment 2).

5.4. Health and Safety

5.4.1. Continuous improvement, monitoring, and reporting of Health and Safety activities are a key focus of the health and safety management system. Attachment 1 indicates the health and safety monitoring and improvement activities that are in progress at WDC.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy

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

6.2. Legislation
6.2.1. The key legislation is the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015.

6.2.2. The Council has a number of Human Resources policies, including those related to Health and Safety at Work.

6.2.3. The Council has an obligation under the Local Government Act to be a good employer.

6.3. Community Outcomes

6.3.1. There is a safe environment for all

The Health, Safety and Wellbeing of the organisation, its employees and volunteers ensures that Community Outcomes are delivered in a manner which is legislatively compliant and culturally aligned to our organisational principles: ta mātou mauri.

6.4. Delegations

6.4.1. An officer under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 is a person who occupies a specified position or who occupies a position that allows them to exercise a significant influence over the management of the business or undertaking. Councillors and Chief Executive are considered to be the Officers of WDC.
Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICER DUTIES</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF ACTIVITIES TO SUPPORT DISCHARGE OF DUTIES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KNOW</td>
<td>• Updates on new activities/major contracts</td>
<td>Various Committee reports Monthly, as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Council reports to include Health and Safety advice as relevant</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Audit Committee to receive minutes of Health and Safety Committee meetings</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Update on legislation and best practice changes to Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(To acquire, and keep up to date, knowledge of work health and safety matters)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERSTAND</td>
<td>• Induction of new Council through tour of District and ongoing site visits.</td>
<td>Start of each new term and as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• H&amp;S Risk register to Audit Committee</td>
<td>Six monthly, or where major change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training on H&amp;S legislation and best practices updates</td>
<td>At least annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CCO activities reported to the Audit Committee</td>
<td>At least annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(To gain an understanding of the nature of the operations of the business or undertaking of the PCBU and generally of the hazards and risks associated with those operations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOURCES</td>
<td>• LTP or Annual Plan to have a specific report on H&amp;S resources</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reports to Committees will outline H&amp;S issues and resourcing, as appropriate</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(To ensure that the PCBU has available for use, and uses, appropriate resources and processes to eliminate or minimise risks to health and safety from work carried out as part of the conduct of the business or undertaking)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONITOR</td>
<td>• Report to every Council meeting – standing agenda item to include Dashboard Update and any major developments</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Risk register review by Audit Committee</td>
<td>Six monthly, or where major change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(To ensure that the PCBU has appropriate processes for receiving and considering information regarding incidents, hazards, and risks and for responding in a timely way to that information)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLY</td>
<td>• Programme of H&amp;S internal work received by Audit Committee</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Internal Audit reports to Audit Committee</td>
<td>As completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Incident Investigations reported Audit Committee</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Worksafe review of incidents/ accidents reported to Audit Committee</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(To ensure that the PCBU has, and implements, processes for complying with any duty or obligation of the PCBU under this Act)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERIFY</td>
<td>• Receive any external audit results and remedial actions (if any) reported to Audit Committee</td>
<td>Two yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Worksafe audits, if undertaken</td>
<td>As completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-assessment against Canterbury Safety Charter and/or SafePlus reported to the Audit Committee</td>
<td>As completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(To verify the provision and use of the resources and processes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Progress against 2017/18 Workplan – September 2018 (**as at 18th September 2018**)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Projects</th>
<th>Current Progress</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1: Improve Health and Safety systems, to align with organisational objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Action 1:** Re-develop Safety Management System to ensure that all Policies align with SafePlus framework (see TRIM 180315027921), and all critical risk procedures are captured in Promapp. | **AS PER LAST MONTH** Policy structure has been drafted, and re-writing of policies has commenced. Policy structure has 3 key policies: Leadership & Commitment, Risk Management and Worker Engagement. There will be several sub-policies under the ‘Risk Management’ main policy, to address critical risks (e.g. Asbestos Management, Drug and Alcohol, Driver Safety etc.)

To date, the following number of health and safety procedures have been captured in Promapp:

- Published (finalised) = 24
- Unpublished (in progress) = 2

Additionally, the Water Unit are using Promapp to review and rewrite their Safe Working Procedures, and have a total of 93 unpublished procedures that are being developed. |  |
| **Action 2:** Implement Promapp training module to improve the management of all Health and Safety training. | The Promapp training module has been purchased, and key staff (including H&S Admin and Manager) are trained in how to use the module. **Single sign-on has been confirmed, and all staff are creating their Promapp profiles.**

Once all profiles are created, Health and Safety team will transfer current training data across to the Promapp Training Module. Estimated date of data transfer completion = 21 December 2018 (dependent on resource availability). |  |

**Objective 2: Maintain a fit-for-purpose internal health and safety auditing system to ensure that WDC is compliant with health and safety policies, procedures and legal requirements.**

**Action 3:** Review and re-develop internal health and safety auditing system, aligned with SafePlus. (see TRIM 180315027921). | The SafePlus Online Self-Assessment tool from WorkSafe has been issued. From there the team will complete the following actions:

- Assess the suitability of the tool (and determine any changes in approach – if required) **COMPLETE**
- Confirm audit timing and approach (report to Management Team) **COMPLETE**
- Arrange audit **IN PROGRESS – DEC 2018**
- Complete audit and submit findings to Management Team
- Develop action plan and monitoring schedule
- Review process and adjust if required |  |
### Objective 3: Ensure that all contractors are managed according to health and safety procedural requirements, and improve staff knowledge of those requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action 4: Contractor management process improvement project (carry-over).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AS PER LAST MONTH</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated date for Contract Management training delivery = mid-November. Timing has been determined by the Promapp rollout project (access to the system). The Contract Management Process Improvement Group is currently working on ensuring contract management processes are completed in time for training delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the interim:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Health and Safety Manager provides a H&amp;S Contract Management overview to all new staff at their induction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Health and Safety Manager also provided an overview of current procedures to U&amp;R, Water Unit, Greenspace and Regeneration teams at a June workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A 6-monthly reminder email was sent to staff on 24/08 to inform them of H&amp;S processes and tools to manage contractors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Deliver training to all staff once Promapp processes are complete (Oct 2018).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Develop audit function based on PDU audit role.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective 4: Improve the Health and Wellbeing of staff, and create measures to ensure success.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action 5: Wellbeing strategy development and implementation project (carry-over).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPLETE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Wellbeing Committee has been established, the wellbeing strategy is complete, and has been submitted to Management Team for their approval in early August. Additionally, the Management Team approved:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Wellbeing calendar of events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Wellbeing presence on intranet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Wellbeing branding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Wellbeing communications plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Wellbeing Committee has now issued the strategy and communications to all staff (September 2018), and will coordinate and communicate all wellbeing activities going forward.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the above workplan, there will be a particular focus on working with volunteers to manage their health and safety. This will include creating written agreements with high risk volunteers, and proactively engaging with all volunteers to ensure that health and safety expectations are aligned with all parties.
**Note: there are some slight differences in the data between last month’s reporting and this month’s. We are currently migrating to a new reporting system, and are finalising the data verification.
Incidents/Injuries - September 2018 (**as at 18th September 2018)

October 2017 to Current: Worker Incident Reporting

- Injury: 34 incidents (59%)
- Near Miss: 10 incidents (17%)
- Property or Vehicle Damage: 10 incidents (17%)
- Ambulance Callout (Aquatics only): 1 incident (2%)
- Illness/Medical Incident: 3 incidents (5%)

Legend:
- Injury
- Near Miss
- Property or Vehicle Damage
- Ambulance Callout (Aquatics only)
- Illness/Medical Incident
Lost Time Injuries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Injuries</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Causes of Injuries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>Body stressing x2 (manual handling) (63hrs) - Falls, trips, slips x2 (231hrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>Carryover Injury – Falls, trips, slips x1 total 49 hours - Body stressing x1 (manual handling) (11.5 hrs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEAD INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety Inspections Completed (Workplace Walkarounds)</td>
<td>Q3 2018</td>
<td>16 out of 16 Workplace Walkarounds completed for Q3 (September 2018). Hazards raised for any non-compliances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Delivered</td>
<td>People Trained: 460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Delivered</td>
<td>People Trained: 284 (to October)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contractor Database (drawn from SiteWise Database)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk rating</th>
<th>Risk type</th>
<th>Suggested Actions</th>
<th>Action Owner</th>
<th>Due date</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Contractors Health and Safety Management</td>
<td>*Train all contract managers in H&amp;S processes/requirements at time of induction.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Contractors Health and Safety Management</td>
<td>*Develop comprehensive contract administration/contract management training package to deliver to all staff managing contractors.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>30/11/2018</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Contractors Health and Safety Management</td>
<td>*Identify volunteer groups and leaseholders that engage contractors on behalf of WDC and train in contract H&amp;S management processes.</td>
<td>Managers &amp; Team Leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Contractors Health and Safety Management</td>
<td>*Complete development of Safety In Design procedures and embed in design processes.</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Vehicle Use &amp; Driver Safety</td>
<td>*Deliver driver training as per training strategy (Driver Safety / 4WD).</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Vehicle Use &amp; Driver Safety</td>
<td>*Identify any drivers that require further progressive driver training on an as-needs basis and provide relevant training.</td>
<td>Managers &amp; Team Leaders</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Vehicle Use &amp; Driver Safety</td>
<td>*Provide information and training regarding use of safety equipment such as fire extinguishers in staff pool vehicles to all drivers.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Vehicle Use &amp; Driver Safety</td>
<td>*Issue reminder to staff about winter driving season (re-send Driving In Waimakariri brochure).</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Volunteers conducting hazardous activities</td>
<td>*Undertake a review of operations to ensure that all activity and training is being carried out as per internal H&amp;S processes.</td>
<td>Liz Ashton</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Volunteers conducting hazardous activities</td>
<td>*Develop Memorandum of Understanding with NZRT12, which will define accountabilities and expectations. May require some further operational and administrative support to implement the requirements. (TBC)</td>
<td>Liz Ashton</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Adverse weather</td>
<td>*Develop protocols for response to adverse weather events (especially at night), and include in Safe Working in the Field Manual *Include in Emergency Management Plan out-of-hours deployment in adverse weather.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne, Kelly La Valley, Kalley Simpson, Chris Brown, Joanne McBride</td>
<td>31/07/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Adverse weather</td>
<td>*Create pre-prepared briefing/toolbox talk for all field staff - regarding specific hazards of an extreme weather event, and the required control measures. Briefing prior to deployment.</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>31/07/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Adverse weather</td>
<td>*Investigate use of monitoring and tracking systems for all field staff for use in extreme weather events.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>30/06/2018</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Adverse weather</td>
<td>*Extend vehicle GPS tracking monitoring capability to the managers of all field staff.</td>
<td>Jill Brightwell/Liz Ashton</td>
<td>30/06/2018</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Airfield operations</td>
<td>*Develop of Airfield Safety Committee and appointment of Airfield Safety Co-ordinator to administer all actions from safety review.</td>
<td>Craig Sargison</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Airfield operations</td>
<td>*Develop of Airfield Operations Manual, and adoption of the manual by Council as the key safety document for the Airfield operations.</td>
<td>Craig Sargison</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Airfield operations</td>
<td>*Provide regular Airfield Operations report to Council</td>
<td>Craig Sargison</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Actions in blue bold are new (since the most recent Risk Register review).*
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1. SUMMARY

1.1 This purpose of this report is to request the Utility and Roading Committee’s recommendation for the Council’s approval to renew the Water Supply Bylaw 2012.

1.2 The trigger for the review is the 5 year anniversary of the original Water Supply Bylaw, which was adopted in April 2012. The original bylaw was made under provisions of Section 145 and 146 of the Local Government Act 2002.

1.3 In February 2018, a review of the need for the Water Supply Bylaw was undertaken (record number 180226020068). It was confirmed that the objectives of the 2012 bylaw are still relevant, and that the bylaw is the best mechanism to achieve these objectives.

1.4 The review of the content of the 2012 bylaw concluded that no significant changes are necessary. Some minor changes are recommended to provide clarification to some clauses, or to reference policies that have been developed since the 2012 by law was adopted (specifically the Backflow Prevention Policy which was adopted in 2014).

1.5 Generally a review of a bylaw would trigger a need to consult on the changes. However, in this case, where the updates are not material, this is not required per Section 156 (2) (a) of the Local Government act 2002.

Attachments:
i. Proposed Water Supply Bylaw 2018, with changes marked (180910103410)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee recommends;

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180910103408.

(b) Notes that a review of the Water Supply Bylaw 2012 has been undertaken, and it has been confirmed that there is a need for a water supply bylaw, and that the 2012 document is generally fit for purpose.
Notes that the proposed Water Supply Bylaw 2018 does not provide Council with extra rights or powers than it currently has, but rather is an update of the existing document to accurately reference current practices, to clarify some clauses and to reference other policies (the Backflow Prevention Policy) that have been developed since the 2012 bylaw was adopted.

Adopts the Waimakariri District Council Water Supply Bylaw 2018.

Circulates this report to the Council’s Community Boards for their information.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 In 2011, it was identified that Council did not have any mechanism for regulating its supply of water to communities within the District, and that it relied heavily on public and businesses to “do the right thing” when it comes to usage of potable water that is supplied by the Council (refer to report 110923043442 to the Utilities and Roading Committee in October 2011).

3.2 For the above reason, a bylaw was created to set our requirements of customers that seek access to the water supply, those undertaking excavations around existing water supply assets, and those that are connected to or draw water from one of Council’s public water supply schemes.

3.3 A draft bylaw was prepared, and community consultation undertaken. Submissions on the original bylaw opened from January to February 2012. Four submissions on the draft bylaw were received. Following this consultation process, minor amendments were made to the draft document and the final water supply bylaw was adopted and came into effect on 3 April 2012 (refer report to Council 120320015367 regarding adoption of 2012 Bylaw).

3.4 A review of the bylaw is required to commence once the bylaw has been in force for 5 years (April 2017), and must be completed within 2 years from that date (April 2019).

3.5 The first step in the process of reviewing the bylaw is to confirm the need for a bylaw. This was carried out in February 2018 and is documented in memo 180226020068. The objectives of the 2012 bylaw were reviewed and considered to still be relevant. Further, the bylaw is still considered to be the most effective tool for achieving its objectives.

3.6 It is noted that the bylaw is not commonly used for enforcement activities. However it is commonly used to assist in answering questions regarding Council’s rights and responsibilities. Therefore, it has proven to be a useful tool since its adoption on 2012.

3.7 Based on the above it was concluded that there is a need for the bylaw and that it should be renewed.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1 A key part of the 2017/18 review of the Water Supply Bylaw was to determine whether significant changes were required (i.e. changes to Council’s rights, responsibilities or powers), or minor changes (i.e. changing or updating the content of the document without changing Council’s rights, responsibilities or powers).

4.2 The significance of the above assessment is that if the changes are significant, there is a need to consult through a Special Consultative Procedure. Conversely if the changes are not significant then there is not a need to consult and the renewal of the document can be approved by Council.
4.3. Following review of the 2012 document it was concluded that the bylaw is fit for purpose, and substantial changes are not required. The nature of the types of changes recommended are given on Table 1.

Table 1: Summary of Significance of Proposed Changes to Bylaw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description of Reason for Change</th>
<th>Significance of Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3 and 4.2</td>
<td>Adding clarification that the bylaw does not apply to private water supplies.</td>
<td>Clarification of existing application of bylaw.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Updating wording to explain where fees and changes are published.</td>
<td>Update to better explain where customers can find information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Updating of the bylaw to refer to the Council’s Backflow Prevention Policy. The 2012 bylaw document was written prior to the Council having a Backflow Prevention Policy, which Council adopted in 2014. Therefore the bylaw outlined some of the requirements that would later be adopted and better defined under the Backflow Prevention Policy. With the Backflow Prevention Policy now in place, there is no need to explicitly outline the requirements of the Backflow Prevention Policy within the bylaw, but instead just to refer to the need to comply with the Backflow Prevention Policy.</td>
<td>Does not give Council any additional rights – just refers to rights / responsibilities already allowed under the Backflow Prevention Policy which was adopted in 2014, and the intent referenced in the 2012 bylaw.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7, 10.3 and 14.6</td>
<td>Update as Engineering Code of Practice not necessarily available at service centres, but is available on the website.</td>
<td>Update to better explain where customers can find information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Updating to make clear the nature of a water outage may just be a loss of pressure, rather than a complete loss of supply (if it is a partial outage rather than full outage).</td>
<td>Update to provide more clarification on nature on potential water outages that could occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1 and 10.2</td>
<td>Minor changes to wording to make sentences clearer</td>
<td>Not significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1 (a) and (b)</td>
<td>Providing clarification to the type of checks that Council may access a property to undertake.</td>
<td>Not significant as this is explaining current practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>Providing clarification of where service valves are located.</td>
<td>Not significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>Council issues permits to use tanker filling points (rather than consents) so clarifying terminology.</td>
<td>Not significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.1 and 14.2</td>
<td>Update wording as Council does not necessarily have as-built information available for all buried services, but has GIS plans that were derived from as-builts.</td>
<td>Clarifying information that is provided and available for buried services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>Referencing pre-existing requirements for any work within the road corridor.</td>
<td>No new requirements, just referencing existing requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>Change is to provide additional detail as to what circumstances may lead to buried services being marked out.</td>
<td>Providing further explanation of requirements / current practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Updating heading to better reflect contents of that section of bylaw.</td>
<td>Not significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>Updated wording to reflect that restrictions may not necessarily be due to high demand, but could be due to constraints in what can be supplied or delivered.</td>
<td>Providing clearer description of potential needs for restrictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.1 and 23.4</td>
<td>Re-ordering of sentence for clarity.</td>
<td>Not significant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4. As is outlined in Table 1, the proposed changes to the bylaw are not significant, but are generally providing additional detail or clarification about existing rights and practices.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.2. No groups or organisations have been consulted with regarding the proposed changes to the Water Supply Bylaw. This is due to the nature of the changes being deemed to not be significant and are simply clarifications of existing systems, practices or policies.

5.3. **Wider Community**

5.4. The wider community has not been consulted regarding the proposed changes to the Water Supply Bylaw, for the same reasons described above under 5.2. It is noted that when a Special Consultative Procedure was undertaken for the 2012 bylaw, there were 4 submissions received, signally a relatively low level of interest from the community at that time.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.2. As no significant changes are proposed as a result of the bylaw, there are no financial implications of proposed changes.

6.3. **Community Implications**

6.4. As part of the consideration for the need of the bylaw, community implications were considered. The bylaw sets out practices and requirements to protect, promote and maintain public health through the provision of water services, therefore is seen to have position implications for the community.

6.5. **Risk Management**

6.6. Without a bylaw there would be risks that Council’s ability to provide and protect its water supplies may be compromised.

6.7. **Health and Safety**

6.8. The objective of the Water Supply Bylaw is to protect, promote and maintain public health and safety through the provision of water services in the Waimakariri district by making rules for the supply and protection of drinking-water.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy. This was determined through the analysis of the significance of the changes to the bylaw.

7.2. **Legislation**

The *Health (Drinking-water) Amendment Act* and the *Local Government Act* (Section 145 and 146) and (Sections 155 to 160) are relevant in this matter.
7.3. **Community Outcomes**

The *Water Supply Bylaw 2018* will continue to contribute to the following community outcomes:

> There is a safe environment for all

- Harm to people from natural and manmade hazards is minimised

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

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

7.4. **Delegations**

The Council has the authority to adopt the proposed *Water Supply Bylaw 2018*. 
OBJECTIVE

To protect, promote and maintain public health and safety through the provision of water services in the Waimakariri District.

Adopted at a Council Meeting held on 36 April November 20128

______________________________
Chief Executive

______________________________
Administration Manager
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WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL WATER SUPPLY BYLAW 2012

The Waimakariri District Council makes this bylaw pursuant to Section 145 and 146 of the Local Government Act 2002; Section 64 of the Health Act 1956 and any other Act or Authority enabling Council in that behalf.

Any person who has permission under any other Bylaw, Act, Regulation, or resource consent to carry out any activity, that conflicts with any requirement of this Bylaw, does not breach this Bylaw when acting in accordance with that permission.

