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A meeting of the WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL will be held in the COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA on TUESDAY 1 MAY 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 Tuesday 3 April 2018

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) **Confirms** as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 3 April 2018.

To be circulated separately

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

(refer to Blue agenda papers circulated separately)

MATTERS ARISING

5. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

5.1. Mr Robert Johnston of Ashley Gorge will express views in relation to his LTP submission.
6. ADJOURNED BUSINESS

Nil.

7. REGENERATION REPORT


RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180315027535.

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

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

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

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

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

8. REPORTS

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

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180415040538;

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

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

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

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

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018 Review Hearing Panel recommends:

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180329034013.
(b) Adopts the Waimakariri District Council Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018.
(c) Notes the bylaw is proposed to come into force on Monday 14 May 2018, which allows time to publish a public notice confirming Council adoption of the bylaw prior to its enactment.
(d) Notes staff will respond to each submitter using the staff recommendations and associated discussion included in the Appendix, as a basis for response to each point of submission.

8.3. Siena/Sillano Drainage Works – Owen Davis (Drainage Asset Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180419042535
(b) Notes that staff will request a new capital works budget of $94,000 under the Ohoka Rural Drainage account in the 2017/18 financial year, for the proposed Siena/Sillano drainage works through the LTP deliberations.
(c) Notes that $56,000 of the drainage works will be separately funded through existing approved Roading budgets.
(d) Notes that groundwater is high in this area and this is likely to persist in winter and spring causing damage to the road if the upgrade is delayed.
(e) Circulates this report to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board for their information.
8.4. **Delegation to Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party Authority to Approve Engagement Methodology and Materials for Solid Waste Services – Kitty Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager) and Simon Collin (Infrastructure Strategy Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180403034992.

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

(c) **Notes** that the engagement referred to in (b) will only be implemented if Council includes additional rubbish and/or organics bin collection services in its 2018-28 LTP.

(d) **Notes** that the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party will consider the issues of bin ownership and fees/charges for changing service options and make recommendations to Council at the appropriate times.

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

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

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

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

(b) **Approves** the draft Council submission on the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018/19 to 2027/28 (TRIM No. 180410038725).

(c) **Delegates** to the Mayor and Chief Executive responsibility for approving any alterations, additions or deletions that may be required before the submission is due to be lodged prior to the closing date of 2 May 2018.

(d) **Circulates** copies of this submission to the Community Boards.

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

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180419042965.

(b) **Adopts** the Register of Interests Policy 2018 (Trim 180419043038).
(c) Notes a Register of Interests will be listed in the Council agenda of June 2018, and on the Council website. The Register will be republished in subsequent agendas and web page when an amendment has been notified and recorded. The Register can be subsequently reviewed each December as a matter of best practice.

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

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

9. MATTERS REFERRED FROM COMMITTEES AND COMMUNITY BOARDS

9.1. Bramleys Road Well Viability Assessment – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager) and Kalley Simpson (3 Waters Manager)

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

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180323031876.

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

(c) Notes that the Bramleys Road well is no longer considered to be a viable future source for the scheme, as the water source would likely require significant treatment and gaining consent to abstract water from the well would be very difficult.

(d) Notes that some Tuahiwi residents opposed the joining of the scheme with Pegasus for cultural reasons, and that the future connection of the Bramleys Road well would have potentially mitigated these concerns.

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

(f) Approves the replacement of the $2.2M capital works budget in 2022/23 and 2023/24 to connect the Bramleys Road well, with a $0.5M capital works budget in 2023/24 to connect the EQ4 well to provide additional capacity on the Woodend Pegasus water supply scheme.
9.2. **Kaiapoi Wharf and Marine Precinct Floating Pontoons Design Update and Procurement Strategy – Duncan Roxborough, Implementation Project Manager, District Regeneration**

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

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180321030331

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

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

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

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

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

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

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

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

10. **HEALTH AND SAFETY**

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

(a) Receives report No. 180420043230.
11. COMMITTEE/WORKING PARTY/JOINT COMMITTEE MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

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

285 - 292

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

293 - 300

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

301 - 310

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

311 - 316

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the information in items 11.1-11.4 be received.

12. COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

12.1. Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board held on 12 March 2018

317 - 323

12.2. Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board held on 14 March 2018

324 - 332

12.3. Minutes of a meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board held on 19 March 2018

333 - 343

12.4. Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board Road and Reserve Naming Committee held on 4 April 2018

344 - 345

12.5. Minutes of a meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board held on 5 April 2018

346 - 354

12.6. Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Ashley Community Board held on 9 April 2018

355 - 363

12.7. Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board held on 11 April 2018

364 - 374

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the information in items 12.1 to 12.7 be received.

13. **CORRESPONDENCE**

14. **MAYOR'S DIARY**

14.1. *Mayor’s Diary 27 March - 23 April 2018*

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report no. 180418042246.

15. **COUNCIL PORTFOLIO UPDATES**

15.1. *Iwi Relationships*

15.2. *Canterbury Water Management Strategy*

15.3. *International Relationships*

15.4. *Regeneration (Kaiapoi)*

16. **QUESTIONS**

(under Standing Orders)

17. **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS**

(under Standing Orders)

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

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of:</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of Council meeting of 3 April 2018</td>
<td>Confirmation of minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of the Utilities and Roading</td>
<td>Receipt of Minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No</td>
<td>Reason for protection of interests</td>
<td>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.1 – 18.5</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
<td></td>
<td></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:

**CLOSED MEETING**

See Public Excluded Agenda (blue papers)

**OPEN MEETING**

19. **NEXT MEETING**

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

**BRIEFINGS**

- Kaiapoi Fire Service Matters – Simon Hart at 4pm
- Community Housing – Rob Hawthorne (Property Manager)
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report seeks direction from Council on whether it wishes staff to continue to progress a proposal to create a minimum 1.5m depth navigation channel in the Kaiapoi River from the Williams Street Bridge to the Waimakariri Confluence at low tide. This query is made given a possibility that targeted removal of “high points” in the river bed through the extent of the channel could increase salt water intrusion in the Kaiapoi River.

1.2 The excavation is intended to remove “high points” in the river bed by targeted dredging of those areas currently identified by the Coastguard and other river users as difficult to navigate at low tide. The attached concept design plans indicate the location of the proposed dredging areas. It is noted these river bed “high points” may form part of an existing “tidal barrage” system in the river. Removal of these points could potentially increase the amount of saline intrusion.

1.3 Staff are in the process of completing dredging and spoil dewatering designs and lodging consent applications. An option is identified of combining dredging for the navigation channel with that required to establish floating pontoons, from the period June / July 2018. The timing of both dredging projects is however subject to review by stakeholders and likely to be influenced by various risks and constraints that are discussed in this report.

1.4 There are budget options associated with either combining or separately undertaking the dredging projects. Subject to Council direction provided for the navigation channel, these options can be presented for further consideration during staff submissions to the Long Term Plan or in a separate report.

Attachments:

i. Minutes of Meeting of Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Working Party 25 October 2017 (TRIM 180315028107)

ii. Concept Design Plans for Dredging and Planting Kaiapoi River (TRIM 180316028304 and 180316028300).
2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) ** Receives ** report No.180315027535.

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

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

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

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

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

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Working Party has, since 2014, been investigating proposals for improving water quality, navigability, flood hazard management, amenity and recreation in the Kaiapoi River. To date, various proposals have been scoped, prioritised and recommended to the Waimakariri District Council and Environment Canterbury for implementation. These include intertidal aquatic planting on side and point bars to trap and treat suspended sediment, creation of a minimum depth navigation channel, development of a major sediment trap and elbow bend realignment/gravel beach creation.

3.2 Of these, the highest priority project identified by the Working Party during its most recent meeting on 25 October 2017 was dredging a minimum depth navigation channel in the river. This is intended to ensure the Coastguard can safely and quickly navigate the river at low tide to perform its coastal and river rescue functions. This project is highly prioritised as it has a safety component for the Coastguard and those from the community relying on Coastguard Services. The minutes of this meeting are attached to this report, for reference (TRIM 180315028107).