1. **Short Title, Commencement and Application**

1.1 This Bylaw is the Waimakariri District Council Water Supply Bylaw 2012.

1.2 This Bylaw shall come into force on 6 November 2012.

1.3 This Bylaw applies to the Waimakariri District, but does not apply to properties that receive potable water from the Hurunui District Council or private water supplies.

2. **Purpose**

2.1 The purpose of this Bylaw is to protect, promote and maintain public health and safety, to protect public water supply infrastructure, to protect the public from nuisance by making rules for the supply of water, and to manage and regulate the Council’s water supply.

3. **Objectives**

3.1 The objectives of the Bylaw are to:

* Provide for public health and safety in the supply of water.
* Ensure fair and reasonable use of the resource.
* Define the obligations of installers, owners and the public in matters related to the public supply of water.
* Protect publicly owned water supply network infrastructure from incorrect use and damage.
* Promote the responsible use of water in the District, ensuring that all fittings and appliances connected to the public water supply achieve optimum performance with a minimum of consumption of water and incorporate safeguards to prevent waste.
* Enable the effective enforcement of any applicable water restrictions that may be imposed by the Council from time to time.
* Enable the volumes of water consumed on any premises by any extraordinary user of a Council water supply to be assessed for rating purposes, and provide for meters accordingly.
4. **Scope**

4.1 This Bylaw is made under the authority of the Local Government Act 2002 for the supply of water to its customers by the Waimakariri District Council. The supply and rating for water by the Council is subject to:

(a) Statutory Acts and Regulations:

(i) Building Act 2004
(ii) Fire Service Act 1975
(iii) Health Act 1956
(iv) Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act 2007
(v) Local Government Act 2002
(vi) Local Government (Rating) Act 2002
(vii) Resource Management Act 1991

(b) Relevant codes and standards:

(i) Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand 2005 (revised 2008)
(ii) New Zealand Building Code
(iii) BS EN 14154-3:2005 Water Meters. Test methods and equipment.
(iv) SNZ PAS 4509:2003 New Zealand Fire Service fire fighting water supplies code of practice.
(vii) Waimakariri District Council Backflow Prevention Policy.
(viii) Waimakariri District Council Underground Service Locating Policy.

4.2 This Bylaw does not apply to any property within the Waimakariri District that receives potable water from the Hurunui District Council or private water supplies.

5. **Interpretation**

5.1 Definitions are set out in Section 6 unless the context requires otherwise. A reference to a repealed enactment should be read as a reference to its replacement.

5.2 For the purpose of the Bylaw, the word ‘shall’ refers to practices that are mandatory for compliance with this Bylaw, while the word ‘should’ refers to practices that are advised or recommended.

6. **Definitions**

**AIR GAP SEPARATION** means a physical separation between the free flowing discharge end of a potable water supply pipeline, and the highest overflow level of the receiving vessel, used to prevent backflow.

**APPROVED** means permitted in writing by the Council, either by resolution of the Council or by any officer of the Council authorised for that purpose.

**AUTHORISED OFFICER or AGENT** means any person appointed in writing by the Chief Executive or by the Council to act on its behalf and with its authority.
BACKFLOW means the unplanned reversal of flow of water or mixtures of water and contaminants into the water supply network.

BACKFLOW PREVENTION DEVICE means a device that prevents backflow of water or mixtures of water and contaminants back into the water supply network.

CHAMBERS means the housing for any fittings.

CONNECTION means the service pipe from the Council’s watermain to the point of supply that is owned and maintained by the Council and includes any pipes, valves, manifolds, water meters, backflow prevention device that is installed on the Council’s side of the point of supply and the protection structure for any such backflow prevention device, and the water meter box.

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

COUNCIL WATER SUPPLY means the Council’s supply of potable water to its customers.

CUSTOMER means the owner of any property who has obtained the right to use, or direct the manner of use of, water supplied by the Council to any premises.

DETECTOR CHECK VALVE means a check (non-return) valve which has a positive closing pressure and a metered bypass to measure flows typically associated with leakage or unauthorised use on a dedicated fire supply.

DISTRICT means the Waimakariri District as constituted by the Local Government (Canterbury Region) Reorganisation Order 1989.

EXTRAORDINARY SUPPLY means a category of an on demand supply including all purposes for which water is supplied other than ordinary domestic supply and which may be subject to specific conditions and limitations.

EXTRAORDINARY USER means a customer that receives an extraordinary supply of water and that specifically includes the following water users:

- Commercial or business premises (including home-based commercial activities e.g. dentists, hairdressers, bed and breakfast and other cottage type industries).
- Industrial premises.
- Temporary supplies.
- Out of District customers (supply to or within another local authority).
- Public facilities, parks and reserves.
- Educational facilities.
- Any premises at which a horticultural or agricultural land use is occurring and that is potentially a high water user.
- Properties with fire protection systems other than sprinkler systems designed to comply with NZS 4517.
- Any property with a connection larger than 20mm nominal bore.

- Any other property found by the Council to be using more than 150% of the assessed reasonable average daily use over a 12 month period as defined in the Waimakariri District Council Water Conservation Strategy (available to view on the Council’s website).

**FEES AND CHARGES** means the list of items, terms, and prices for services associated with the supply of water as adopted by the Council in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002 and the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002.

**FITTING** means any apparatus or appliance together with the necessary accessories and connection which may be attached to or associated with the plumbing or drainage system of any premises, or which is intended for the collection or retention of any waste materials or liquid wastes for ultimate discharge to a drain.

**FIRE INSTALLATION** means a water installation which conveys water solely for the purpose of fire fighting.

**KERBSIDE, FOOTPATH, or ROADSIDE** means an area on the road reserve outside a property.

**LEVEL OF SERVICE** means the measurable performance standards on which the Council undertakes to supply water to its customers.

**METER** means a Council owned device that is used to measure the volume of supplied water.

**NUISANCE** means anything that disturbs the reasonable use of the water supply or endangers life and health or is offensive.

**OCCUPIER** means the inhabitant of any property including any person who, for the time being, is in control of the premises, and in any case where any building, house, tenement, or premises is or are uninhabited shall be deemed to include the owner as hereinafter defined.

**OFFENCE** includes any act or omission in relation to this Bylaw or any part thereof for which any person is liable for prosecution.

**ON DEMAND SUPPLY** means a supply which is available directly to the customer without restriction of flow from the point of supply subject to the agreed levels of service.

**ORDINARY SUPPLY** means a category of an on demand supply used solely for domestic purposes, excluding any identified extraordinary water use.

**OWNER** has the definition as specified in Part 1, section 2 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

**PERMIT** means any written permission or consent required by this Bylaw or any relevant legislation.
PERSON means a natural person, corporation sole or a body of persons whether corporate or otherwise.

POINT OF SUPPLY means the point where the connection meets the supply pipe and it marks the boundary of responsibility between the customer and the Council, irrespective of property boundaries.

PREMISES means
(a) A property or allotment which is held under a separate certificate of title or for which a separate certificate of title may be issued and in respect of which a building consent has been or may be issued; or
(b) A building or part of a building that has been defined as an individual unit by a cross-lease, unit title or company lease and for which a certificate of title is available; or
(c) Land held in public ownership (e.g. reserve) for a particular purpose.

PUBLIC NOTICE means information that is published on at least one occasion in a newspaper with a weekly or more frequent circulation to the area, or under emergency conditions, by the most practical means available at that time.

RESTRICTED SUPPLY means a type of water supply where a limited flow is supplied by a flow control device, and storage is provided on-site by the customer to cater for demand fluctuations.

RESTRICTOR means a flow control device fitted to the service pipe to limit the flow rate of water to a customer’s premises.

RESIDENTIAL 4 ZONE PROPERTY means a property as defined by the Waimakariri District Plan.

ROADING AUTHORITY means a territorial authority or the New Zealand Transport Agency.

RURAL PROPERTY means a property as defined by the Waimakariri District Plan.

SERVICE PIPE means that section of water pipe between a water main and the point of supply that is owned and maintained by the Council.

SERVICE VALVE or TOBY VALVE means a Council owned valve that may be located on the Council’s service pipe or at the point of supply.

STORAGE TANK means a secure vessel for holding potable water.

SUPPLY PIPE means that section of pipe between the point of supply and the customer’s premises that is installed, owned and maintained by the customer.

SUPPLY VALVE means a valve that is located on the customer’s supply pipe and is the customer’s responsibility.

UNIT OF WATER means a flow of water that is equivalent to 1,000 litres a day for any restricted water connection.

WATER SUPPLY NETWORK means all the components of the Council water supply between the point of abstraction from the natural environment and the point of supply. This includes but is not limited to: wells, infiltration galleries, intake structures, open raw water storage ponds and/or lakes, falling mains, treatment plants, treated water...
reservoirs, trunk mains, service mains, rider mains, pump stations and pumps, valves, hydrants, scour lines, service pipes, connections, meters, backflow prevention devices and tobies.

7. **Supply of Water**

7.1 Each property in the District shall generally be entitled to potable water supplied from the Council subject to each of the following conditions:

(a) Meeting the criteria in the Council’s Water Supply Extension Policy, and
(b) Payment of a connection fee for new connections, and
(c) Payment of a Development or Financial Contribution where applicable, and
(d) Payment of the appropriate water rates, and
(e) A public supply being physically available with adequate capacity.

7.2 The Council shall be under no obligation to provide an on-demand or restricted supply of water.

7.3 Any person wishing to connect to a reticulated Council water supply or receive a supply of additional water units must either:

(a) Complete and submit the “Application for the Supply of Water” form (available on the Council’s website and from any Council Service Centre) and will be invoiced upon installation offer the connection as prescribed in the Council’s Fees and Charges manuals published on the Council’s website and the Application for the Supply of Water form; or
(b) Obtain a subdivision consent with a condition requiring connection to a Council water supply and comply with all the relevant consent conditions.

7.4 For applications made under clause 7.3 (a), the following provisions apply:

(a) The applicant must be the owner or have the authority to act on behalf of the owner of the premises for which the supply is sought, and shall produce written evidence of this if required.
(b) The Council or its authorised officer shall approve the following:
   (i) The type of water supply to be provided to any premises (restricted or on-demand)
   (ii) The size of the connection to be provided to any premises
   (iii) The design of the connection to be provided to any premises
   (iv) Any additional elements of the connection or supply including water meters, pipes, valves, backflow prevention devices and any other equipment deemed necessary by the Council.
(c) Upon approval, the Council will install the connection at the applicant’s expense.
(d) The Council is entitled to refuse the application and notify the applicant of the decision giving the reasons for refusal.
(e) No person shall act on a written authorisation that is more than 12 months old to supply water unless an extension of time is authorised in writing by the Council.
7.5 No person shall be supplied water unless the supply is authorised in writing by the Council.

7.6 A premises shall only have one connection, unless otherwise authorised in writing by the Council.

7.7 A customer who has altered, or who seeks to alter the ground levels in the vicinity of the connection shall be responsible for the alteration of the existing service pipe and cover to ensure the connection complies with the Council’s Engineering Code of Practice (available on the Council’s website) and at Council service centres and libraries. Such work shall be carried out by the Council at the owner’s expense.

7.8 Where a customer supplies and installs a new or altered supply pipe up to the point of supply, the customer shall contact the Council to arrange an inspection and obtain written approval of the completed works prior to covering the supply pipe.

8. **Level of Service**

8.1 The Council has target levels of service for each water supply specified in its Activity Management Plan. The Council makes every reasonable effort to achieve these levels of service.

8.2 The Council is not liable for any loss, damage or inconvenience which the customer (or any person using the supply) may sustain as a result of deficiencies in, or interruptions to, the water supply.

8.3 The Council does not guarantee any specified maximum or minimum pressure in its Council water supply and no allowance or compensation will be made or allowed on account of a change of pressure in the supply.

9. **Continuity of Supply**

9.1 The Council does not guarantee an uninterrupted supply of water to any premises, or a guarantee of water pressure.

9.2 A customer with a particular requirement for an uninterrupted level of service (flow, pressure or quality), shall be responsible for providing any necessary storage, back up facilities, or equipment to satisfy that requirement at their own expense, and should notify the Council of their particular requirements.

9.3 The Council may shut down the supply of water to any part of the District in order to maintain, repair, alter or extend its water supply network.

9.4 Where practical the Council will make every reasonable attempt to notify the potentially affected persons of a scheduled maintenance shut down of the supply before the work commences. Where immediate action is required and this is not practical, the Council may shut down the supply without notification.

9.5 The customer may use the service valve to isolate the supply to the customer’s premises. The Council does not guarantee that any Council service valve will be operational at all times.

10. **Point of Supply**
10.1 The Council shall own and maintain the service pipe from the water main up to the point of supply. For new connections, the Council shall assume ownership and maintain the service pipe from the water main up to the point of supply, upon completion of the installation and subsequent acceptance by the Council.

10.2 A customer shall own, and maintain and be responsible for the supply pipe between the point of supply and the customer's premises.

10.3 Any new water connection, installed after the adoption of this Bylaw, shall be located and installed in accordance with the Waimakariri District Council’s Engineering Code of Practice, available at the service centres, libraries, and on the Council’s website.

10.4 The following diagram indicates a typical layout of the point of supply for a standard premises.

![Service Pipe Feeding Individual Property Diagram]

10.5 The following three diagrams indicate different scenarios for the layout of multiple points of supply for properties on private “rights of way” or private lanes.
Single Service Pipe Feeding Multiple Properties

Service Pipes Feeding Multiple Properties with Multiple Service Valves

Note: The above layout is NOT to be used on new properties.

Note: All new multiple properties are serviced using this method, unless specifically approved otherwise by the Council.
Service Pipe Feeding Multiple Properties Without a Main Service Valve And With an Easement in Gross

Note: The above method is not to be used on new properties, unless specifically approved by Council, and the length of the private lane or right of way exceeds 500 metres, and the service pipe is protected by an easement in gross.

11. **Access to Point of Supply**

11.1 An authorised Council officer shall be entitled to enter premises that have a water supply on any day between 7.30am and 6pm to have access to the point of supply:

(a) Without notice in order to read the water meter, check the restrictor or undertake any necessary testing that will not interrupt the supply; or

(b) With notice being given whenever possible to check, test or undertake maintenance work that may interrupt the supply temporarily or to check whether an offence may be occurring.

11.2 At all other times the authorised officer shall give notice prior to entering premises except in emergency situations when authorised officers shall be entitled to enter premises that have a water supply at any hour without notice as specified in the Local Government Act 2002.

11.3 If an authorised officer is prevented from having access to the property at any of the above times and a return visit is required, the Council may recover actual costs for that visit from the property owner.

11.4 The customer shall ensure that the area in and around the point of supply is maintained free of soil, growth, or other matter or obstruction which prevents, or is likely to prevent convenient access by authorised officers.

12. **Protection of Water Supply**
12.1  No person other than the Council and its authorised officers or agents shall have access to any part of the water supply network unless with approval in writing from the Council, except to connect to the point of supply as specified in Section 7 Supply of Water, and to operate the service valve at the point of supply.

12.2  Except as set out in the Section 13 on Fire Hydrants, no person shall make any connection to, or otherwise interfere with, any part of the water supply network, unless with approval in writing from the Council.

12.3  The customer shall take due care not to damage any part of the water supply network, including but not limited to pipework, valves, meters, restrictors, chambers, and backflow prevention devices.

12.4  Subject to the provisions of the Local Government Act 2002, the customer shall allow the Council with or without equipment, access to any area of the premises for the purposes of determining compliance with clause 12.3.

12.5  Where, in the opinion of the Council, any pipe, tap, appliance, or fitting used in relation to any water supply at any premises has deteriorated, has been damaged or is of inferior quality or workmanship, or is causing or is likely to cause water to be wasted, or is insufficient for the proper supply of water, the Council may give the customer notice in writing requiring the defect (as specified in the notice) to be rectified within a reasonable time which shall be specified in the notice.

13.  Fire Hydrants

13.1  Only the attending fire service/s shall gain access to, and draw water from fire hydrants for the purposes of fighting fires, training and testing.

13.2  The right to gain access to, and draw water from a water supply for uses other than fire fighting (for example, flow testing or pipe flushing) shall be restricted to:

(a) The Council and its authorised officers or agents;
(b) Water abstraction consent/permit holders during the period for which the consent/permit has been issued, and only for the specified fire hydrant or dedicated tanker filling point.

14.  Working Around Buried Services

14.1  The Council shall keep permanent records (‘as-builts’) of the location of its buried services. This information shall be available for inspection at no cost to users. Charges may be levied to cover the costs of providing copies of this information.

14.2  Any person proposing to carry out excavation work shall view the as-built information records to establish whether or not Council services are located in the vicinity. Where Council services are present, copies of the relevant as-built service location information shall be present on site.

14.3  At least five working days written notice shall be given to the Council of an intention to excavate in the vicinity of its services, or the notice as required in the National Code of Practice for Utility Operators’ Access to Transport Corridors, whichever is greater.

14.4  Excavation within roadways is also subject to the permit process of the appropriate roading authority.
14.5 Where deemed necessary or requested to protect its services, the Council shall mark out to within plus or minus 0.5m on the ground the location of its services, and nominate in writing any restrictions on the work it considers necessary to protect its services. The Council may charge for this service.

14.6 When excavating and working around buried services due care shall be taken to ensure the services are not damaged, and that bedding and backfill are reinstated in accordance with the Council’s Engineering Code of Practice—(available on the Council’s website).

14.7 Any damage which occurs to any component of the Council’s water supply network shall be reported to the Council immediately. Any person causing damage is responsible to meet all of the costs associated with repairing that damage.

15. **Backflow Prevention**

15.1 It is the customer’s responsibility (under the Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act 2007 and the Building Act 2004), to take all necessary measures on the customer’s side of the point of supply to prevent water which has been drawn from the Council’s water supply from returning to that supply.

15.2 For the purposes of clause 15.1, “all necessary measures” means to take the required steps to comply with the Waimakariri District Council’s Backflow Prevention Policy includes:

- providing an adequate air gap separation, or
- the use of an approved backflow prevention device;
- the exclusion of any direct cross-connection between the Council’s potable water supply, and:
  - any other water supply (potable or non-potable)
  - any other water source
  - any storage tank
  - any other pipe, fixture or equipment containing chemicals, liquids, gases, or other non-potable substances.

Notes:

(1) A building consent is required to install any backflow prevention device to meet the requirements of Section 15.

(2) Fire protection systems that include appropriate backflow prevention measures would generally not require additional backflow prevention, except in cases where the system is supplied by a non-potable source or a storage tank or fire pump that operates at a pressure in excess of the Council’s normal minimum operating pressure.

15.3 Notwithstanding the previous clauses the Council may fit a backflow prevention device on the Council’s side of the point of supply where the customer cannot demonstrate that the risk of backflow has been managed or where the Council deems it necessary to protect the network. The Council may charge the customer for the installation of a backflow prevention device.

15.4 The Council may undertake annual testing on point of supply backflow prevention devices. The owner of the property at which the backflow prevention device is
16. **Fire Connections**

16.1 A customer whom designs any fire sprinkler system on their premises shall prevent water being drawn from the system for any purpose other than fire fighting and shall construct, install and maintain that system in good order, and for its intended purpose.

16.2 The customer shall ascertain and monitor whether the fire protection supply available is adequate for the intended purpose. When designing a fire protection system, the customer shall give due consideration to Section 9 of this Bylaw and the seasonal and daily pressure fluctuations in the water supply network.

16.3 No person shall install a new connection for fire protection unless authorised in writing by the Council to do so. Any such connection must be installed by Council’s contractors at the applicant’s expense and shall be subject to any terms and conditions specified by the Council. All fire connections shall have a Council approved detector check valve fitted at the owners expense.

16.4 The Council shall be under no obligation to provide a fire protection supply at any particular flow or pressure.

16.5 Where the supply of water to any premises is metered the Council may allow the supply of water for the purposes of fire fighting to be made in a manner which bypasses the meter, provided that:

(a) The drawing of water is possible only in connection with the sounding of an automatic fire alarm or the automatic notification of the fire brigade; or

(b) A Council approved detector check valve has been installed as part of the fire connection.

16.6 Any unmetered connection provided to supply water to a fire protection system must not be used for any purpose other than fire fighting and testing the fire protection system.