3.3 The Working Party received an email record of feedback about navigation safety and access from boating clubs using the Kaiapoi River as at 23 October 2014. The record provides details about navigating difficulties experienced by various groups using the river. A brief summary is provided of the main points:

**Saint Margaret’s Rowing Club:** “our main concern is navigation on the river. Sedimentation will be an on-going issue but if there was any way this could be improved e.g. dredging including the removal of any snags left in the river from floods. There is currently one where the Kaiapoi meets the Waimak which is a danger when there are lower tides”.
**MV Tuhoe Trust (now not operating):** “…problems have been growing over the last few years. The bed of the river at the wharf where the ship sits on a ledge due to the build-up of sediment. The Trust dredged this some time ago but the sediment seems to be building up again…. Narrowing of channel due to weed growth, particularly around the Maori Dam (Courtenay Dam) area… General sediment build up in the River over the years due to the lack of dredging if there is no action taken now the channel will be closed up that much there will be no way to navigate the river so all sports and recreation will stop…."

**Cure Boating Club:** “yes there are a number of issues up and down the Kaiapoi River with navigability due to silting, narrowing of the river, collapsed banks and trees and in growth of vegetation. There is mud build up in significant portions of the river…”

3.4 This feedback led the Working Party to commission a more detailed study, titled “Kaiapoi River Navigation Channel Concept Design”, prepared by Marico Marine New Zealand Ltd, an independent harbour management consultant in May 2016. The report recommended further investigation into an option of targeted dredging of high spots in the river bed.

3.5 The report recommendations state “a number of ‘high spots’ exist in the channel, where depths are currently 1.0 – 1.5 m or less at low water and particular attention is required when navigating. Targeted dredging of these identified high spots could improve the safety of all vessels using the river, but particularly for Coastguard operations. This would also extend the tidal ‘window’ for any deeper draught vessels that may in future use the Kaiapoi River (Marico Marine 2016, p.7).

3.6 They comment further that “the Coastguard representatives present for the scoping visit reported that they are currently able to use the river at all stages of the tide, albeit by navigating very carefully at low water. Having such minimal under-keel clearance is not ideal from a safety of navigation perspective, with the risk of grounding en-route to a rescue. Other river users currently restrict their passage to when the tide is higher, if limited by their vessels draught” (Marico Marine 2016, p.21).

3.7 The report notes “Coastguard reported their ideal operational depth would be a minimum of 1.5m water depth. This provides a small safety margin to prevent engine or propeller damage. The Coastguard need should be seen as a minimum, as to operate anything larger than a craft of the type used by Coastguard at present would be difficult” (Marico Marine, 2016, p.8).

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1 Staff have recently become aware of growing concern among the Council and the wider Kaiapoi community regarding the extent of salt intrusion in the Kaiapoi River. A presentation from Environment Canterbury staff on Tuesday 13 March about saline intrusion in the Kaiapoi River has indicated that increasing periods of “low flows” in the Waimakariri River is reducing pressure from the upper catchment. This is enabling greater salt encroachment extending further inland, for longer periods, into the Kaiapoi River system. There are several possible causes or contributing factors to the increasing saline intrusion which are still being investigated. These include:

- Low flows in the Waimakariri River
- Ongoing effects of climate change and gradual sea level rise
- Seasonal flow variations in the Kaiapoi River and its key tributaries
- Changes to the levels of the Waimakariri and Kaiapoi River beds following the 2010/11 earthquakes
4.2 The Environment Canterbury presentation on 13 March has indicated there is a possibility that the proposed navigation channel dredging of river bed “high points” may increase saline intrusion within the river system.

4.3 The excavation of a minimum 1.5m depth navigation channel in the river is intended to remove “high points” at various locations along the river bed. It is noted the river bed “high points” may form part of an existing “tidal barrage” system, which if removed could potentially increase the amount of saline intrusion in the river.

4.4 Staff are currently working on dredging and spoil dewatering designs and consent applications for dredging projects for both: 1) dredging at the Kaiapoi Wharf to allow berthing at proposed new floating pontoons; and 2) dredging targeted areas between the Williams Street Bridge and Waimakariri confluence in the Kaiapoi River to establish the minimum 1.5 m depth navigation channel. Wherever practicable, consenting and design costs and methods are being shared across the projects to reduce costs and share resources.

4.5 The ability to combine the physical dredging works in the river when these are undertaken would represent potential cost savings to the Council. However, the ability to obtain timely resource consent approval for both projects, given the different nature and drivers of each, together with the particular risk of increasing saline intrusion from navigation channel dredging is such that the projects may not be able to be undertaken as one package within the desired timeframe.

4.6 Both projects each involve dredging up to approximately 6,000m3 of spoil. There is considerable uncertainty surrounding the design and planning aspects, including:

- Acceptability among key stakeholders of the proposed dredging timeframe of 1 June to 15 August (in any year), to avoid inanga spawning and harvesting (coincident with likely lower salt intrusion due to higher rainfall and winter flows in Waimakariri River)
- Suitability of December of any year as a potential alternative dredging timing option (subject to salt levels in the water column)
- Acceptability among key stakeholders of proposed dredging methods
- Ability to predict and avoid saline intrusion in the water column whilst dredging and programme and manage works on site, accordingly
- Acceptability of depositing salt during dewatering at the proposed final spoil deposition sites

4.7 Staff are investigating a number of potential spoil disposal sites on land near the Kaiapoi River. The reuse of spoil near the dredging abstraction point is considered critical to reducing overall costs of dredging and is a key component of affordability of the projects. River bed spoil has been tested for a range of contaminants and has been found to generate a low risk of environmental contamination. The spoil may therefore provide a useful resource for proposed land uses within the Regeneration Zone, Askeaton Reserve (building up slumped land) or on unused Council land at Ferry Road next to the Wastewater Treatment Plant (as a potential temporary spoil dewatering site).

4.8 Use of spoil with an entrained salt component may have an unintended benefit of providing long term weed control which is desirable for some land uses. Salt application on land would provide a natural, long term alternative to use of herbicide. The inadvertent application of salt to some of the sites would also be able to be corrected by adding additional topsoil layers, enabling future aesthetic planting.
4.9 A preliminary assessment of water quality sampling results in the Kaiapoi River indicate the salt water may be neutralising effects of usual urban stormwater contaminants in the river. Although requiring further investigation, the increasing saline intrusion may have an unintended consequence of reducing water contamination associated with stormwater discharges. This could reduce costs of implementing the Kaiapoi stormwater network discharge consent, subject to further expert review of the data. A further update will be provided to Council once the water quality sampling data has been comprehensively assessed.

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

5 COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1 Groups and Organisations

5.2 The Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Working party and the Kaiapoi Riverbank Steering Group have developed these dredging proposals. These groups comprise key stakeholders including Ngai Tuahuriri, the Kaiapoi Tuahwi Community Board, Environment Canterbury, the Water Zone Committee and the Waimakariri District Council.

5.3 A Cultural Impact Assessment has been provided on behalf of Ngai Tuahuriri which covers the dredging proposals outlined in this report. This CIA recommends various sediment control measures and options for use in the river during dredging. Further consultation will be undertaken on detailed design options as required to determine on site agreements for sediment control and protection of sensitive habitats. The possible presence of a cultural monitor during the works will also be discussed.

5.4 As a part of the consent preparation the Council has written to the Department of Conservation and the North Canterbury Fish and Game Council to seek specific advice on effects of dredging on fish passage and spawning sites. The Council is working through comments raised by the Department of Conservation in its Assessment of Effects required for the dredging consent applications.

5.5 Wider Community

5.6 The Kaiapoi River navigation channel concept design has been widely consulted within the Kaiapoi community, during the period April to May 2017. The proposals were consulted with a Centrespread in the Kaiapoi Advocate newspaper on 7 and 21 April 2017, with brochures widely circulated around community facilities and an Open Day held on 27 April 2017. No opposition to targeted navigation channel dredging was indicated in the consultation responses.

6 IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1 Financial Implications

6.2 Staff have been working on an option to cost share between the dredging at the Kaiapoi Wharf to allow berthing of floating pontoons and dredging to establish the minimum 1.5 m depth proposed navigation channel.