16.7 Where a fire connection has been installed in a manner or at a location whereby it is possible that water will be drawn from it for purposes other than fire fighting, the Council may install a detector check valve to ensure compliance with clause 16.6.

16.8 Fire hose reels on any premises shall not be connected to the fire connection.

16.9 Where the supply of water to any premises is metered, the customer shall connect any fire hose reels on those premises to the metered supply and not to a dedicated fire protection connection. The water supply to fire hose reels shall comply with the requirements of NZS 4503:2005 (Hand Operating Fire Fighting Equipment).

16.10 Customers intending to test fire protection systems in a manner that requires a draw-off of water, shall obtain the approval of the Council beforehand.

17. **Water Metering and Charging**

17.1 The Council may fit a water meter to any connection at any time for the purposes of determining water consumption.
17.2 If the Council resolves to introduce volumetric water charges then the Council may fit a water meter to the connection of any extraordinary user and may charge for water usage on a volumetric basis in accordance with any charges specified in the Council’s fees and charges schedule for such water usage.

17.3 Meters shall be located in a position where they are readily accessible for reading and maintenance, and if practicable immediately on the customer side of the point of supply.

17.4 The Council may recover all unpaid water charges from any premises as prescribed in the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, sections 57 to 82.

17.5 Where it is not practical to install the water meter at the point of supply, the customer shall:

(a) Provide an approved site within the premises for the water meter;
(b) Take sufficient precaution to protect the water meter from damage at all times;
(c) Ensure the water meter is readily accessible for reading;
(d) Ensure that no other devices are installed in the water meter box.

17.6 Accuracy

17.6.1 Any meter installed shall be accurate to OIML R49 for the purposes of volumetric charging.

17.6.2 The Council may test meters as and when required or as prescribed in OIML R49 (International Organisation of Metrology R49). The maximum permissible error for the upper flow rate zone \( Q_2 < Q < Q_4 \) is \( \pm 2\% \), for temperatures from 0.3 °C to 30 °C and the maximum permissible error for the lower flow rate zone \( Q_1 < Q < Q_2 \) is \( \pm 5\% \).

Note- where \( Q \) is the flow rate:
- \( Q_1 \) is the minimum flow rate;
- \( Q_2 \) is the transitional flow rate;
- \( Q_3 \) is the permanent flow rate; and
- \( Q_4 \) is the overload flow rate as defined in OIML R49-1.

17.6.3 Any customer who disputes the accuracy of a water meter would first be encouraged to carry out a self assessment. The customer may then apply to the Council for the meter to be tested, provided that the testing is not requested within three months of the last test.

17.6.4 To conduct a test, the Council shall install a temporary water meter and remove the customer’s meter to have an independent test carried out.

17.6.5 A copy of independent certification of the test result shall be made available to the customer on request.

17.6.6 If any test shows non-compliance with clause 17.6.2 above, the customer shall not be charged for the test.

17.6.7 If any test shows compliance with clause 17.6.2, the customer may be required to pay all reasonable costs associated with the Council’s testing of the water meter.

17.7 Adjustment
17.7.1 If any meter, after being tested, is found to register a greater or lesser consumption than the quantity of water actually passed through such a meter, the Council at its discretion may make an adjustment in accordance with the results shown by such tests, backdated for a period at the discretion of the Council but not exceeding 12 months, and the customer may be required to pay a greater or lesser amount according to the adjustment.

17.7.2 Where a meter is under-reading by more than 20% or has stopped, the Council reserves the right to charge for the amount of water assessed as having been used over the past meter reading period, taking into account any seasonal variations in demand.

17.7.3 Where a meter is over-reading, the Council will make appropriate adjustments to the customer’s invoice(s), based on a period of similar use and backdated for a period at the discretion of the Council but not exceeding 12 months.

17.8 Estimating consumption:

17.8.1 Where a meter is damaged, ceases to register, has been removed, or where the seal or dial of a meter is broken, or the meter has otherwise been interfered with, the Council may estimate the consumption for the period since the previous reading of the water meter (based on the average of the previous four meter readings in respect of the premises) and the customer may be required to pay according to such an estimate.

17.8.2 Where by reason of a large variation of consumption due to seasonal or other causes, the average of the previous four meter readings would be an unreasonable estimate of the consumption, or where there have not been 4 previous meter readings in respect of those premises, the Council may take into consideration other evidence for the purpose of arriving at a reasonable estimate, and the customer may be required to pay according to such an estimate.

17.8.3 If water metering indicates a significant increase in consumption to a premises, which is established as being caused by a previously unknown leak, the Council may either estimate consumption as provided in clauses 17.8.1 and 17.8.2, providing that the customer repairs the leak with due diligence, or the customer shall be liable for the cost of water which passes through the water meter regardless of whether this is used or is the result of the leakage.

17.9 Incorrect accounts:

17.9.1 Where a situation occurs, other than as provided for in the previous clauses of this Bylaw, where the recorded consumption does not accurately represent the actual consumption for a premise, the account shall be adjusted using the best information available to the Council. Such situations include, but are not limited to, misreading of the meter, errors in data processing, meters assigned to the wrong account, and unauthorised supplies.

17.9.2 Where an adjustment is required, in favour of the Council or the customer, this shall not be backdated more than 12 months from the date the error was detected.

18. Restricted Connections
18.1 Any property connecting to a restricted water supply or any Rural or Residential 4 Zone property connecting to an on demand supply after the adoption of this Bylaw, shall be provided with a restricted connection.

18.2 All restricted connections must receive a minimum of two units of water, where 1 unit is equivalent to a flow of 1,000 litres per day.

18.3 The Council may install a restrictor on any property with an on-demand connection to a restricted scheme or any Rural or Residential 4 Zone property connected to an on-demand scheme.

18.4 Where the Council requires the permanent installation of a restrictor on a previously on-demand connection, the Council shall meet all reasonable costs of providing the restricted connection including the provision of the on-site storage tank, the ownership and maintenance of which shall become the customer's responsibility.

18.5 The owner of any premises at which a restricted connection is installed after the adoption of this Bylaw shall provide for a minimum on site storage facility that is equivalent to twice their daily water allocation.

18.6 The flow restrictors must be accurate to within ± 10% of their rated capacity.

18.7 An air gap separation shall be provided on the connection to the storage tank as defined by and in accordance with Clause G12 of the New Zealand Building Code.

18.8 Procedure for testing a restrictor

18.8.1 Any customer who disputes the accuracy of a restrictor may apply to the Council for it to be tested provided that the testing is not requested within three months of the last test.

18.8.2 An initial test shall be carried out by Council staff at the point of supply to determine the accuracy of the restrictor by measuring the quantity that flows through the restrictor in a period of not less than 1 minute at the operating pressure. Results will be provided to the customer on request.

18.8.3 If a customer is still not satisfied with the accuracy of the restrictor, Council staff shall install a temporary restrictor and remove the customer's restrictor to have an independent test carried out.

18.8.4 A copy of independent certification of the test result shall be made available to the customer on request.

18.8.5 If any test shows non-compliance with clause 18.6 above, the customer shall not be charged for the test.

18.8.6 If any test shows compliance with clause 18.6, the customer may be required to pay all reasonable costs associated with the Council’s testing of the restrictor.

19. Demand Management

19.1 The Council may issue water restrictions on use of potable water from any Council water supply during periods of high demand.
19.2 During an emergency, the Council may restrict or prohibit the use of water for any specified purpose, for any specified period, and for any or all of its customers.

19.3 No person shall contravene any restrictions issued by the Council to manage high seasonal or other demands or constraints on the system, which are publicly notified.

19.4 When such restrictions apply, the Council shall take all practicable steps to ensure that an adequate supply for domestic purposes is provided to each point of supply.

19.5 The customer shall not intentionally allow water to run to waste from any pipe, tap, hose, sprinkler, or other device or fitting, nor allow the condition of the plumbing within the property to deteriorate to the point where leakage or waste occurs.

19.6 The Council provides water for consumptive use, not as an energy source. A customer shall not use water or water pressure directly from the supply for driving lifts, machinery, generators, condensers or any other similar devices; unless specifically authorised by the Council in writing.

19.7 The customer must not use water for a single pass cooling system, for air conditioning, or to dilute trade waste prior to disposal, unless specifically approved by the Council.

19.8 An industrial plant shall not use water from the public water supply for cooling purposes, unless specifically approved by the Council.

20. Plumbing System

20.1 The customer shall not install or operate any devices that are likely to cause pressure surges or fluctuations that could be transmitted to the water supply network and compromise the ability of the Council to maintain its stated levels of service, unless otherwise approved by the Council.

20.2 In accordance with the Building Regulations 1992 the plumbing system shall be compatible with the water supply.

21. Delegations & Approvals

21.1 In this Bylaw where any written permission or approval of the Council is required, that approval may be given by the Chief Executive, and the Chief Executive may delegate all or part of that function to any other officer of the Council.

21.2 The form of any application for and grant of any permission or approval required under this Bylaw will be determined by the Council.

21.3 The Council may attach any terms or conditions as it thinks fit to any permission or approval granted under provisions of this Bylaw.
22.  **Offences and Breaches**

22.1 **Every person who breaches this Bylaw and commits an offence who carries out any of the following activities will be considered to have committed an offence and breached this Bylaw:**

(a) Does, permits, or allows anything to be done, which is contrary to this Bylaw or any part of it; or

(b) Fails to do or perform any act, or thing, that he or she is required to do by this Bylaw, within the time and in the manner required by this Bylaw or any part of it; or

(c) Commits any other breaches of the terms and conditions of this Bylaw; or

(d) Does anything which this Bylaw prohibits; or

(e) Fails to comply with any notice given to him or her under this Bylaw or any part of it or any condition that is part of any notice granted by the Council; or

(f) Obstructs or hinders any Council officer or other Council appointed person in performing any duty or in exercising any power under this Bylaw; or

(g) Tampers with their connection or any restrictor, or draws water from a connection or restrictor that has been tampered with.

23.  **Notices**

23.1 The Council may give notice to any person in breach of this Bylaw to carry out any remedial action in order to comply with the Bylaw and every such notice shall state the time within which the remedial action is to be carried out, and may be extended at the Council’s discretion.

23.2 If after the time specified in the notice in Clause 23.1, the customer persists in the breach, the Council reserves the right to reduce the flow rate of water to the customer without notice.

23.3 In such an event, the full service of the supply shall be re-established only after payment of the appropriate fee and remedy of the breach to the satisfaction of the Council.

23.4 In addition, if the breach is such that the Council is required to disconnect the supply for health and safety considerations, such disconnection may be carried out forthwith by Council with no notice.

24.  **Penalties**

24.1 Subject to anything to the contrary, every person who commits an offence against this Bylaw shall be subject to the penalties set out in Section 242(4) of the Local Government Act 2002.

24.2 Under Section 163 of the Local Government Act 2002 the Council or an authorised agent appointed by it, may remove or alter any work or thing that is or has been constructed in breach of this Bylaw.

24.3 The Council may recover the costs of removing or altering the work or thing that is in breach of this Bylaw from the person who committed the breach. This does not relieve that person of liability for the breach.
24.4 Under Section 162 of the Local Government Act 2002 the Council may apply to the District Court for the grant of an injunction restraining a person from committing a breach of this Bylaw.

24.5 The Council may seize and impound property not on private land that is materially involved in the commission of an offence, under and in accordance with Section 164 of the Local Government Act 2002.

24.6 The Council may seize and impound property from private land that is involved in the commission of an offence, under and in accordance with Section 165 of the Local Government Act 2002.

24.7 The Council will deal with any property seized and impounded in accordance with Sections 167 and 168 of the Local Government Act 2002.

25. **Fees**

25.1 The Council may in accordance with Section 150 of the Local Government Act 2002 prescribe fees or charges payable for any certificate, approval, permit or consent form or inspection made by the Council under this Bylaw.

25.2 The customer may be liable to pay for the use of water on a volumetric basis, and the Council may install a water meter on any premises for this purpose.

25.3 The customer shall be liable to pay for the water and related services in accordance with the Council’s fees and charges prevailing at the time. A Development Contribution levied under the Local Government Act 2002 may also be payable for new connections as specified in the Council’s Development Contributions Policy. A Financial Contribution charge may be payable as determined in accordance with the Resource Management Act 1991.

26. **Transfer of Rights and Responsibilities**

26.1 The customer shall not transfer to any other party the rights and responsibilities set out in this Bylaw.

26.2 A supply pipe shall serve only one premises, and shall not extend by hose or any other pipe beyond that premises, unless authorised in writing by the Council.

26.3 In particular and not in limitation of the above, any water which the customer draws from the Council water supply shall not be provided to any other party without the approval of the Council.

27. **Change of Ownership**

27.1 In the event of a premises changing ownership the Council shall record the new owner as being the customer at that premises.

27.2 Where a premises is metered the outgoing customer shall give the Council five working days notice to arrange a final meter reading.

28. **Disconnection at the Customer’s Request**

28.1 The customer shall give 20 working days notice in writing to the Council of the request for disconnection of supply. Disconnection, if approved, shall be at the customer’s
expense and the Council may require the customer to obtain a resource consent for the disconnection.

28.2 In accordance with the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002, any disconnection from the Council water supply (whether initiated by customer or the Council) shall not necessarily release the customer from liability for incurred or ongoing water charges.

29. **Dispensing Powers**

29.1 The Council may waive full compliance with any provision of this Bylaw in a case where the Council is of the opinion that full compliance would needlessly cause harm, loss or inconvenience to any person or business without any corresponding benefit to the community. The Council may in its discretion impose conditions of any such waiver.

30. **Serving of Notices and Documents**

30.1 Except as otherwise expressly provided for in any Act, where any notice, order or other document is required to be served on any person for the purposes of this Bylaw, the Council may serve notice by:

(a) Delivering it personally
(b) Sending it by messenger
(c) Sending it by registered post to the person’s last known place of residence or business.

30.2 If that person is absent from New Zealand, the notice may be sent to his or her agent instead of to that person.

30.3 If that person has no known name or address or is absent from New Zealand and has no known agent, and the notice relates to any land or building, the notice may be served on the occupier, or if there is no occupier the notice may be put on some conspicuous part of the land or building without the notice naming the owner or occupier.

30.4 If that person has died, the notice may be served on his or her personal or legal representative or executor.

30.5 Where a notice is sent by registered post it will be sent to arrive in the normal course no later than when the notice is required to be served and will be deemed to have been served at the time when the registered letter would be delivered in the ordinary course of post.

31. **Review of Bylaw**

31.1 The Bylaw shall be reviewed by March 2017 November 2028.

31.2 This Bylaw can be reviewed at any other time before that date at the discretion of the Council.

32. **Commencement Date**

32.1 This Bylaw comes into force on 63 April November 2012, being the day at which the Waimakariri District Council in its meeting confirmed the making of this Bylaw by public resolution.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE AUDIT AND RISK COMMITTEE HELD IN THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 18 SEPTEMBER 2018 COMMENCING AT 3.30PM.

PRESENT

Deputy Mayor Felstead (Chairperson), Mayor D Ayers, Councillors A Blackie, K Barnett and P Williams

IN ATTENDANCE

Councillors D Gordon, J Meyer, W Doody
Messrs J Palmer (Chief Executive), J Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support), G Meadows (Policy Manager), H Street (Corporate Planner), P Christensen (Finance Manager) and Mrs A Smith (Committee Advisor)

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON FOR THIS MEETING

In the absence of the Committee Chairperson Councillor N Atkinson, Mr Millward opened the meeting and called for nominations for a Chairperson for this meeting.

Moved Councillor Blackie seconded Councillor Williams

THAT Deputy Mayor Felstead be appointed as Chairperson of the Committee for the duration of this meeting.

CARRIED

Deputy Mayor Felstead assumed the role of Chairperson at this time.

1 APOLOGIES

Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead seconded Councillor Blackie

THAT an apology for absence be received and sustained from Councillor Atkinson

CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest recorded.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee held on Tuesday 24 July 2018

Moved Councillor Williams seconded Councillor Barnett

THAT the Audit Committee

(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee, held on the 24 July 2018, as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED
4 MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising.

5 PRESENTATION/DEPUTATION

There were no presentations or deputations.

6 REPORTS

6.1 Non-Financial Performance Measures 4th Quarter Results as at 30 June 2018 – Helene Street (Corporate Planner)

G Meadows introduced recently appointed Corporate Planner Helene Street to the Committee, and the report was presented.

It was highlighted by Councillor Barnett that some of the areas reported on are not meeting the measures set. Mr Palmer suggested that as a follow up, there could be a report to relevant committees in relation to the measures that have not been met – specifically community protection performance reporting against the measures, and the Enterprise North Canterbury measure is below the measure and not within 5%. There was also a question on the performance measures not met for water services, drinking water and property management which are below target and to ask for these to be reported to the relevant committee.

Moved Councillor Barnett seconded Councillor Williams

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) Receives report no. EXC-08-03/ TRIM No. 180905101560 Non-Financial Performance Measures for the year ended 30 June 2018.

(b) Notes 71% of performance measures for the 2017/18 financial year end were achieved, 28% were nearly achieved and 1% were not achieved.

(c) Requests a report to the relevant committees on community protection, water supply and property that have not met the relevant non-financial performance measure.

CARRIED

Councillor Barnett said these reporting measures are important and gives an excellent snapshot to the Audit and Risk Committee and provides an overview of Council activities. It is timely for these measures to be reviewed and to look at are the standards in place realistic and measurable.

6.2 Capital Projects Report for the period ended 30 June 2018 – Paul Christensen (Finance Manager)

Mr Christensen presented this report covering the capital expenditure for the year ending 30 June 2018. For that year 56% of projects were complete on or time in this financial year (151 of 271 projects). This is lower than previous years, noting that the Council had an ambitious programme and there has been a lot of work done. The two biggest areas of expenditure are Roading $25.5million and Sewer $24.4 million.
Councillor Williams questioned the figure under Roading on Urban Cycleway Programme – specifically the Rangiora to Kaiapoi cycleway/walkway and the Rangiora to Woodend cycleway/walkway. It was confirmed that there was further investigation required for this figure and would be reported back to the committee. Mr Palmer noted that previously advised to Council is the total cost on the walkways, $1.72m for Kaiapoi to Rangiora, and Rangiora to Woodend is $995,000, total budget of $2.715 million for both projects.

Following a question from Councillor Barnett, it was agreed that the recommendation should include the relevant figure for the capital expenditure spent to date on projects, which is 69.3% for the 2017/18 year. This compares favourably with figures from the previous five years.

Councillor Barnett questioned the amount of carry over funding each year. Mr Palmer provided an explanation – there is an Asset Management Steering Group, who monitor each of these projects and look closely at implementation of capital programme delivery – this needs to be delivered on and to not expand on the capital programme. Mr Millward added that there are a number of actions that the Council are now taking to make sure any matters relating to capital projects are monitored, including procuring properly, to keep track of progress. Progress is also tracked on any projects that could qualify for subsidies. Any reports coming to Council on additional capital projects, will provide additional information on what the Asset Management Steering Group has undertaken to try to mitigate any extra expenditure. The threshold being used at the moment is $250,000, but there is consideration of the Asset Management Steering Group of this being reduced to $100,000 for any new capital works.

Councillor Barnett noted the two areas that stand out with projects which are late are Drainage and Recreation and asked if there is any additional work being undertaken looking at these groups. Mr Palmer acknowledged that in terms of completion rates, Drainage has been a challenge because of flood events and being redirected to other programmes of work. It is proposed to hold a workshop following the next Utilities and Roading committee meeting. This is to look at resourcing of the Three Waters area, particularly the Drainage team. In the Recreation area, the programme of work that has not been completed includes replacing of some public toilets, Oxford Cemetery improvements and other projects. Mr Palmer also provided an explanation of budget provision for neighbourhood reserves in new subdivisions, noting that this area will always generate large variances. This is a matter for debate and discussion during LTP time.

Councillor Barnett requested a change in the phrasing of the recommendation to show the actual percentage of capital spent in relation to the full Budget.

Councillor Gordon noted the Standard and Poors rating that the Council currently has and questioned is the Council in a good place to retain this rating and have the right information at the next review. Mr Palmer suggested there will be further reporting at the next two Audit and Risk Committee meetings on the capital project programme to provide more in-depth information. The next review by Standard and Poors will be undertaken in March 2019. Mr Christenson also noted that the next budget round in January is another opportunity to consider the capital expenditure programme and that the figure should be relative to the LTP and shouldn’t be getting bigger.

Mayor Ayers noted that on the charts there is reference to “Wards” and this should read “Communities”. Mayor Ayers also suggested there could be a
separate indication in the chart to show any projects that are not complete because of delays relating to developer matters. It could be worthwhile to be able to show this in the chart and it was agreed that this would be possible.

Following a question from Councillor Barnett on the implication on rating of the unspent portion of the capital funds in the current year, Mr Palmer confirmed that there is no impact as the rating is always done in arrears the following year, if the capital hasn’t been spent, it goes forward as a carry forward. There hasn’t been any over rating in this current year.

Moved Councillor Barnett seconded Councillor Blackie

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) Receives report No. 180906101922.
(b) Circulates the report to the Boards
(c) Notes that progress of the capital projects with 151 (56%) of the 271 projects on time or completed
(d) Notes that the expenditure on capital projects is 69.3% for the 2017/18 year.

CARRIED

Councillor Barnett appreciated this discussion being held and look forward to progress on managing capital expenditure going forward. Councillor Barnet supports the suggestion of Mayor Ayers of identifying the development related capital projects which has always been a significant issue at Annual Plan and Long Term Plan

Councillor Gordon supported Councillor Barnett’s comments and noted that the addition of any large capital projects in the future will need to be given careful consideration by the Council.

Following comment from Councillor Williams, Mr Palmer said a memo would be circulated confirming the budget that was agreed for the cycleway projects, and what was actually spent.

6.3 Preliminary Financial Report for the period ended 30 June 2018 – Paul Christensen (Finance Manager)

Mr Christensen presented this report which provides a preliminary financial report for the period ended 30 June 2018. The figures highlighted from the report looked at the significant variances from the budget, and it was noted that a lot of these figures are accounting adjustment items, including vested assets, gain on revaluation of forestry, depreciation, loss on disposing of assets and loss of revaluation of interest. A lot of these significant variance figures are not related to operating costs. Two other large items which were originally budgeted as capital costs but now classed as expenses, were ocean outfall repairs and the Kaiapoi wharf plan costs.

At the end of the year there was a total debt of $130 million and there was a total of $148 million budgeted in the Annual Plan. In August the Council raised another $15 million of debt, so the total debt is now $145 million.

Mayor Ayers asked if there was a budget for emergency roading work?, P Christensen advised that there is a budget for emergency work but the work required following the rain events in July 2017 was bigger than any
emergency funding. Negotiations were undertaken with NZTA to grant the Council extra subsidies to cover this. Mr Palmer added that there is a snow and rain event emergency budget but it didn’t extend to what was spent last year.

Councillor Williams noted the external debt figure of $130m, suggesting that there should be an internal debt figure included as well. Mr Millward agreed that this can be included in the report in future.

Mr Millward also noted that the roading deprecation increase figure is challenging. This is an accepted formula and it tries to calculate the valuation for future of the total network replacements.

Councillor Williams questioned the figure noted of disposal of water assets. Mr Millward provided explanation of this figure, with a “disposed of” figure refers to a book value that is still sitting in the Councils books, which may have been replaced by new assets, before the expected term of life of this asset. These figures have to be written off as an expense.

Councillor Williams suggested that when an asset needs to be replaced, funds should come from the depreciation budget for this. If any replacement is higher than the depreciation fund, it has to come from the capital funds.

Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead seconded Councillor Blackie

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) Receives report No. 180905101284.

(b) Notes that the preliminary surplus is $20.8 million, which is 4.9% better than budget for the financial year. The final audited accounts will be presented for adoption on 16th October.

CARRIED

6.4 PAYE and WHT Compliance Evaluation – Jeff Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)

Mr Millward presented this report which presents the results of a review of the Council’s PAYE and Withholding Tax that was undertaken under the Tax Risk Governance Framework that was adopted by Council in March 2018.

Overall the review, which was undertaken by PWC tax team, found that the council had a “high level of PAYE compliance”. There were three areas that was suggested required immediate action, and these are notional drivers deductions, engagement of contractors and identification of WHT obligations and payments made to non-residents.

Moved Councillor Barnett seconded Councillor Williams

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) Receives report No. 180904100814;

(b) Notes the findings, recommendations made by PWC and the Council responses, noting that all the recommendations have been accepted and are being actioned;
Notes that the Council will be making a voluntary disclosure to pay additional PAYE tax and Kiwisaver contributions.

CARRIED

6.5 Update of Register of Key Risks – September 2018 – Jeff Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)

Mr Millward presented this report which indicates that there is substantially the same view on the key risks as was assessed in March 2018 review. There are still nine major risks, some of which the Council has no control over. It has been suggested by Councillor Stewart, that water supplies need to be included also to acknowledge the risk of nitrate levels and contaminates.

Mr Millward mentioned that there is the risk of cyber attacks on Council information or infecting viruses which could stop the Council’s system working altogether. There is work being undertaken currently looking at insurance cover for such risks, both by this Council and with ALGIM.

Councillor Barnett questioned why Health and Safety is such a high rating. Mr Palmer suggested the degree is not as high as stated in the report. The Health and Safety work that the Council staff have been focused on, is that which has the most severe consequence, being death or severe injury. Mr Palmer said there has been a lot of work done on this in the last six months. One area of concern has been driver safety and Council vehicles are kept as safe as they can be and staff undertake driving instructions.

It was agreed that the risk of nitrate contamination should be added into the chart under the Public Health and Safety section. There was mention made of individual water supplies from individual wells which may need to be considered in the future. There was discussion on the level of risk that this should be set at and noted that this was a difficult level to assess.

Mayor Ayers asked in the development of a risk register such as this, to what extent do Council look out decades. Mr Palmer said with matters such as climate change or an alpine fault, these are high risk and currently the Council has insurance cover for earthquake damage. The Council will need to be including climate change in its Annual Plan within the next two years. Should the Council be looking at areas where people live and the issue of retreat will need to be considered and will be challenging for all communities to deal with.

Councillor Barnett questioned is the Council looking at the financial risk with any issues with controlling nitrate levels in our water supplies and to make the supplies compliant. Mr Palmer said when a regulatory framework is introduced, with a limit, the question will be has the Council got a solution which is likely to meet these regulations. This will translate into a financial risk to the Council.

Councillor Williams spoke on the risk of climate change, noting issues already experienced in Dunedin with pipework lifting out the ground. Councillor Williams asked is the Council mitigating the risk now for new work that is being undertaken. Mr Palmer said the Council is thinking about this in terms of rainfall events with modelling that is being undertaken. The coastal communities are the most vulnerable, both the liquefaction risk and pump risk. Some new sewer systems are now pressure systems as opposed to gravity systems in parts of Pegasus and Beach Grove. The Council is starting to consider where any new developments would be located in relation to the projected sea water rise.
Councillor Gordon asked if tenant negligence should be included as a measure in the Risk Register. Mr Millward said this could be included as a general risk.

At 5.05pm the meeting adjourned and a briefing was held to consider an issue with tenants in Council properties. The meeting resumed at 5.20pm.

Moved Mayor Ayers seconded Councillor Williams

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) Receives report No180906102540.
(b) Receives the Register of Key Risks;
(c) Notes there have been no significant changes in risk ratings;
(d) Notes there are nine risks that remain rated as high risk, even after applying actions to mitigate the effects. These primarily relate to the risk of natural disasters and growth.

CARRIED

Mayor Ayers suggested that there needs to be serious consideration given to the issue of Climate Change.

7 PORTFOLIO UPDATES

7.1 Audit, Risk, Long Term Plan and Excellence Programme – Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead

The LTP document made it to the final ten of the SOLGM competition, but didn’t make it to the top five. Throughout this process there were some favourable comments received.

7.2 Communications – Councillor Neville Atkinson

Councillor Atkinson was absent.

8 QUESTIONS

There were no questions.

9 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

There was no urgent general business.

10 MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead seconded Councillor Barnett

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of:</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the Public Excluded Portion of the Audit and Risk Committee meeting of 24 July 2018</td>
<td>Confirmation of Minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>Report of Jolanda Simon (Chief Information Officer)</td>
<td>Multi-year Technology One licensing contract</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>Report of Jeff Millward, (Manager Finance and Business Support)</td>
<td>Procurement maturity assessment and contract management assessment</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>Report of Jeff Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)</td>
<td>Tranche 10 Electricity Tender</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>Report of Jeff Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)</td>
<td>Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trustee Appointment</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1 – 10.5</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CARRIED**

**CLOSED MEETING**

**Resolution to resume in Open Meeting**

Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead seconded Councillor A Blackie

**THAT** open meeting resumes and the business discussed with the public excluded remains public excluded.

**CARRIED**
OPEN MEETING

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 6.15pm.

CONFIRMED

____________________________
Chairperson

____________________________
Date
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY AND RECREATION COMMITTEE
HELD IN THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 18 SEPTEMBER 2018 AT 1.00PM.

PRESENT

Councillor A Blackie (Chairperson), Mayor D Ayers, Councillors K Barnett, R Brine, W Doody and D Gordon.

IN ATTENDANCE

Councillors K Felstead, P Williams and J Meyer
Messrs C Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation), J Palmer (Chief Executive), C Brown (Community Green Space Manager), Mrs T Sturley (Community Team Manager) and Mrs E Stubbs (Minute Secretary).

1 APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

No conflicts of interest were noted.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee held on Tuesday 24 July 2018

Moved Councillor Gordon  seconded Councillor Brine

THAT the Community and Recreation committee:

(a) Amends the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee Item 7.3 should read;

Councillor Doody
• Commented that the Oxford Winter Festival of Light had been well attended.
• The Ashley Gorge Reynolds Heritage Pavilion was going well.
• Attended the Social Services Waimakariri meeting.

Councillor Barnett
• Councillor Barnett met with Martin Pinkham of Wellbeing North Canterbury and advised Wellbeing North Canterbury was in a good position financially, they had a new Trustee.
• Had met with T Sturley and highlighted that there was available funding for emergency housing following extreme weather events. This was not well known in the social services sector.
• Had attended two networking forums for the Migrants and Newcomers group and commented on the outstanding work of this group. Mr Palmer advised staff had been canvassed to find those with a second or third language who were willing to volunteer time to assist with interpretation. The interpretation would assist with customer service however would not extend to providing advice due to the translation risk. The service was related to Council customer service.

(b) Confirms the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee, held on Tuesday 24 July 2018, as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED
4 MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising.

5 DEPUTATIONS

There were no deputations.

6 REPORTS

6.1 Community Team Update to 31 August 2018 – Tessa Sturley (Community Team Manager)

T Sturley advised the report was to outline the key activities of the Community Team for July August 2018. She noted that the Terms of Reference for the Waimakariri Health Advisory Group were still under review. A draft would be presented for approval at the November meeting. T Sturley highlighted the progress in the areas of work noted in the recommendation.

The Careers Expo for Migrants and Newcomers and the English Language Classes were two initiatives that helped empower the Migrants and Newcomers community. In the English Language Classes there were eleven nationalities represented. A more advanced class was now being held which focused on people being able to complete the IELTS test which was a requirement for seeking a work visa. The careers expo was led by a newly developed migrant employment agency developed by one of the members of the migrants group. The seminar had and audience of twenty and highlighted local opportunities.

T Sturley noted the locally based ‘Reach Out’ had been moved to a Christchurch-based Integrated Safety Response Model (ISR). This programme was mandated, classroom based rather than ‘walk alongside’. Violence Free North Canterbury members valued the long term empowerment focus where the aim was for men to manage and women to stop tolerating. T Sturley advised she had met with ISR leadership and met with good response around scoping a proposed programme.

The District-wide roll out of a mentor driver-licensing programme would make a difference in people’s lives by helping prevent social isolation. There were ten partners with local agencies. The programme would sit under Oxford Community Trust.

The supported Youth Housing initiative came out of identified need for supportive housing for local young people transitioning to independent living without support or skills. There was potential for the service to be similar to the Abbeyfield model. There was interest from the Ministry of Social Development.

The Age Friendly Community project was well underway. There was a steering group being pulled together and there was assistance from a University of Canterbury Lecturer specialising in this area. A tertiary student would assist with the plan.

T Sturley advised that from 10am to 12pm on Tuesday 2 October there would be the presentation of a draft concept plan for development of a Community House. Members were welcome to attend. C Sargison advised that the Community House Steering Group would be invited to present to the November meeting.

Questions
Councillor Gordon referred to the supported living project and asked if T Sturley was aware of the discussions with Rob Hawthorne around options.

Councillor Williams referred to the 100 members in attendance of North Canterbury Grey Power and asked if there could be a breakdown on that feedback. T Sturley advised that it had been a discussion forum, she was not sure of how that had been documented however would discuss with the staff member concerned and could provide feedback from GreyPower.

Mayor Ayers referred to social housing in general and asked T Sturley if there was evidence of people from the Waimakariri District going into social housing provided by the Christchurch City Council. T Sturley replied she would raise with Tina Robinson as she would have those numbers.

Councillor Doody referred to funding received by the Hurunui District Council for the elderly and asked if that was available in the Waimakariri. T Sturley replied they had received $11,600 external funding, and were also supporting HDC in the development of their plan.

Moved Councillor Doody seconded Mayor Ayers

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 180906102187
(b) Notes, in particular, progress in the following areas of work:
   (i) Empowerment and skills-development for migrants (Item # 4.1.2 and 4.1.3)
   (ii) Empowerment-focussed family violence prevention (Item 4..3.3)
   (iii) District-wide rollout of Mentor Driver Licencing (Item 4.5)
   (iv) Supported Youth Housing initiative (Item 4.6.2)
   (v) Age Friendly Community initiative (Item 4.7.1)

CARRIED

Councillor Doody congratulated T Sturley on a good presentation and thanked the team for working hard in the community.

Mayor Ayers added to the report on the driver licencing programme, the importance of driver licencing for jobs. LTNZ and the Mayor’s Taskforce were also promoting driver licencing. With regard to Age Friendly Community Development it was important to have a community that supported elderly people.

6.2 Community Year in Review Report – Tessa Sturley (Community Team Manager)

C Sargison noted the Year in Review report was not attached to the agenda but was in Diligent Board.

T Sturley advised the purpose of the report was to present of overview of the work of the community team for the 2017-2018 financial year and to celebrate the incredible work of the community. The team was in a fortunate position to have strong relationships within the community. The report acknowledged the support of philanthropic funders. T Sturley drew attention to the ‘Top 5’ achievements and to looking forward to next year. She noted as well as those highlighted the report detailed more achievements.
1. The roll out of ‘TimeBank Waimakariri’ was a highlight. It was a community led approach from inception to incorporated society status. It provided a learning exchange where anyone’s skills could be celebrated.

2. The Youth Development Strategy followed sound practice and was well researched. She looked forward to the final documents release in October.

3. There had been a tremendous amount of work in the migrant portfolio including a more migrant led approach by the steering group. There had been an increase in the number of English language classes. The ‘Migrant Stories’ video had been released and had facilitated connection and understanding.

4. Working with neighbourhoods was continuing including supporting community groups and a holding a neighbourhood park event in Kippenberger Estate.

5. Raising awareness and facilitating action to address suicide and family violence. There had been good feedback in terms of results and work being done.

Looking forward to 2018-2019 T Sturley advised of a priorities including;

- Supporting Learning Exchange and Timebank.
- Encouraging and supporting the local Youth Services sector. Noted overstretched providers with increasing Mental Health issues. The Youth Development Facilitator would focus on bringing the Youth Services sector back together for collaborative focus on issues.
- Continuing to work with neighbourhoods.
- Continuing to empower migrants for a more welcoming and inclusive district.
- Age Friendly Plan for the District.
- An empowerment-based approach to addressing Family Violence and Suicide.

Moved Councillor Barnett seconded Councillor Gordon

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) Receives report No: 180906102542

CARRIED

Councillor Barnett referred to the indicator results commenting that they were stunning results and noting the 85% of respondents satisfied with the information about what happening in the district. She congratulated the team on receiving over 10,000 monthly hits on the community page of the WDC website. They were achieving measureable results.

Councillor Gordon concurred with Councillor Barnett and noted the achievements listed in the Year in Review. He had attended the Timebank launch and was hopeful with new enthusiasm there would be positive results. He had attended the Kippenberger Estate park event which was a successful model. The work in the migrant community was superb and the ‘Migrant Stories’ video was a high quality piece of work. He noted the work of the Youth Development Facilitator. He commented that collectively the Community
Team should be proud of what they were achieving in partnership with the community.

Mayor Ayers congratulated the team. He noted that in his last 8 years of performing Citizenship Ceremonies there had been 50 different nationalities introduced in the community.

Councillor Doody commented positively on the work of the Migrant and Newcomers Group.

6.3 Aquatic Facilities Update – to 31 August 2018 – Matthew Greenwood (Aquatic Facilities Manager)

C Sargison spoke briefly to the report highlighting customer service improvements. Feedback from the schools pilot with SwimDesk software had been very good. It enabled regular email updates and allowed a more tailored useful programme to be delivered. It was a huge step forward in terms of quality delivery to schools.

The customer survey process was being refined, tablets had been used in the facility, the next survey would be refined further so it could be completed from home and better responses were expected.

Moved Councillor Doody seconded Councillor Gordon

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 180809089646

(b) Notes Aquatic Facilities achievement against key performance indicators including Water Quality and Facility Attendance.

(c) Notes that the year end result for the Aquatic Facilities for the 2017/18 financial year.

CARRIED

Councillor Doody congratulated the aquatic Facilities Manager on the improvements.

6.4 Library Update to 31 August 2018– Philippa Ashbey (District Libraries Manager)

C Sargison advised that P Ashbey had resigned and would be finishing in mid-December. They were not progressing filling the vacancy until the Community and Recreation Manager position was filled. While there would still be programmes running, staff would not be initiating new customer service improvements until there was a new manager. The series of highlights in Item 4.1 were pleasing.

AnyQuestions was a programme that allowed anyone in New Zealand to have a live chat with a qualified reference librarian. C Sargison highlighted that a live chat session with a member of the Waimakariri Reference Team had been recorded and adapted as a model of good service.

The ‘Good Read’ bookmark was a low key initiative that older people were engaging with well. C Sargison noted the near 97% of satisfied or very satisfied response in the annual Customer Satisfaction Survey.

Councillor Barnett noted that while the whole report was positive, there was a slightly lower level of satisfaction with eResources and asked if there was potential to develop that area. C Sargison relied that changes had been made to purchasing, previously they had brought as part of a consortium, but now they were able to individually select while still getting the consortium
discounts. Staff were reviewing constantly the borrowing statistics to see what was popular and it had already made a difference with a greater range available.

Moved Councillor Barnett  seconded Councillor Gordon

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180906102191
(b) **Notes** the customer service improvements, and activities and events, provided by the Waimakariri Libraries in July and August 2018.
(c) **Notes** the positive feedback gathered through the Libraries’ annual Customer Satisfaction Survey that was conducted in June 2018.
(d) **Circulates** the report to the Boards for their information.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Barnett commented that the library was showing a high level of service, it was a place of meeting and great community connectivity.

Councillor Gordon endorsed the comments of Councillor Barnett and was sad to note the departure of P Ashbey complementing her on an outstanding job. She had been involved more broadly in the arts and supported the Arts Collection Trust.

Mayor Ayers endorsed the comments of Councillor Barnett and Gordon and noted P Ashbey’s role on the acquisition panel of the Art Collection Trust. The libraries were a great space and there was good feedback from the community. He noted the role of the libraries in supporting te reo Maori including school sessions. Librarian Jason Clement was a published poet who would be attending the Enshi Poetry Festival furthering the relationship with the ‘Sister City’.

6.5 **Community Facilities – User applications for exemption from Fees – Chris Brown (Community Greenspace Manager)**

C Brown spoke to the report regarding community facilities fee exemptions. Staff were seeking a decision from the committee regarding the eight applications for fee exemptions received. Following the July 2018 increase to fees and charges that delegation had been passed onto the committee. Some of the events were one off and others were recurring. C Brown indicated there would be further reports to the committee of this nature.

With regard to the Waimak Wee Ones, the proposal was for a 50% fee waiver such that they would be charged for one meeting room but could use two. Variable numbers meant it was hard to predict what was required. The time of use of the rooms had never caused conflict.

Councillor Brine referred to Fernside School’s use of the Fernside Hall for $500 annual flat fee. This had not changed since 2012 in which time he believed school fees would not have remained level. He did not know how the fee could be decided when the usage was not known. C Sargison advised that Fernside School fundraised for the $500 and were unofficial caretakers of the hall. For this reason it was proposed to leave at $500. The school completed a lot of unpaid cleaning and kept an eye on the hall, it had never created a problem. The school had tennis courts which the community was able to use.

Councillor Barnett commented there was a huge response to the fee increases and asked if staff saw an issue. She noted that the exemption applications came from existing groups and asked if the fees could prevent
new groups from starting who were not aware they could request exemptions. C Brown advised that new groups would be able to apply for an exemption. There could be an issue with one off events that were not in a committee reporting cycle before the event. Customer service staff were actively promoting the form and they were expecting more applications.

Councillor Barnett asked if it looked inconsistent – some groups were receiving a rebate whereas others were paying full rate. C Brown noted there was a standard application form. C Sargison commented that for fairness they had provided all the information that groups had provided and a summary of the applications was included. The Craft Market Oxford have been paying the historical rate for some time which was why it was listed separately.

C Sargison advised for the Annual Plan there could be a short report to summarise this year compared to last year to show trends and provide facts.

Moved Councillor Gordon seconded Councillor Blackie

**THAT** the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180907102652.

(b) **Notes** the submissions for exemption from fees received from users.

(c) **Approves** a 50% reduction in booking fee for Dementia Canterbury for community workshops for 2018/19.

(d) **Approves** Toot for Tucker having the use of Dudley pavilion for no cost for their annual event 2018/19.

(e) **Approves** a 50% reduction in booking fee for Waimak Wee Ones for use of the Woodend Community Centre meeting rooms for their weekly booking for 2018/19.

(f) **Approves** Mah Jong continuing to use Dudley Pavilion for $12 per hour for 2018/19.

(g) **Approves** a 50% reduction in booking fee for Woodend Beach Country Music Club for use of Woodend Community Centre meeting rooms for 2018/19.

(h) **Approves** Oxford Craft Market using Oxford Town Hall for their monthly meeting at $8 per hour, for 2018/19.

(i) **Approves** one-off waiver of fees for West Eyreton Miniature Rifle Club event for Big Brothers/Big Sisters.

(j) **Notes** that Fernside School has traditionally used Fernside Hall for an annual fee of $500.

(k) **Approves** a fee of $500 for Fernside School for the use of the Fernside Hall for 2018/19.

(l) **Circulates** the report to the Boards for their information.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Gordon commented that there had been an understanding there would be feedback once the new rates came into effect. He was very happy to be approving the reduction. He noted some groups were being retained at the historical rate which was why he was comfortable with the recommendation. Other groups could come back for a rebate or go to the Boards for a discretionary grant.

Councillor Blackie commented there would always be inconsistencies as it was the nature of the situation involving community groups. There was the problem of existing usage rights. He was happy to support.
Councillor Brine commented that he had raised Fernside Hall usage since it had been a long time since they had had a fee increase. He was happy with approving due to the community use of the school courts as ‘quid pro quo’.

Councillor Barnett was happy to support however she was looking for consistency. She understood historic lower fees but wanted to encourage new activities. New groups may see the prices and be discouraged. Service and non-profit groups could apply for discount as long as that was communicated. She had concerns that legitimate community groups could be discouraged from using community facilities. She would like to see good communication around the use of community facilities.

Mayor Ayers commented the short list were a microcosm of a variety of groups. Setting a rate had in-built inconsistencies. The groups served a purpose and were largely volunteers or supported by volunteers which was a feature of life in any community in New Zealand. He supported the groups.

6.6 **Councillor Appointment to Waimakariri Youth Council – Craig Sargison** (Manager Community and Recreation)

C Sargison spoke briefly to the report commenting it was a matter of housekeeping.

Moved Councillor Brine Mayor Ayers

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180906102172.

(b) **Approves** the appointment of Councillor Barnett to replace Councillor Doody as the Council representative on the Waimakariri Youth Council.

(c) **Notes** that Mayor Ayers and Councillor Gordon will continue to also be the Council representatives on the Waimakariri Youth Council.

CARRIED

7 **PORTFOLIO UPDATES**

7.1 **Greenspace (Parks Reserves and Sports Grounds) – Councillor Robbie Brine**

Nothing new to report.

7.2 **Community Facilities (including Aquatic Centres, Halls, Libraries and Museums) – Councillor Wendy Doody**

- Councillor Doody noted the Ashley Gorge Reynolds Pavilion had a soft opening with the builders handing over the building to the community, the builders had appreciated the historical nature of the project. Staff including C Sargison and C Brown attended the handover. The group had worked very hard to raise the funds.
- Councillor Doody had appreciated being able to attend the ENC business awards and noted the local Oxford business Cruisy Diner receiving runner up.
- Waimakariri Access Group – Jill Waldron was stepping down and C Greengrass was taking on the role. Councillor Doody acknowledged the work of J Waldron and how much she had achieved.

7.3 **Community Development and Wellbeing – Councillor Kirstyn Barnett and Councillor Wendy Doody**
• Councillor Barnett noted Wellbeing North Canterbury Trust receiving the Community Enterprise award and Lesley Ottey the Step Change Environmental award.
• Councillor Barnett had the privilege of attending the Canterbury Youth Award and noted that Oxford Ohoka Community Board member Thomas Robson had received the overall Waimakariri Youth Award and Zoe Loffhagen the overall Canterbury Award.
• Attended the River Trust Kaiapoi business Community Empowerment Speaker breakfast

It was noted that Clarkville School had received the Canon Oceania Grant for their work in Silverstream. In addition a number of Waimakariri school students had received awards for their environmental efforts around the district.

8 QUESTIONS

There were no questions.

9 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

There was no urgent General Business.

NEXT MEETING

The next scheduled meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee is 1pm, Tuesday 20 November, in the Council Chambers at the Rangiora Service Centre, 215 High Street, Rangiora.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING CLOSED AT 2.19PM.

CONFIRMED

_______________________
Chairperson

________________________
Date
| 1. | **Present:** | Andrew Besuyen (Co-Chair), Ellie Tizzard, Caitlin Tipping, Jacob Harford, Olivia Silby, Alex Jackson, David Ayers (WDC - Mayor), Eris Le Compte (Minute Secretary). |
| 2. | **In Attendance:** | Michelle Flanagan, Waimakariri District Council Regeneration Team. |
| 3. | **Apologies:** | Kirstyn Barnett (WDC - Councillor), Sam Redman (WDC), Arabella Jarman (Co-Chair), Stella Graydon, Katie Lange, Dan Gordon (WDC Councillor). |
| 4. | **Recovery Plan for red-zoned area in Kaiapoi** | Michelle Flanagan explained the recovery vision for red zoned areas in Kaiapoi and is looking for ideas/input for consultation. Feedback is required to be placed with the Regeneration Team before 3 November. Andrew/Sam hope to arrange a group meeting prior to 3 November. |
| | **ACTIONS:** | Ideas and feedback to either Andrew or Sam before 3 November please. |
| 4. | **Mayor David Ayres** | Up for discussion is the Draft Zone Implementation Plan Addendum covering surface water in streams, ground water, native species, plants, farming practices. Also discussions for future planning around climate change and coastal communities. Meetings continue between the three councils of Christchurch, Selwyn and Waimakariri around the future growth between the three areas. |
| | **ACTIONS:** | |
| 5. | **Vision for Youth Development Strategy** | Andrew Besuyen is to liaise with Sam re young people of the district engaging in activities and it is hoped to arrange another meeting of the working group preferably before 9 October. |
| | **ACTIONS:** | Andrew and Sam to liaise. |
| 6. | **General Business** | Hoodies Andrew will check with Sam as to where the hoodies are at. | **ACTIONS:** | Andrew |
| | Youth Council Defence Hui | Andrew Besuyen This is being held in Christchurch on 12 October. One person from each youth council has been invited to attend. Contact Andrew if interested. | **Expressions of interest to** | Andrew/Sam |
**Sustainable Transport Meetings**

Being held at Ara Institute of Canterbury Thursday 27 September between 4.30 – 8pm. Contact either Sam or Andrew if transport required.

**Volunteers required**

| Andrew Besuyen |

Volunteers are required to man activity stations at an event at Trousslet Park, Charles Street, Kaiapoi on 14 October between the hours of 10am – 2pm. Further information from Nicola Trolove at the Waimakariri Community Team. Contact Andrew if interested in helping with this.

**Volunteers for Youth Grant**

| Andrew Besuyen |

A volunteer is required to sit in on interviews for the above grant. Two dates are involved; 1 October and 17 October. These interviews are to be held in the Rangiora Council rooms. Caitlin possibly expressed an interest in helping.

**Transport Submissions**

Submissions for the Regional Transport Plan are to be ready by next meeting.

---

**Meeting closed at 7.47 pm**

**Next meeting** on Tuesday 30 October 2018 at 7pm in the Rakahuri Room, at the Rangiora Service Centre.

---

Chair  

Date
MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE REGENERATION STEERING GROUP HELD IN THE RUATANIWHA KAIAPoi CIVIC CENTRE ON MONDAY 1 OCTOBER 2018 AT 4.00PM

PRESENT:
Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust C McMillan, D Ayers (Mayor), J Palmer (Chief Executive), C Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation), D Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager - District Regeneration).

IN ATTENDANCE:
C Brown WDC, S Lodge WDC, S Hart WDC.

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received and sustained from C McKay, J Watson, M Pinkham, and P Redmond, R Wallace for absence.

An apology was received and sustained from C McMillian, and J Palmer for lateness.

Moved: N Atkinson
Seconded: C Greengrass

CARRIED

S Stewart noted she has put in a standing apology to the Regeneration Steering Group meeting for when this meeting clashes with the Water Zone Committee meeting. S Stewart noted this was not reflected in the last Regeneration Steering Group meeting minutes and asked that it be noted she was an apology for the 3 September Regeneration Steering Group meeting.

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Moved: N Atkinson
Seconded: A Blackie

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group:

Confirms as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting held on Monday 3 September 2018.

CARRIED
3. MATTERS ARISING

D Roxborough gave an update on the current Reserves Master Plan consultation. A briefing was held at the Executive Runanga meeting on 20 September, and another briefing was held at the Youth Council meeting on 25 September. Letters have been sent out to interested and directly affected parties. Information is available on the website. D Roxborough advised that at the Executive Runanga meeting initial feedback was received that the Runanga are supportive of the draft Reserves Master Plan and have advised they are working on the suggested names for the reserves. This will exclude the Norman Kirk Reserve that has been named through a separate process. There have been two hard copy submission forms returned, and seven Facebook comments received.

The consultation period closes on Friday 5 October and a report will be prepared for the 5 November Regeneration Steering Group meeting.

4. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

4.1 AA Bees North Canterbury Club – Susani Gebhardt

Susani Gebhardt from the AA Bees North Canterbury Club gave a presentation to the Regeneration Steering Group.

- Club has been going since 2016.
- 40 members and rising.
- The club meet twice a month – hive day and discussion evening.

S Gebhardt noted the location for the hives would be in Cass Street, East Kaiapoi Regeneration area. This would be fenced off with deer fence netting to a height of 1.8 metres. This is not only to protect the bees and people but to also protect from vandalism.

S Gebhardt noted there would be posters on the fence to inform people on what is happening with the bees at different times of the year. There would also be signs to advise people to keep out and what to do if you are stung by a bee.

R Blair asked why this particular site was chosen.

S Gebhardt replied that this site is quite sheltered, it is close to the Food Forest, and is also an area that will allow the bees to pollenate the fruit trees in the area.

5. TE KŌHAKA O TŪHAITARA TRUST UPDATE

C McMillan noted they are currently in the stage of exploring what options they do with the Regeneration land.

6. REPORTS

6.1 District Regeneration Communications Report – September 2018 – Sarah Lodge -
(Communications Advisor – District Regeneration), Duncan Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager – District Regeneration)

D Roxborough introduced Sarah Lodge to the group. Sarah has come on board as the Communications and Engagement Advisor in the District Regeneration team.

D Roxborough noted in regard to Clause 4.2 with the Enabling works planning to start soon that staff are working on the Communications and Engagement plan for this work. This will include some start works notices and maps informing of the changes that will be coming to the roads over the coming months.

D Roxborough noted in regard to Clause 4.3 and 4.4 that the Regeneration E-newsletter and video were both issued last Friday.
D Roxborough noted the joint Honda and Council media release will now be announced in October.

C Sargison noted the Honda sponsorship agreement will be ready to be signed in the next few days.

D Ayers asked if the display board screens would also be available at Rangiora and Woodend. D Ayers noted that what is happening in the Regeneration areas is a district project and not only a Kaiapoi project.

C Sargison noted he will be meeting with the new Communications Manager to discuss how this can be shown in the other service centres.

Moved: A Blackie Seconded: N Atkinson

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group:

(a) Receives report No 180920109186.

CARRIED

6.2 Licence to Occupy, AA Bees Club North Canterbury – Roxanne Ramsay (Project Administrator – District Regeneration)

R Ramsay advised the purpose of the report is to seek approval for staff to issue a licence to occupy to the AA Bees North Canterbury Club for three beehives to be located at Cass Street in the Kaiapoi East Regeneration area.

As per the recommendations, the term of the lease would be for an initial period of three years with the right of renewal. The lease fee would be set at $10.00 per annum.

As noted in the report there would be some special conditions applied as part of the licence to occupy agreement.

The club are looking for a space of approximately 20 x 20 metres. The area would be fenced with deer fence netting to a height of 1.8 metres with a lockable gate entrance.

The hives will be managed by the local Kaiapoi Commercial Bee Keeper and the club will maintain the grass inside the fenced area.

Both the AA Bees club and a council staff have been in contact with the neighbouring property owners and they have advised they are supportive of the beehives being located near their property.

R Ramsay read out the views provided by M Pinkham. M Pinkham advised he does not support the proposal to grant a licence to occupy to the AA Bees Club.

- This will create precedent for a raft of other small groups wanting a licence to set up their own activities.
- This is very close to the proposed sports field carpark.
- There are numerous other council owned locations around the district that would be far more suitable.

C Sargison noted this is a recommendation to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board and said that deer netting fencing is not a good idea as children can climb this type of fence. C Sargison noted that a different type of fence will be provided.

A Blackie noted this is a no-brainer, if we want to be alive in 50 years we need to support bees in the planet. The locals are supportive, the whole idea is an excellent project. The only possible debate is the location. A Blackie does not support M Pinkham’s comments on the bee hives being too close to the car park as it is at least 100 metres or more from the carpark.
N Atkinson noted he believes it is a great thing to do, and if the neighbouring property owners are happy then this is a good thing. N Atkinson’s views are if other small groups are wanting space to use then this will be a good thing.

D Ayers noted he supports the motion and the more activity happening in the Regeneration area the better.

Moved: A Blackie Seconded: N Atkinson

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group recommends:

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180906101921.

(b) Approves staff issuing a Licence to Occupy to the AA Bees Club North Canterbury on the basis of the standard Council Licence to Occupy agreement with the following conditions included:

i. Term of lease is for an initial period of 3 years with the right of renewal and the rental fee being $1.00 per year.

ii. The plan, spatial definition, and landscape design of the area to be approved by the Community Greenspace Manager.

iii. The club shall obtain the written approval of the Council prior to the erection of any signage and structures (including fences).

iv. The Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board have the right to terminate the contract immediately should there be any nuisance caused to the neighbouring property or the wider community, or any non-compliance with the Licence conditions.

v. The maintenance of the area will maintained to a standard that is acceptable by the Council.

CARRIED

7. CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

8. GENERAL

There was no general business.

9. NEXT MEETING

The next scheduled meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group commences at 4.00pm on Monday 5 November 2018 at the Ruataniwha Centre, Kaiapoi.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS THE MEETING CLOSED AT 4.29PM.
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE OXFORD-OHOKA COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN THE MANDEVILLE SPORTS CLUB, 431 MANDEVILLE ROAD, SWANNANOA
ON WEDNESDAY 3 OCTOBER 2018 AT 7.00PM.

PRESENT
D Nicholl (Chair), W Doody, J Ensor, S Farrell, K Felstead, J Lynn and T Robson.

IN ATTENDANCE
S Markham (Manager, Strategy and Engagement), C Brown (Green Space Manager), J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager), Owen Davies (Drainage Asset Manager), Libica Hurley (Technical Administrator), D Ayers (Mayor), E Cordwell (Governance Adviser) and E Stubbs (Minute Secretary).

Sixteen members of the public were present in the gallery for Item 5.1.

1 APOLOGIES
Moved W Doody seconded J Lynn
An apology was received and sustained from M Brown for absence. CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Item 7.4 – K Felstead as a member of the Oxford Community Men’s Shed Trust.
Item 5.2 - J Ensor as Chair of the Mandeville Residents’ Association.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board – 6 September 2018

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
(a) Amends the circulated minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting, held 6 September 2018, Page 13, Paragraph 3 should read ‘staff should not be asked to park on the roadside at night.’
(b) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting, held 6 September 2018, as a true and accurate record.
CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
J Lynn advised that the Ohoka Gatekeeper’s Lodge Committee would be putting in a request for landscaping funding. They had been granted $3,000 for fencing and had only utilised $1,222 with $1,778 remaining which they would like to spend on landscaping around the lodge. C Brown advised there would be a report to the following meeting regarding the landscaping fund, where that request would be noted.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

5.1 Tracy Doe (Co-ordinator) and Cat Hannah (Secretary/treasurer) presented an overview of the work of North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support Inc.
(NCNS). T Doe spoke to a handout (Trim 181011118531) advising that Neighbourhood Support (NS) was a network of organisations that assists neighbourhoods and communities to be safer and to reduce crime, be prepared for emergencies, increase community connectedness and enhance well-being. She advised that there are 64 affiliated NS networks operating throughout New Zealand. Between them they provided information, resources and support to over 15,000 neighbourhood groups, who in turn connected with over 170,000 households nationwide. NS worked closely with NZ Police and Civil Defence, as well as many other community organisations. They had Memorandum of Understandings with NZ Police, Civil Defence and Community Patrol.

T Doe advised that NCNS could help local government by promoting a community-led approach so that local communities were able to develop a NS model that works best for their circumstances and location. NCNS maintained a comprehensive membership database with email and text ability and were able to provide helpful and critical information to communities when required. This was done via the platform of North Canterbury ‘GetsReady’, which was developed in response to the Christchurch earthquakes and was based on the NS network model. ‘GetsReady’ enabled localised, up-to-date and relevant information to be sent to households, including in the event of an emergency. It could, for example, pinpoint households that may be vulnerable in an emergency situation (e.g. a person who requires an electric ventilator) and match them with other households nearby who have the skills and resources to assist (e.g. emergency generator.) T Doe advised that with ‘GetsReady’ geographical areas could be targeted with information so the right people were getting the right information. Any person in a household irrespective of ownership of that address could sign up to ‘GetsReady’ to receive the information. T Doe highlighted that NS only disseminated credible information given direct from their working partners and councils. In addition ‘GetsReady’ could work collaboratively with the whole of Canterbury Region, show maps interactively of where members were and be accessed anywhere at any time as it was cloud based.

T Doe commented that they had recently completed an exercise with Civil Defence to showcase how NS would work in an emergency and see how they would fit. It was shown in the exercise that NS would sit across the whole programme – community, intelligence and welfare. T Doe advised that NS did not currently receive funding from Waimakariri District Council. An example in the Waimakariri District where there had been collaboration with Police was following of spate of trailer thefts in Kaiapoi.

T Doe provided statistics on the membership which is spread across the region. Membership was growing, in 2016 there were 98 streets engaged, there were now 560. T Doe highlighted the benefits of connected communities including that they were happier and healthier, could work together to find solutions to local issues and were prepared for emergencies.

T Doe provided an overview of how local government was involved with NS in NZ commenting that City and District Councils were an important partner for NS. 39% of the local Councils in NZ financially support NS groups. These statistics were a conservative estimate as not all groups specified where their grant income came from in their Charities Services’ returns, and the statistics do not take into account the remaining 27% of NSNZ affiliated groups who were not registered charities. T Doe advised that Council support enabled NS organisations to provide sustainable services in local communities. It was used for a variety of purposes, such as operational costs, running events and setting up and supporting the ‘GetsReady’ software.

T Doe advised that Selwyn District Council had adopted NS within their welfare team and had incorporated it into its Civil Defence organisation and response processes. In the Port Hills fires ‘GetsReady’ had been able to work across Selwyn and Christchurch and assisted with movement of stock.
Questions
S Farrell asked what 1,322 member households represented as a percentage of households in the Waimakariri. T Doe advised she could get that information. C Hannah noted they were getting 5-6 signups per day over the previous two weeks through organic growth.

S Farrell noted that WDC did not fund NCNS and asked if the Council had been approached. T Doe replied they had applied through the LTP and Annual Plan and been declined.

J Lynn asked how people could connect with GetsReady and T Doe replied through the website www.northcanterbury.getsready.net.

D Nicholl asked if the statistics referred to total households or total people and T Doe replied it was total people as people were not always together in the same household during an emergency.

D Nicholl asked if NS was aware they could apply for a Community Board Discretionary fund to a maximum of $500.

T Robson referred to the social isolation in rural areas especially the elderly and asked if NS was a platform that could help. T Doe commented that some street groups organised a barbeque once a year which was a good opportunity to create social connections. It was certainly possible in rural areas. C Hannah commented that Community Connector was a program in the Hurunui helping with social isolation in the rural community and NSNC was working closely with that group.

W Doody referred to the Port Hills fires and asked how quickly ‘GetsReady’ was able to get information out to people. T Doe replied that within 15 minutes those in Selwyn, Banks Peninsula and Christchurch registered on ‘GetsReady’ all knew where they could go and what was happening.

5.2 Louise Douglas (Mandeville Residents Association, MRA) introduced a number of speakers who wished to raise concerns regarding local issues.

MRA member (Mike) (Trim 181017121608)
M spoke to a number of photographs regarding his concerns around flooding and drainage. He advised that since 2014 flooding had been a regular occurrence at San Dona and other locations in the area. He had been at that location for 7 years. He referred to the Becca report regarding flooding remediation for Siena Place. He believed there were issues with routing the water to Bradleys Road as planned, as it was not possible to make water run up hill. There was two feet of water sitting in the drain that was stagnant and attracting mosquitos. He believed the Council’s service was poor and asked for the short term measures to be fixed properly.

O Davies commented that there was a meeting to discuss these and other complex issues with the MRA at the Council Offices on Monday 8 October.

Ian Shrimpton (Trim 181011118534 and 181017121608)
I Shrimpton advised that he lived in Wetherfield Lane, Mandeville. He highlighted key observations and outcomes alongside photo records taken during the 2014 rain event.

- The water sheeted from an overflow across 50 metres of No 10 Rd.
- During the preceding 6 years, there had never been a puddle at No. 26.
- The flooding went from nothing to inundation in 90 minutes and stopped 45mm short of entering the house.
- The access lane was wrecked with the repair quote from Isaacs, commissioned by the Insurers, at $33,000
• The stock water race on two sides of the property did not breach.

I Shrimpton advised that post flooding the WDC engineers ordered waste water holding tanks to have their lid mounts to be extended as they had flooded. He believed staff had randomly selected properties and randomly decided who would have to bear the cost. His flooding issues had been identified as owner responsibility. In addition he had been advised that the titles of all flood affected properties would have their titles amended noting the tanks as being too low. I Shrimpton advised that his property had been ticked as code compliant in 2001 and noted that after much protest the decision to amend the titles was reversed. After the photos were viewed by the WDC engineers they had decided to cover the cost at his property.

I Shrimpton commented that it had now been assessed that the cause of the flooding was caused by mismanagement of stormwater by the WDC which he believed included inept approval of new developments and zero policing of owner modifications to existing water races.

I Shrimpton asked if the Board could guarantee residents would see remedial work within 12 months and would they bring funding forward to allow this to happen.

Rosina Rouse and Tom McBrearty (Trim 181011118533)

R Rouse advised that they were speaking on behalf of the Eyre District Environmental Association Incorporated (EDEAI) and the MRA and apologised for Noel Fraser, Chairperson of the EDEAI not being able to attend the meeting.

R Rouse expressed concern about the high level of Nitrate in their water (private well). When tested it was 11.2mg/L, the maximum allowable value (MAV) was 11.3. As levels fluctuated, the MAV was likely to have been breached, making the water unsafe to drink. R Rouse advised they had been very concerned for their safety, and had researched options. Personally they had installed a reverse-osmosis filtration system installed for their drinking water and had been pleased with the results.

R Rouse advised that they were aware of elevated nitrate levels in their neighbours’ private wells. They did not know how widespread the problems with high nitrates were within the Waimakariri but they did know that a major problem existed and that it appeared to be up to individuals to do their own research and provide their own solutions. She commented that there appeared to be no plan in place for action to take when nitrate levels were high or when the MAV was breached (in private wells), although maintenance of high-quality drinking water was a First Order Priority in the Canterbury Water Management Strategy. They were concerned that in the Draft ZIPA the recommended nitrate limit for private water supply wells was 5.65mg/L and asked how that was to be achieved and what was the timeframe.

They had two questions;

• In the Waimakariri District, how are wells with high Nitrate levels, adversely affecting the supply of safe drinking water, identified, what education is provided about the dangers of high nitrate levels, and what plans have been, are, or will be, put in place to address compromised water supplies, and ensure supply of safe quality drinking water?

• At an earlier Community Board meeting EDEAI and MRA requested a Staff Report into the feasibility, timeframe required, and cost of providing a safe supply of potable water to the potentially affected residents of the district. Has this been completed and provided?
T McBrearty spoke to the decision by WDC to grant the Canterbury Landscape Supplies revised Land Use Resource Consent on 21 September 2018. He noted that the MRA and the EDEAI, and possibly the Community Board, were not consulted. Those groups had understood that a WDC decision would be made once ECan had made their decision. They also understood that the Commissioners appointed by ECan for the Hearing, were appointed by WDC to make a decision on WDC’s behalf.

T McBrearty noted the members of the EDEAI and MRA had put in a huge amount of time and energy because they were deeply concerned about CLS’s operation and its impact on the environment and their lives. It had come at personal cost and expense.

Residents were stunned at when, and how, the decision to grant the Resource Consent has been made and signed off. They believed some of the assumptions were incorrect including:

- that ‘mature compost is safe and will not produce an offensive odour’ - a very large amount of this ‘mature compost’ went anaerobic and had to be moved off the site following Mediation.
- the area was sparsely populated - had been proven to be incorrect at the Hearing.

T McBrearty commented that the way the Consent had been granted had undermined the confidence of many residents in WDC and was certain to impact on their willingness to engage with the WDC in the future. He noted that the groups had followed all requirements and procedures and asked how else the voice of the people could be heard. T McBrearty suggested the next step may be to formally advise media.

They had two questions;

- Would WDC please explain to the members of the (EDEAI), the (MRA) and the Community Board, how this decision was made?
- Could a special meeting be requested to follow up on their concerns?

**Graeme Chisnall and a further MRA member**

G Chisnall spoke regarding car parking issues at Mandeville. He noted that the new commercial complex had been very successful which had contributed to parking issues. The parking on Mandeville Road obstructed visibility at the entrance. Trimming trees on Mandeville Road could help alleviate that issue. In addition there was potential for car parking for staff in an area from the end of the Childcare centre to Mandeville Road. There was good lighting in this location.

Another concern was the narrowness of the parking spaces themselves and some cars were getting damaged, a truck had also hit the fence.

Also of concern was people not adhering to the 80km/hr speed limit on Tram Road outside the shopping area. Enforcement was required.

G Chisnall noted that the Council had tidied up the reserve well, however it was already being damaged by tyre marks.

**Questions**

D Nicholl advised that Council staff were aware of parking issues and that the Board was expecting feedback shortly on this. A carpark behind the preschool for staff was something to consider. E Cordwell noted that the issue of car parking had been raised the previous month by J Ensor and that it was a live issue being followed up by staff.
S Farrell referred to the discharge to air CLS consent and asked if ECan had made a decision. E Cordwell reminded members that this was subject to an appeal to the Environment Court. S Markham commented that the matters raised this evening was in regard to a new application to WDC and that staff were obliged to process this as a wholly new application within statutory timeframes. The application was related to storage of materials rather than composting.

S Farrell spoke to the gallery and asked if the Mandeville residents felt short changed by not being consulted and T McBrearty replied categorically yes. S Farrell asked if the community was involved in the decision and T McBrearty replied no.

J Ensor commented that there was no guarantee of what was in the material going onsite and noted that there were a number of issues including swales that had not been addressed before approval was given.

S Farrell commented that the Resource Management Act was not a well written document and asked if the community felt that if the RMA was different they could have been more involved in consultation. D Nicholls countered that this was not a decision the Board could make. S Farrell asked if the Council could look at those shortcomings and make a submission to central government to change the legislation. S Markham explained that there was ongoing dialogue between the Council and central government regarding the RMA. It was hoped that the proposed amendments to the RMA being presented to Parliament shortly might reduce or remove some of the restrictions on public consultation.

J Ensor asked if the Board could request a staff report on how the decision was made and why the community was not consulted.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

There was no adjourned business.

7 REPORTS

7.1 Safety Barrier for Meyer Place Footpath – Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager)

J McBride spoke to the report noting that it was to seek further guidance from the board regarding installation of a safety barrier alongside the footpath in Meyer Place. Previously the Board had agreed to approve the installation of a stainless steel rail, since then the adjacent business use had changed and a set of steps had been installed. If the handrail was installed along the full length, the steps would require removal. Another option would be to incorporate the steps into the design at a cost of $2,000 which did not include a kick rail. There were two options for a kick rail; stainless steel or timber.

K Felstead asked about a further possible modification which J McBride commented would potentially cause issues as it was not a continuous handrail. The current steps were rusted and staff had allowed for a replacement in the costing to bring the steps up to the required standard.

J Lynn asked who had installed the steps and J McBride stated that it was the property owner. J Lynn asked whether the removal of the steps would affect the business and it was advised that the property owner believed the steps were required in order to ensure customers could easily access the business.

W Doody requested that there be assurance that merchandise would not be on the footpath blocking access, in particular at delivery times. J McBride advised it was a policy issue and there could be a discussion with the business owner regarding expectations around that.
W Doody asked if the kick rail was compliant with needs from the Access group and J McBride replied yes.

T Robson asked about the financial implications and the possibility of the requesting the business owner paying the extra cost of accommodating the steps. J McBride advised that when the footpath was put in there were no stairs, this had changed last year with the new business.

T Robson asked how steps affected parking and why had that changed. J McBride referred to the photo, highlighting that there was a clear, marked area for pedestrians to walk and the stairs would not cause any problems.

K Felstead asked if the recommendation was approved how long the installation would take as it had been three years already. J McBride replied she could speak to contractors the following day to request the work to be undertaken.

J Lynn asked if the owner had been asked if they were prepared to contribute and J McBride replied yes and it had not been well received.

There was some discussion over the type of kick rail.

Moved S Farrell seconded J Ensor

THAT the Oxford - Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 180921109526;

(b) Approves the installation of a barrier/fence along the raised footpath on the west side of Meyer Place including steps, associated handrail and stainless steel kick rail with an additional cost to be advised.

(c) Circulates this report to the Utilities and Roading Committee.

CARRIED

S Farrell commented that she entirely supported the recommendation, a barrier was required and the kick board would assist mobility scooters.

J Ensor was pleased to see the recommendation proceed.

K Felstead supported the recommendation commenting it had taken way too long, he wished to see it completed quickly following the meeting. He understood the business owner not wanting to contribute as it was currently compliant with the Building Code and there was no legal requirement.

7.2 Oxford Football Club temporary Storage Container at Pearson Park – Tori Stableford (Greenspace Landscape Architect)

C Brown spoke to the report noting that the purpose was to seek a decision in relation to the Oxford Football Club (OFC) requesting a storage facility. Currently they were using the old bowling green storage. The Club felt the storage was too far from the playing fields, and in addition it could not act as a central meeting point. In the future they were looking for a club room type facility and the container was a short term solution.

C Brown advised that the Club had raised $10,000 themselves to install the container and footpath construction. This would cover all costs aside from the provision of some plants for landscaping. There had been discussions around the visual treatment of the container and the club would be required to paint it and clad it in wood. While the container was temporary in nature there was a risk it could be permanent. However the club was looking at two longer term options for a club room, firstly moving a building from Oxford Area School to the site (which would require consultation with the board) and a further idea that was currently being investigated by the Oxford Rugby Club was a sporting hub with the OFC being part of the development.
C Brown advised that the suggested licence to occupy was for three years only. The Sports and Recreation Reserve Management Plan allowed the licence as an activity for sport and recreation. C Brown noted that the OFC would like service connections however that was believed to be cost prohibitive due to the location of sewers.

C Brown advised that the request had already been presented to the Pearson Park Advisory Group who had approved it as a temporary situation.

S Farrell asked if the container required a building permit. C Brown replied no it did not require a building consent. S Farrell asked if the structure would be 10m from the drain and C Brown replied it would and that staff would be in contact with other departments within Council to ensure compliance.

S Farrell asked about the foundations due to wet ground conditions and C Brown replied that it was the responsibility of the club to provide a suitable solution.

W Doody asked if the three year licence to occupy was inflexible. C Brown replied under the Sports and Recreation Reserve Management Plan the Board could issue an extension based of the progression of other projects.

Moved K Felstead seconded T Robson

THAT the Oxford - Ohoka Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180920109138.

(b) **Approves** a licence to occupy 15m2 for the Oxford Football Club for the purpose of installing a 20 Ft container to be used for temporary storage and an after game meeting area as identified on the attached plan (Trim 180920109181).

(c) **Approves** the licence to occupy having standard conditions as well as the following:

- A cost of one dollar per year, if requested,
- A three year licence term,
- No additional structures associated with the temporary container are to be constructed without prior approval.
- No service connections made unless prior approval from Council.
- Container to be sufficiently painted, clad and landscaped in order to mitigate visual effects
- All maintenance of the container and associated landscaping will be the responsibility of the Oxford Football club
- Security will be the responsibility of the Oxford Football Club

(d) **Notes** that the Pearson Park Advisory Group support the placement of a container within Pearson Park by the Oxford Football club.

CARRIED

K Felstead supported the recommendation. He was aware OFC had been looking for storage and club rooms for some time and he was pleased something was underway. He would also like to see a Sport Hub.

T Robson concurred with K Felstead.

7.3 **Proposed Closure of Stockwater Race R8-1** – Owen Davies (Drainage Asset Manager) and Libica Hurley (Technical Administrator)

Unconfirmed
Owen Davies advised that the reason to request closure of the race was that the stock water was no longer required. The closure was not significant in terms of the overall scheme and represented 0.4% of the total 800km length. Closing the race had no financial implications as all properties involved had access to another part of the scheme and therefore the closure would not impact rates.

D Nicholl asked if the water race also functioned as a stormwater drain and whether any filling in of the race after closure would cause problems in this regard. O Davies replied that it may do but generally when a race was closed, in order to fill in the person would need to speak to the Council and be advised by drainage staff. The report and recommendations had assumed part of the race would be filled in. S Farrell suggested it was important to ascertain whether it was a natural watercourse or not and agreed that the process of filling in needed to be managed carefully.

J Ensor referred to old drains that had been converted to irrigation races in the past and built to a certain depth to alleviate rough drainage. He suggested there needed to be an investigation before filling in and referred to the issues in Mandeville. He asked if there was a report on the likely effects of filling in. O Davies commented that staff took the requests to fill in races seriously and there were good analytical tools available such as flood hazard plans. Staff had assessed this race carefully and did not believe there was an issue. There was a secondary process farmers needed to go through before filling in a race by coming back to Council and at that point staff could examine the request to fill in on its merits. He did not support the need for a further report at this point. He confirmed that he understood the concern but reassured the Board there were checks and balances in place.

J Ensor noted high ground water pressure when the Eyre River was flooding and asked how this would affect the race. O Davies did not believe there would be an effect, currently there was high groundwater in the district however the race was dry. J Ensor commented there was no water in the Eyre River at the moment. O Davies advised the race was part of another system and it was only cutting off a bypass of the race system.

T Robson asked if the advice from ECan, that they preferred no closure of stockwater races due to the benefits of nitrate dilution by the scheme, was relevant. O Davies commented that the overall stockwater race system was vast and ‘leaky’ providing a recharging effect. ECan took the view that augmenting groundwater diluted nitrate loads and the stockwater system helped that effect. Council staff viewed the stockwater as a utility and had a resource consent to take water from the Waimakariri River only for stockwater or irrigation, it did not include the use for groundwater recharge. If a group of farmers had no more need for the stockwater system, but it was retained and rates were continued to be charged, there would be an understandable backlash. In addition maintenance was required to be carried out by the property the race went through.

S Farrell asked if the race could be closed for a number of years to see what happened with natural flow before farmers were allowed to fill in. O Davies replied that this could be considered. The view at the moment was that if it was shown not be creating any flooding issue staff would allow the race to be filled in.

K Felstead asked about consultation with the other property owners affected and asked if they were aware it could affect their Farm Environment Plan. L Hurley replied that although affected property owners had given consent with the application they were also provided with further opportunities to provide feedback.
W Doody noted that the piece of land had been used for stockwater for a long time and asked if Heritage New Zealand were happy with the closure. L Hurley noted the archaeologist advised that there was very little heritage left in that area as all the structures were modified including the first part of the race close to Warren Road. It was recommended it be recorded before it was filled in.

Moved S Farrell seconded W Doody

**THAT** the Oxford - Ohoka Community Board recommends:

**THAT** the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) **Receives** report no. 180919108570.

(b) **Approves** the closure of Stockwater Race R8-1.

(c) **Notes** that, following the closure of R8-1, Council staff will discuss maintenance arrangements and possible filling in of sections of the race with the affected property owners.

(d) **Notes** that, following approval to close R8-1, the Council may be required to apply for an Archaeological Authority as per requirements of *Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Toanga Act 2014*, in order to authorise earthworks associated with possible filling in of sections.

**CARRIED**

K Felstead supported the recommendation and was comfortable as it was a short piece of race. He shared the concerns regarding flooding after filling in the race however stated that was a secondary issue as the race would be filled in under staff control.

J Ensor referred to the issue of fencing off and was confident in the drainage team and that there would be a good outcome.

W Doody noted the due diligence of the farmer as he had the race fenced.

### 7.4 Applications to the Oxford – Ohoka Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2018/2019 – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

E Cordwell spoke briefly to the report.

S Farrell asked if the Board should consider a grant of $700 to the Waimakariri Gorge Golf Club. E Cordwell advised that the Board’s criteria stated a maximum grant of $500 although the groups could apply twice in a year. S Markham commented that the Board could find themselves setting a difficult precedent if they did not stick to the maximum, as over time the amount asked for by groups could increase.

**THAT** the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180919108409.

(b) **Approves** a grant of $500 to Oxford Playcentre towards the cost of a vacuum cleaner.

(c) **Approves** a grant of $500 to Oxford Community Men’s Shed Trust towards the cost of the Spring into Oxford event.

(d) **Approves** a grant of $500 to Coastguard North Canterbury towards the cost of a replacement Coastguard Rescue vessel.

(e) **Approves** a grant of $343 to Oxford Community Garden (Oxford Men’s Shed Trust) towards the cost of fertiliser and other gardening items for the community garden.

(f) **Approves** a grant of $500 to Waimakariri Gorge Golf Club towards the
cost of a UV water purifying system.

CARRIED

K Felstead sat back from the table and took no part in the discussion or decision.

J Lynn believed all the applications were warranted and worthwhile. He did not agree with going over the $500 guideline as keeping it at $500 would allow more groups to receive a portion.

S Farrell concurred with J Lynn.

8 CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chairperson’s Report for September 2018

Moved T Robson seconded W Doody

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 180925110894.

CARRIED

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 12 September 2018 (Trim No. 18905101297).

10.2 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 13 August 2018 (Trim No. 180905101421).

10.3 Youth Council meeting minutes – 31 July 2018.

10.4 Community Facilities – user applications for exemption from fees – report to Community and Recreation Committee 18 September 2018 (Trim No 180907102652).

10.5 Capital Projects Report for the period ended 30 June 2018 – report to Audit & Risk Committee 18 September 2018 (Trim No 180906101922).

10.6 Library Update to 31 August 2018 – report to Community and Recreation Committee 18 September 2018 (Trim No 180906102191).

Moved J Ensor seconded J Lynn

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.6

CARRIED

S F

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

11.1 J Ensor

- Attended Draft Zone Implementation Programme Addendum (ZIPA) meeting – concerned with issues involved. The upcoming workshop regarding a Board submission to the ZIPA was noted.

11.2 J Lynn

- Attended North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support (NCNS) Meeting, commented there was good engagement with the Hurunui and Kaikoura District Councils compared to reluctance from the
Waimakariri District Council and suggested the Council should rethink that.

- Attended All Boards briefing.
- Commented the Ohoka School 150th celebrations had gone extremely well.

11.3 **S Farrell**

- Believed the Council should fund NCNS and noted the deputation from NCNS to all Boards to prompt that debate. It was noted that there had been concerns regarding the previous application for Council funding as to the confidence in the organisation. It was clear that this had greatly improved and that any future application would be very credible well received. The concerns around social isolation in general were noted.

- Attended Oxford Museum meeting where the potential for installing security cameras at the entrance had been mentioned.

- Noted personal inconvenience arising from a communications failure as regards her attendance at a Council Briefing to which Oxford-Ohoka Board members had also been invited. Staff apologised on behalf of the organisation.

- Attended ZIPA meeting and found the information useful.

- Attended Pearson Park Advisory Group meeting. The half court construction had started. Believed the Council's tender process was poor with contractors using further subcontractors.

11.4 **T Robson**

- Attended All Boards' Briefing.
- Attended Pearson Park Advisory Group meeting.
- Attended OPAC meeting. Concerns raised by some members of the community around education and safety at pedestrian crossings.

11.5 **K Felstead**

Provided an update of the Council meeting from earlier in the week

- Delay to refresh of Waimakariri Zone Committee members.
- Rangiora-Woodend Road, Gressons Road, Boys Road and Northbrook Road Speed Limit Review
- Review of the Local Alcohol Policy 2018
- District Road network extension of contract with SICON.

11.6 **W Doody**

Tabled Councillor's report Trim 181011118532, noted

- Oxford Rural No1 to be completed end of November.
- Thanked staff for continuing to advertise in the Bulletin and the Northern Outlook the upcoming JP signings.

S Markham asked how the Bulletin was running under the ownership. W Doody replied it was looking good and included community information.

J Ensor asked about the new well for the water scheme and K Felstead advised that the consent had been issued by ECan.

12 **CONSULTATION PROJECTS**

**Draft Reserves Master Plan - Regeneration**
Consultation closes Friday 5 October 2018.

https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/have-a-say/lets-talk/consultations/draft-reserves-master-plan-regeneration

Canterbury Regional Public Transport Plan
Consultation closes Sunday 14 October 2018.

https://haveyoursay.ecan.govt.nz/connect-canterbury

Waimakariri Water Zone Committee Draft Zone Implementation Programme (ZIPA)
Consultation closes Friday 12 October 2018.

https://haveyoursay.ecan.govt.nz/waimakariri-water-zone-committee-draft-zipa

13 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE
13.1 Board Discretionary Grant
Balance as at 25 September 2018: $5,520.

13.2 General Landscaping Fund
Balance as at 25 September 2018 – $9,508.

14 MEDIA ITEMS

15 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

16 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board is scheduled for Thursday 8 November 2018 commencing at 7.00pm, in the Ohoka Hall.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 9.15pm.

CONFIRMED

________________
Chairperson

________________
Date
Workshop

- Members Forum - 9.15pm to 10.30pm

Discussion of a range of matters including RMA processes.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WOODEND-SEFTON COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN PEGASUS COMMUNITY CENTRE, MAIN STREET, PEGASUS ON MONDAY
8 OCTOBER 2018 AT 7.00PM.

PRESENT
S Powell (Chairperson), A Thompson (Deputy Chair), A Allen, J Archer, A Blackie, and
R Mather.

IN ATTENDANCE
C Sargison (Community and Recreation Manager), C Brown (Greenspace Manager) and
E Stubbs (Governance Support Officer).

1 APOlogIES
Moved J Archer seconded R Mather
An apology for absence was received and sustained from J Meyer for absence.
CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Item 7.1 R Mather as a member of the Pegasus Residents’ Group.

3 CONFIRMATION MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board – 10 September 2018
Moved J Archer seconded A Thompson
THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community
Board meeting, held 10 September 2018, as a true and accurate record.
CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
There were no matters arising.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS FROM THE COMMUNITY
5.1 Tracy Doe (Coordinator) presented an overview of the work of North
Canterbury Neighbourhood Support Inc. (NCNS). T Doe spoke to a handout
(Trim 181011118531) advising that Neighbourhood Support (NS) was a
network of organisations that assisted neighbourhoods and communities to
be safer and to reduce crime, be prepared for emergencies and increase
community connectedness and enhance well-being. She advised that there
are 64 affiliated NS networks operating throughout New Zealand. Between
them they provided information, resources and support to over 15,000
neighbourhood groups, who in turn connected with over 170,000 households
nationwide. NS worked closely with NZ Police and Civil Defence, as well as
many other community organisations. They had Memorandum of
Understandings with NZ Police, Civil Defence and Community Patrol.
T Doe advised that NCNS could help local government by promoting a
community-led approach so that local communities were able to develop a NS
model that works best for their circumstances and location. NCNS maintained
a comprehensive membership database with email and text ability and were
able to provide helpful and critical information to communities when required.
This was done via the platform of North Canterbury ‘GetsReady’, which was
developed in response to the Christchurch earthquakes and was based on the
NS network model. ‘GetsReady’ enabled localised, up-to-date and relevant information to be sent to households, including in the event of an emergency. It could, for example, pinpoint households that may be vulnerable in an emergency situation (e.g. a person who requires an electric ventilator) and match them with other households nearby who have the skills and resources to assist (e.g. emergency generator.) T Doe advised that with ‘GetsReady’ geographical areas could be targeted with information so the right people were getting the right information. Any person in a household irrespective of ownership of that address could sign up to the ‘GetsReady’ to receive the information. T Doe highlighted that NS only disseminated credible information given direct from their working partners and councils. In addition ‘GetsReady’ could work collaboratively with the whole of the Canterbury Region as the systems were the same, show maps interactively of where members were and could be accessed anywhere at any time as it was cloud based.

T Doe commented that they had recently completed an exercise with Civil Defence to showcase how NS would work in an emergency and see how they would fit. It was shown in the exercise that NS would sit across the whole program – community, intelligence and welfare. T Doe advised that NS did not currently receive funding from Waimakariri District Council. An example in the Waimakariri District where there had been collaboration with Police was following of spate of trailer thefts in Kaiapoi. T Doe advised Selwyn District Council had adopted NS within their welfare team. In the Port Hills fires ‘GetsReady’ had been able to work across Selwyn and Christchurch and assisted with movement of stock. In Kaikoura, with the large number of holiday home NS was a good conduit for credible verified information for those people. Kaikoura would be testing its text system during the nationwide ‘Shake Out’ day.

T Doe provided statistics on the membership is spread across the region. Membership was growing, in 2016 there were 98 streets engaged, there were now 560. T Doe highlighted the benefits of connected communities including that they were happier and healthier, could work together to find solutions to local issues and were prepared for emergencies.

T Doe provided an overview of how local government was involved with NS in NZ commenting that City and District Councils were an important partner for NS. 39% of the local Councils in NZ financially supported NS groups. These statistics were a conservative estimate as not all groups specified where their grant income came from in their Charities Services’ returns, and the statistics do not take into account the remaining 27% of NSNZ affiliated groups who were not registered charities. T Doe advised that Council support enabled NS organisations to provide sustainable services in local communities. It was used for a variety of purposes, such as operational costs, running events and setting up and supporting the ‘GetsReady’ software.

T Doe commented that NCNS could provide wide support to communities to help create relationships and bridge gaps in understanding, for example they helped a group would were having trouble understanding Council process over a roading issue.

Questions

A Blackie asked what were the pros and cons between the way NS worked with Selwyn District Council (SDC) and WDC, and whether T Doe was comfortable with the current setup or preferred what was happening with SDC. T Doe replied that the ‘GetsReady’ model was the same but had the advantage of sitting under the SDC in that district. A major difference was that NCNS spanned three Councils. If WDC absorbed ‘GetsReady’ then it could not facilitate the entire NCNS area. Currently the funding was split between Waimakariri, Hurunui and Kaikoura. If those Councils funded proportionally and worked collaboratively that would be a good scenario.

A Allen asked T Doe to describe how many were in her team. T Doe replied there was herself as coordinator, Catherine Hannah as Secretary / Treasurer,
and a part time administrator. There was also a committee who assisted with events.

A Allen asked whether there was any impact on NCNS of having the coordinator split between three Councils. T Doe replied that it would be great to share that load between three coordinators if it was financially supported. It would make a difference to have a coordinator on the ground in each area as that person could follow through to support local groups with things such as signage and barbeques. Currently the Hurunui Community Connectors were doing a good job championing NS.

S Powell asked how people could join NS. T Doe replied that a website had been setup [www.ncns.org.nz](http://www.ncns.org.nz) where people could sign up to join. There were groups in Pegasus and it was a growing area. NS worked with community groups and residents groups in order to listen to the community and see what they wanted. She commented that they found event funding easy, however it was difficult to get sustained funding to run the organisation.

S Powell thanked T Doe for attending the meeting.

A Blackie made the comment that NS were rebuilding credibility with T Doe as coordinator after steadily decreasing in the value they had brought to the community. This decline had influenced the Council’s LTP decision. C Sargison noted that Council had suggested that NS work with Community Boards to assist with that and there was now a member of each Board on the Committee. He suggested that the Boards if they wished could also make a submission to the Annual Plan regarding NS.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

There was no adjourned business.

7 REPORTS

7.1 Application to the Woodend-Sefton Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2018/2019 - Edwina Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

C Sargison spoke briefly to the report.

A Allen asked if it was possible to increase the grant to $600 as a recognition of the increase in number of families in Pegasus.

Moved A Allen seconded A Blackie

THAT the Woodend Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180926111640.

(b) Approves a grant of $600 to Pegasus Residents’ Group towards the cost of the Christmas on the Lake event.

CARRIED

R Mather sat back from the table and took no part in the discussion or decision.

A Allen believed the increase was necessary due to the increase in size of Pegasus as the cost of running the event would also increase.

8 CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chairperson’s Report for September 2018
S Powell had also assisted with the native planting day on Kaitiritiri Ridge alongside community members, Pegasus Bay School and Ngai Tahu staff.

Moved S Powell seconded J Archer

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 181001113764.

CARRIED

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 6 September 2018 (Trim No. 180829098038).

10.2 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 12 September 2018 (Trim No. 18905101297).

10.3 Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 17 September 2018 (Trim No.180911104350).

10.4 Youth Council meeting minutes – 31 July 2018.

10.5 Community Facilities – user applications for exemption from fees – report to Community and Recreation Committee 18 September 2018 (Trim No 180907102652).

10.6 Capital Projects Report for the period ended 30 June 2018 – report to Audit & Risk Committee 18 September 2018 (Trim No 180906101922).

10.7 Library Update to 31 August 2018 – report to Community and Recreation Committee 18 September 2018 (Trim No 180906102191).

Moved R Mather seconded A Allen

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.7.

CARRIED

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

11.1 July Diary for A Allen, J Archer, R Mather and A Thompson (Trim No. 181001113776)

A Allen

- Attended NS meetings where they discussed and confirmed the constitution. She had raised the issue of what would happen in the case a Board member was incapacitated.
- Attended Sefton ‘Down the Back Paddock’ presentation.
- Attended Zone 5 Community Boards’ meeting. Questioned its relevance and effectiveness – appeared to be grandstanding not knowledge sharing.
- Attended All Boards’ Briefing.

A Thompson

- Noted upcoming Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group meeting.

S Powell asked if there would be a signage review. A Blackie advised that there was a stocktake of signage before the group was set up. The next step was to determine what needed to be done and where. It was in hand.
A Blackie

- Commented on an aspect of the draft Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board’s submission to the ZIPA regarding waterway protection and implications for weed growth.

R Mather

- Taken as read.

J Archer

- Assisted with Woodend School Fair with a large number of attendees.

**Draft Reserves Master Plan - Regeneration**
Consultation closes Friday 5 October 2018.
https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/have-a-say/lets-talk/consultations/draft-reserves-master-plan-regeneration

**Community Facilities**
Consultation closes Monday 15 October 2018.

**Canterbury Regional Public Transport Plan**
Consultation closes Sunday 14 October 2018.
https://haveyoursay.ecan.govt.nz/connect-canterbury

**Waimakariri Water Zone Committee Draft Zone Implementation Programme (ZIPA)**
Consultation closes Friday 12 October 2018.
https://haveyoursay.ecan.govt.nz/waimakariri-water-zone-committee-draft-zipa

C Sargison advised there had been a good response so far to the Community Facilities consultation.

S Powell advised that the Board’s submissions to the Canterbury Regional Public Transport Plan and Waimakariri Water Zone Committee Draft Zone Implementation Programme (ZIPA) were nearing completion and requested any further feedback. With regard to the Taranaki Stream they were hoping that a catchment management plan would be developed early.

The drop in on Monday 29 October for the Rangiora Woodend Road Speed Limit Consultation was noted. NZTA would also be attending regarding safety on SH1. S Powell was concerned that it appeared that a submitter was required to have a view on each road in the consultation area as a number of those were minor roads. She suggested that requirement could skew the results. C Sargison suggested the Board provide feedback on this aspect to the new WDC Communications Manager.

12 **FOSTERING COMMUNITIES**
13 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE
13.1 Board Discretionary Grant
Balance as at 2 October 2018: $4,362.
13.2 General Landscaping Fund
Balance as at 2 October 2018 $12,160.

14 MEDIA ITEMS
Neighbourhood Support deputation, Pegasus Residents’ Group grant.

15 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
There were no questions.

16 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
There was no urgent general business.

NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Monday 12 November 2018 at the Woodend Community Centre.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 7.57pm
CONFIRMED

________________________
Chairperson

________________________
Date

Workshop
- General Landscaping Fund – Chris Brown (Greenspace Manager)
A number of potential projects for the General Landscaping Fund were discussed. C Brown would bring a report to the Board based on those discussions.
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 10 OCTOBER 2018 AT
7PM.

PRESENT
J Gerard QSO (Chair), D Lundy (Deputy Chair), R Brine (from 7.10pm), M Clarke, K
Galloway, D Gordon, S Lewis, C Prickett and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE
J Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support), Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport
Manager), C Brown (Greenspace Manager), E Cordwell (Governance Adviser) and Emma
Stubbs (Governance Support Officer).

ABSENT: K Barnett and G Miller.

1 APOLOGIES
Moved M Clarke seconded S Lewis
An apology was received and sustained from J Hoult for absence and R Brine for
lateness arriving at 7.10pm (Item 5.1).

CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
There were no conflicts of interest.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board – 12 September 2018
Moved P Williams seconded C Prickett
THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Community
Board meeting, held on 12 September 2018, as a true and accurate
record.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
There were no matters arising.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
5.1 Tracy Doe (Co-ordinator) and Cat Hannah ((Secretary/treasurer) presented
an overview of the work of North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support. T Doe
spoke to a handout (Trim 181011118531) advising that Neighbourhood
Support (NS) was a network of organisations that assisted neighbourhoods
and communities to be safer and to reduce crime, be prepared for
emergencies and increase community connectedness and enhance well-
being. She advised that there are 64 affiliated NS networks operating
throughout New Zealand. Between them they provided information, resources
and support to over 15,000 neighbourhood groups, who in turn connected with
over 170,000 households nationwide. NS worked closely with NZ Police and
Civil Defence, as well as many other community organisations. They had
Memorandum of Understandings with NZ Police, Civil Defence and Community Patrol.

T Doe advised that NCNS could help local government by promoting a community-led approach so that local communities were able to develop a NS model that works best for their circumstances and location. NCNS maintained a comprehensive membership database with email and text ability and were able to provide helpful and critical information to communities when required. This was done via the platform of North Canterbury ‘GetsReady’, which was developed in response to the Christchurch earthquakes and was based on the NS network model. ‘GetsReady’ enabled localised, up-to-date and relevant information to be sent to households, including in the event of an emergency. It could, for example, pinpoint households that may be vulnerable in an emergency situation (e.g. a person who requires an electric ventilator) and match them with other households nearby who have the skills and resources to assist (e.g. emergency generator.) T Doe advised that with ‘GetsReady’ geographical areas could be targeted with information so the right people were getting the right information. Any person in a household irrespective of ownership of that address could sign up to ‘GetsReady’ to receive the information. T Doe highlighted that NS only disseminated credible information given direct from their working partners and councils. In addition ‘GetsReady’ could work collaboratively with the whole of the Canterbury Region as the systems were the same, show maps interactively of where members were and could be accessed anywhere at any time as it was cloud based.

T Doe commented that they had recently completed an exercise with Civil Defence to showcase how NS would work in an emergency and see how they would fit. It was shown in the exercise that NS would sit across the whole program – community, intelligence and welfare. T Doe advised that NS did not currently receive funding from Waimakariri District Council. An example in the Waimakariri District where there had been collaboration with Police was following of spate of trailer thefts in Kāiapoi. T Doe advised that Selwyn District Council had adopted NS within its Civil Defence Welfare team. In the Port Hills fires ‘GetsReady’ had been able to work across Selwyn and Christchurch and assisted with movement of stock. Kaikoura would be testing its text system during the nationwide ‘Shake out’ day.

T Doe provided statistics on the membership which is spread across the region. Membership was growing, in 2016 there were 98 streets engaged, there were now 560. T Doe highlighted the benefits of connected communities including that they were happier and healthier, could work together to find solutions to local issues and were prepared for emergencies.

T Doe provided an overview of how local government was involved with NS in New Zealand commenting that City and District Councils were an important partner for NS. 39% of the local Councils in NZ financially supported NS groups. These statistics were a conservative estimate as not all groups specified where their grant income came from in their Charities Services' returns, and the statistics do not take into account the remaining 27% of NSNZ affiliated groups who were not registered charities. T Doe advised that Council support enabled NS organisations to provide sustainable services in local communities. It was used for a variety of purposes, such as operational costs, running events and setting up and supporting the ‘GetsReady’ software.

Questions

C Prickett referred to 1,700 total membership in Rangiora Ward and asked if that was one person per household. T Doe replied that NS encouraged all members of a household to be members as during an emergency the whole household may not be in one place.

C Prickett asked how many households were members percentage wise, and J Millward advised that, as an indication, there are on average about 2.5 people per household in the Rangiora Ward.
C Prickett asked about the crossover with Civil Defence and Council and how NS ensured they did not spread misinformation or overload people with information. T Doe replied that they only sent out critical information. There were renters in the community who did not receive the same communication as ratepayers. C Hannah commented that they did not send out a great deal of information – they waited for information from Civil Defence.

6 **ADJOURNED BUSINESS**

There was no adjourned business.

7 **REPORTS**

7.1 **Request for Parking Restrictions on Edward Street, Rangiora – Joanne McBride (Roading & Transport Manager)**

J Gerard thanked J McBride for the recent display of proposed festive lighting for Rangiora High Street.

J McBride introduced the report commenting that it was in response to a request for parking restrictions near the Ashley Street / Edward Street intersection as a result of ‘all day’ parkers not allowing enough space for customers to park.

J McBride advised there was currently two existing P60 parks on Ashley Street in front of the car sales yard requesting the restrictions and one on the Western side of Ashley Street. Staff recommended changing those to P120 for consistency with other time limits on the outer edge of the town centre.

J McBride noted the three proposed options in the report.

1. Two additional P120 parks on Ashley Street.
2. Three P120 parks on Edward Street outside the car sales yard.
3. Do nothing.

**Questions**

D Gordon asked which option the car sales yard owner had requested and J McBride replied option 2.

J Gerard asked if the Board granted the additional parking on Edward Street, would the two existing time restricted parks on Ashley Street stay? J McBride advised that they would.

K Galloway asked if there were no stopping restrictions on Ashley Street outside the car yard and J McBride replied yes, the proposed new time restricted parks for Ashley Street would be further to the north, the no-stopping zone would not be removed. K Galloway asked if there could be assurance there would be no all-day display of cars like on Southbrook Road and J McBride advised the time restrictions would ensure that.

P Williams asked if J McBride believed vehicles, including trucks, that parked all day on Edward Street were a hindrance to the movement of vehicles. J McBride replied that the laneways were generally clear. On the south side vehicle were generally well off the road, and the parking area on the northern side of Edwards Street was well defined. She did not see all day parking creating a major issue.

C Prickett noted other businesses in that area on Ashley Street and asked if those businesses had also requested parking restrictions. J McBride replied there had been no specific request. Some had their own large carparks.
C Prickett asked if there was a desire to include both parking restrictions options and J McBride commented there was not currently that need.

Moved D Gordon seconded P Williams

THAT the Rangiora Ashley Community Board recommends:

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 180919108757;

(b) Amends the Parking Bylaw 2007 to include parking on Edward Street as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Item</th>
<th>Rangiora</th>
<th>Edward St</th>
<th>Immediately east of the Blackett St Roundabout</th>
<th>North side</th>
<th>P120</th>
<th>3 Parks, North side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

CARRIED

D Gordon commented that it was a common sense solution and thanked staff for bringing forward the report. A member of the community had raised concerns with both himself and P Williams. He was happy to leave the P60 restriction in place, it could be raised in the future if required.

P Williams concurred. It would clean up the parking on that corner comfortably.

7.2 Application to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2018/2019 – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

E Cordwell noted that the organisation had applied to the Board the previous year. She would take the report as read.

Moved K Galloway seconded D Gordon

THAT the Rangiora—Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180926111566.

(b) Approves a grant of $395 to McAlpines North Canterbury Pipe Band Inc. towards the cost of sending a piper to the Royal New Zealand Pipe Bands’ Association Summer School.

CARRIED

K Galloway believed the Pipe Band deserved support. It was a long established group that supported many local events with their music.

D Gordon concurred. He recently attended the 90th birthday function and advised the group was in good heart.

8 CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chair’s Diary for September 2018

Moved J Gerard seconded D Lundy

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 181001113810.
CARRIED

10  MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1  Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 6 September 2018
(Trim No. 180829098038).

10.2  Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 10 September
2018 (Trim No. 180905101421).

10.3  Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 17 September
2018 (Trim No. 180911104350).

10.4  Youth Council meeting minutes – 31 July 2018.

10.5  Community Facilities – user applications for exemption from fees –
report to Community and Recreation Committee 18 September 2018
(Trim No. 180907102652).

10.6  Capital Projects Report for the period ended 30 June 2018 – report to
Audit & Risk Committee 18 September 2018 (Trim No 180906101922).

10.7  Library Update to 31 August 2018 – report to Community and Recreation
Committee 18 September 2018 (Trim No 180906102191).

10.8  Cones Road Safety Improvements – report to Council 4 September 2018
(Trim No 180823095984).

Moved S Lewis  seconded D Lundy

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board receives the information in
items 10.1-10.8.

11  MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

11.1  M Clarke
- Attended proposed lighting demonstration.

11.2  S Lewis
- Attended All Boards meeting.
- Attended proposed lighting demonstration.
- Attended MainPower Hockey Turf tournament and commented it was
  a fantastic day.

11.3  P Williams
- Attended a number of Council briefings.
- Attended Community House meeting – they were raising funds for the
  Community House to hold Community Groups in Waimakariri. There
  were a number of groups interested.

11.4  D Gordon
- Attended Rangiora Promotions Association Meeting:
  They were interested in plans for Christmas lights.
  Looking to add another event on Rangiora High Street to coincide with
  Muscle Car Madness and draw people in for retailers.
  Reviewed the Business Expo, the numbers had been disappointing.
- Attended Rangiora Fitness Centre opening, it was a fantastic new
  facility.
- Attended Cust Fire Brigade Awards night. Commented that it was
  important that volunteer effort was recognised. Bernard Kingsbury
  was awarded a double gold star for 52 years of service and Chris
Neason had 25 years of service. Commented on the condition of the interior of the Cust Community Centre and asked where that was in refurbishment program.

- Highlighted number of complaints regarding long grass in sections. It was a difficult issue with FENZ now responsible. Complaints should be directed to N Harrison.
- Noted upcoming trip to China with K Felstead to attend Wuhan Conference. Advised that this was at no cost to the Council.
- Noted upcoming Waimakariri Zone Committee public meeting regarding ZIPA.

11.5 **D Lundy**

- Was busy with 20 October Rangiora A&P Show preparations.
- Attended workshops for Draft ZIPA and Public Transport submissions.
- Attended Central Drainage Meeting – site visit to McAlpines Industries and was impressed with improvements.

17.10 **R Brine**

- Was interviewed for Compass Radio.

12 **CONSULTATION PROJECTS**

**Draft Reserves Master Plan - Regeneration**
Consultation closes Friday 5 October 2018.
https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/have-a-say/lets-talk/consultations/draft-reserves-master-plan-regeneration

**Community Facilities**
Consultation closes Monday 15 October 2018.

**Canterbury Regional Public Transport Plan**
Consultation closes Sunday 14 October 2018.
https://haveyoursay.ecan.govt.nz/connect-canterbury

**Waimakariri Water Zone Committee Draft Zone Implementation Programme (ZIPA)**
Consultation closes Friday 12 October 2018.
https://haveyoursay.ecan.govt.nz/waimakariri-water-zone-committee-draft-zipa

E Cordwell advised that the submission drafts were nearly complete.

13 **BOARD FUNDING UPDATE**

13.1 **Board Discretionary Grant**
Balance as at 2 October September 2018: $8,198 plus estimated carry forward of $1,917.
13.2 **General Landscaping Fund**
Balance as at 2 October 2018: $26,160 (including carry forward).

14 **MEDIA ITEMS**
None

15 **QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**
None

16 **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**
None

**NEXT MEETING**
The next meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Tuesday 13 November 2018 in the Cust Community Centre.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 7.47pm.

CONFIRMED

__________________
Chairperson

__________________
Date

---

**Workshop**

- *Chris Brown (Community and Greenspace Manager) – General Landscaping Fund.*

  C Brown presented a number of potential projects and it was generally agreed that these be investigated further as to their merit and that a report be provided to the next meeting for consideration.
1 APOLOGIES
Moved J Watson Seconded P Redmond
THAT apologies for absence be received and sustained from M Pinkham and for lateness from A Blackie who arrived at 4.15pm at the commencement of Item 12.
CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
There were no conflicts of interest recorded.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board – 17 September 2018
Moved J Watson Seconded C Greengrass
THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting, held 17 September 2018, as a true and accurate record.
CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
Regarding item 7.1 General Landscaping Budget - S Stewart queried whether there had been any progress as regards a redesign of the current planter boxes to ensure water retention if additional similar planters were to be installed. S Stewart also enquired if there were any plans to address the existing planters in this regard and also if the proposed evaluation of the Totara trees had taken place. Staff agreed to follow up with the Greenspace team.
C Greengrass also provided a report back on the process for enabling members of the community to give new homes to the Red Zone camellias and rhododendrons. You Me We Us had undertaken a site visit and been working with WDC staff on how to facilitate this. It had been agreed that the shrubs would be removed on Friday 26 October and available for collection on Saturday 27 October. This would be widely publicized.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
The deputation from Tracy Doe and Cat Hannah on the work of North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support was postponed to the November Board meeting.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
There was no adjourned business.

7 REPORTS
7.1 Re-installation of the Dr M Ramsay Commemorative Sundial in Memorial Reserve, Kaiapoi – Greg Barnard (Parks Community Asset Officer)
G Barnard provided members with an overview of the history of the sundial and the contribution that Dr Ramsay had made to the Kaiapoi community. The RSA and Kaiapoi District Historical Society were extremely supportive of its reinstatement in the Memorial Reserve. All parties were working to achieve this in time for the 100 year Armistice Commemoration in November 2018.

The Board also noted that correspondence had been received from the RSA seeking the retention of the wooden cross created by pupils at Kaiapoi High School in 2014 to mark the 100 years since World War 1 commenced. Item 9 refers.
S Stewart asked if the plinth was still available and G Barnard confirmed that it was and had been stored securely and was undamaged.
S Stewart also queried if any refurbishment was planned. G Barnard replied that this would only be done on the advice of the RSA/Historical Society so as to ensure appropriate preservation. It was not envisaged that this would be significant.
N Atkinson asked if the placement of the sundial and its relationship to the Cross could be considered. G Barnard agreed that this would take place and agreed with all parties.
N Atkinson was also keen to ensure that the placement of the sundial was in keeping with a garden situation as well as being easy to maintain and mow around both memorials. G Barnard advised that although time was of the essence in order to install the sundial for the Armistice Commemoration, there were plans to create a small garden around both the Cross and sundial.

Expertise was being sought on the alignment of the sundial to ensure that it would once more act as a ‘time keeper’.

Moved J Watson Seconded N Atkinson

THAT the Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No.181002114004.
(b) **Notes** that staff have received a request from the Kaiapoi District Historical Society and the Kaiapoi Returned Services Association to reinstall the Dr M Ramsay Memorial Sundial.

(c) **Notes** that both the Kaiapoi District Historical Society and the Kaiapoi Returned Services Association have confirmed that the Kaiapoi Memorial Reserve is the appropriate location to have the sundial reinstalled.

(d) **Approves** the installation of the commemorative sundial to honour Doctor Maxwell Ramsay previously located in McAllister Square, Kaiapoi to Kaiapoi Memorial Reserve.

(e) **Approves** staff working with the Kaiapoi RSA to determine the exact location for the sundial to be re-installed within Kaiapoi Memorial Reserve.

**CARRIED**

J Watson stated that she was extremely pleased to see the return of the sundial and to its original 1927 location. It celebrated the life of an active member of the community and would be in position for the centenary.

N Atkinson concurred.

8 **MATTERS REFERRED FROM THE REGENERATION STEERING GROUP**

8.1 **Licence to Occupy, AA Bees Club North Canterbury – Roxanne Ramsay** (Project Administrator – District Regeneration)

R Ramsay outlined the lease arrangements as being three years and with a right of renewal.

P Redmond asked if neighbouring properties had been consulted. R Ramsay advised that they had and were supportive of the proposal. The lease also made provision for it to be terminated should there be any issues with the location of the hives.

R Blair queried the process as regards the Board and the Regeneration Steering Group. R Ramsay confirmed that the Board had the delegated authority for such matters not the Steering Group.

Moved J Watson Seconded P Redmond

**THAT** the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180906101921.

(b) **Approves** staff issuing a Licence to Occupy to the AA Bees Club North Canterbury on the basis of the standard Council Licence to Occupy agreement with the following conditions included:

i. Term of lease is for an initial period of 3 years with the right of renewal and the rental fee being $1.00 per year.

ii. The plan, spatial definition, and landscape design of the area to be approved by the Community Greenspace Manager.

iii. The club shall obtain the written approval of the Council prior to the erection of any signage and structures (including fences).
iv. The Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board have the right to terminate the contract immediately should there be any nuisance caused to the neighbouring property or the wider community, or any non-compliance with the Licence conditions.

v. The maintenance of the area will maintained to a standard that is acceptable by the Council.

CARRIED

J Watson stated that more bees and encouraging more bees was a great thing to be supporting and that this was also one of a variety of ways of ensuring enjoyment and value of the Regeneration Zone.

P Redmond was reassured that the lease could be terminated if there were to be any issues in general or for neighbouring properties. There was a shortage of bees and this had an impact on pollination.

9 CORRESPONDENCE

Moved J Watson Seconded C Greengrass

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives the tabled letter from the RSA regarding the retention of the start of World War 1 Commemoration Cross (TRIM No. 181015120205).

(b) Receives the tabled letter from Sarah Lodge regarding proposed Reserve Names (TRIM No.181017121719).

CARRIED

10 CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT

10.1 Chair's Diary for August - September 2018

Moved J Watson Seconded N Atkinson

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 181008116679.

CARRIED

11 MATTERS REFERRED FOR INFORMATION

11.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 6 September 2018 (Trim No. 180829098038).

11.2 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 12 September 2018 (Trim No. 18905101297).

11.3 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 10 September 2018 (Trim No.180905101421).

11.4 Youth Council meeting minutes – 31 July 2018.
11.5 Community Facilities – user applications for exemption from fees – report to Community and Recreation Committee 18 September 2018 (Trim No 180907102652).

11.6 Capital Projects Report for the period ended 30 June 2018 – report to Audit & Risk Committee 18 September 2018 (Trim No 180906101922).

11.7 Library Update to 31 August 2018 – report to Community and Recreation Committee 18 September 2018 (Trim No 180906102191).


Moved R Blair Seconded J Watson

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board receives the information in items 11.1-11.8.

CARRIED

12 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.

N Atkinson

Provided feedback on recent attendance at the Greater Christchurch Partnership meeting, including transport corridors. Submissions had just closed on the Draft Public Transport Strategy.

R Blair

Reminded members of the AGM of North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support on 24 October.

The Darnley Club were finalizing arrangements for Christmas parties for volunteers and friends.

C Greengrass

Had presented the Board’s submission to the Draft Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan Hearing.

Attended the breakfast event at Riverside Church.

Landmarks Trust meeting – excellent speaker encouraging consideration of heritage value of more modern buildings from 1960’s and 1970’s.

River Carnival planning is progressing well including photo competition.

Noted the Amazing Race and Pines Beach Gala both on 25 November.

A Blackie

Also noted the River Carnival preparations advising of 14 river based events and numerous static displays and stalls. He would provide a more detailed update to the November Board meeting.
S Stewart
Water Zone Committee

- Provided feedback on the recent Water Zone Committee meeting and the process for assessing and incorporating feedback from the recent consultation on the Zone Implementation Programme Addendum (ZIPA).
- The Committee would be reviewing this on 23 October prior to ratification at the formal Zone Committee meeting in November. The finalised document would be considered by the Council and Environment Canterbury in December.
- Noted that some recommended actions would require additional specialist resources/costs if they were to be adopted. Advised of possible funding mechanisms including a targeted rate.

Problems with whitebaiters had been successfully resolved.

Had met with the Council’s Greenspace Manager to discuss offering perennial plants, in Council flower beds, to the community once the flowering season was over and replanting was due to occur. Staff are progressing this.

P Redmond
Noted that he had not been at the September meeting.

23 August - had attended Draft Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan Drop In.

24 August - hosted a walking tour of the Kaiapoi CBD which had been well received noting that this might be an opportunity for others to build on.

31 August - had attended Zone 5 Community Boards meeting in Christchurch noting that a new Chairperson had been elected. Also attended ENC Awards.

Merchant Navy Day had been a success.

3 September – Regeneration Steering Group meeting.

8 October – Water Zone Committee meeting.

Raised query re footpath adjacent to BNZ building and received assurance from J Palmer that the matter was progressing.

Also queried plethora of signage and hoardings at a number of specific sites and how these could be improved/addressed. J Palmer addressed specifics of Rangiora signage which was much improved and reaffirmed that an overall strategy was required and planned.

J Watson

Impressed with the progress achieved at Silverstream Reserve.

Noted that the Youth Development Grant Committee would be meeting shortly to consider any award(s).

The Breeze Walking Festival had also included a walk around Kaiapoi town centre.

13 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

13.1 Rangiora Woodend Road Speed Limits

Consultation closes Sunday 4 November 2018.

14 REGENERATION PROJECTS

14.1 Town Centre, Kaiapoi
Updates on the Kaiapoi Town Centre projects are emailed regularly to Board members. These updates can be accessed using the link below:

14.2 Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group
The next meeting of the Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group will be held in Meeting Room 1, Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre, 4pm on Monday 5 November 2018. This meeting is open to the public.

15 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

15.1 Board Discretionary Grant
Balance as at 9 October 2018: $4,048 (including carry forward).

15.2 General Landscaping Budget
Balance as at 12 September 2018: $46,420 (including carry forward).

16 MEDIA ITEMS

17 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
There were no questions.

18 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
There was no urgent general business.

NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board is scheduled for 4pm, Monday 19 November 2018 at the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 4.45pm

CONFIRMED

________________________
Chairperson

________________________
Date
Workshop

- Regeneration Area Reserves Names – Duncan Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager – District Regeneration) and Michelle Flanagan (Landscape Planner – District Regeneration)

4.45pm – 5.15pm

Members discussed possible reserve areas and names including those of historical community members, commemoration of earthquake victim and remembrance of previous street names, now red zoned. Staff to provide a formal report in due course.

Members Forum

5.15pm to 5.30pm

General Matters of interest and sharing.
### 1. SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 25 September</td>
<td>Compass FM interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting to discuss Avian Botulism recurrence at Kaiapoi Waste Water Treatment Plant with Fish and Game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Council Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 25 September</td>
<td>Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead and I began Community Service Awards interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 26 September</td>
<td>New Employee Session: Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiapoi Town Centre Hearings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enterprise North Canterbury (ENC) Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waimakariri Water Zone Community Workshop, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead attended Chinese National Day Reception on my behalf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 27 September</td>
<td>Multi-Use Sports Facility Project Steering Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visited North Canterbury Kapahaka Celebration at Ohoka School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citizenship Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead attended the reception for the 40th anniversary of the Social Equity &amp; Wellbeing Network Tuia Te Oranga on my behalf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 28 September</td>
<td>Waimakariri Water Zone Community Workshop, Pegasus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended David Viles’ Funeral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead the Police Memorial Service in Christchurch on my behalf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with David Hill North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended opening of Southbrook Fitness Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 29 September</td>
<td>NZ Secondary Schools Small Bore rifle shooting, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visited St Bartholomew's Book Fair, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 30 September</td>
<td>Attended You Me We Us Party in the Park, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 1 October</td>
<td>Lunch at launch of Older Persons' Expo, Papanui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mayors Professional Advisory Group Teleconference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regeneration Steering Group Meeting, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 2 October</td>
<td>Person to Person Help Trust, Peter Kenyon Breakfast, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compass FM interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiapoi Town Centre Review - Deliberations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 3 October</td>
<td>Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 4 October</td>
<td>Art on the Quay Opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 5 October</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 6 October</td>
<td>Attended Woodend Flower Show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 7 October</td>
<td>Spring into Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 8 October</td>
<td>McAlpines North Canterbury Pipe Band lunch generating 90 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury Museum Trust Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CE Jim Palmer and I addressed the Rotary Club of Rangiora on the subject of China relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 9 October</td>
<td>Compass FM interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 11 October</td>
<td>Ashley Combined Friendship Club talk on Passchendaele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 12 October</td>
<td>Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee - workshop and formal meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passchendaele Ceremony at Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cr Dan Gordon attended the Country Cricket Association Luncheon on my behalf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater Christchurch Partnership workshop with Ministers Hon Phil Twyford and Hon Megan Woods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 15 October</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended North Canterbury IHC AGM, Southbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 16 October</td>
<td>Compass FM interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cut the Cake for the Soroptimists to celebrate 25 years of the Craft Fair, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 17 October</td>
<td>Mayoral Forum CREDS - Regional Validation Workshop at Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boyle Outdoor Education Centre 40th Anniversary Dinner, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 17 October</td>
<td>Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead and Cr Dan Gordon attended an economic development conference in Wuhan as guests of the Hubei Provincial Government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 21 October</td>
<td>Regional Road Safety Working Group, Rolleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Transition North Canterbury Programme Discussion - Doug Reid Mayoral Forum CREDS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 19 October</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of National Road Safety Strategy - Teleconference between the Ministry of Transport and the South Island Regional Transport Committee Chairs Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 20 October</td>
<td>Attended Northern A&amp;P Show, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cure Boating Club 150th Anniversary Dinner, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 23 October</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 24 October</td>
<td>Waimakariri Water Zone Committee Briefing Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellbeing North Canterbury Community Trust - 30th year anniversary, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 25 October</td>
<td>ENC Trustee workshop, Patoa Farms, Hurunui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 26 October</td>
<td>Continuation of discussions with Te Maire Tau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Canterbury Sports Awards Dinner, Ohoka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THAT** the Council:

a) **Receives** report №.181026125532

David Ayers
MAYOR