6.3 Combining these two projects could potentially achieve cost savings in the following: a) hydrographic surveying immediately before and after dredging; b) dredge and spoil dewatering design concepts; c) resource consenting and AEE preparation; and d) deployment and disestablishment of the barge and dredge in the river. To date, staff have been combining consent preparation and dredge / dewatering design costs for the two projects to achieve cost efficiencies as far as practicable.
6.4 If the Council wishes to proceed with the minimum depth navigation channel project, then further cost savings could be achieved by combining the physical dredging works in one operation on the river. In this instance, the river rehabilitation budget would be “bought forward” and potentially increased as required in the 2018/19 year to provide a 50% cost contribution to the total combined works.

6.5 The Working Party has, at the current time, recommended a budget of $25,000 per annum be provided from the Waimakariri District Council and Environment Canterbury for river rehabilitation. This provides a current ongoing budget of $50,000 per annum for the project, until 2019/20 (noting Environment Canterbury has not confirmed its share for 2018/19). This means a budget of $100,000 is theoretically available for the navigation channel dredging over 2018/19 and 2019/20, if that project proceeds.

6.6 Staff will discuss cost with Environment Canterbury as they are refined. The Council may need to consider whether it is prepared to pre fund the Environment Canterbury share of the navigation dredging and work recover this from Environment Canterbury in future years as their share of the Kaiapoi River rehabilitation funding.

6.7 Navigation dredging, whether undertaken in conjunction with the pontoon establishment or as a separate project would need to be undertaken in one winter season if practicable. This means the budget would need to be combined into the financial year when the works occur. Ongoing funding for the wider river rehabilitation project from 2020/21 is still to be confirmed.

6.8 An initial budget for dredging at the wharf to allow berthing at the proposed new floating pontoons is estimated at $250,000. This budget is likely to be revised following completion of detailed dredging and spoil dewatering designs.

6.9 Direction from Council is now required to determine whether the navigation channel targeted dredging project should proceed. Following this direction, suitable budget allocations and adjustments can be made as required and updates presented to subsequent Council meetings.

6.10 Community Implications

6.11 It is apparent that there is concern among the Kaiapoi community about the level of saline intrusion in the Kaiapoi River. There is also concern among river users about safety of navigating the Kaiapoi River. Some members of the community are seeking a higher ‘level of service’ in general for river navigability. There appears agreement on the need to improve water quality and habitat in the Kaiapoi River, and promote the fishing resources and other forms of active and passive recreation.

6.12 The Council will need to balance these views when potentially in conflict, when deciding on the priority of different projects and management approaches in the river. It is possible that an improved “tidal barrage” system may not be easily introduced into the mainstem without interfering with existing navigation. The existing tidal barrage, in the form of the river bed high points, if removed, may have implications for increasing saline intrusion. The further information being provided by Environment Canterbury may clarify these issues and identify future solutions.

6.13 This report takes the view that some of the potential causes of saline intrusion may be able to be controlled by Council or others. These include irrigation abstractions and minimum river flow restrictions. Other potential causes cannot be controlled such as seasonal weather variations, climate change, effects of earthquakes and sea level rise.
6.14 The Council will need to decide whether to seek to respond to the saline intrusion by implementing features in the river to address its effects, such as tidal barrages. The Council could seek to develop improved tidal barrages in the Kaiapoi River tributaries which would not interfere with or restrict the river mainstem navigation.

6.15 Risk Management

6.16 Risks to public safety when navigating the Kaiapoi River have been identified and potential options and responses are proposed in this report.

6.17 Health and Safety

6.18 The proposal to dredge the Kaiapoi River minimum depth navigation channel was prioritised by the Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Working Party because it will “improve the safety of all vessels using the river, but particularly for Coastguard operations” (Marico Marine 2016, p.7).

For instance, “the Coastguard representatives present for the scoping visit reported that they are currently able to use the river at all stages of the tide, albeit by navigating very carefully at low water. Having such minimal under-keel clearance is not ideal from a safety of navigation perspective, with the risk of grounding en-route to a rescue” (Marico Marine 2016, p.21).

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

Any decisions made about future actions within the Kaiapoi River will be subject to the Resource Management Act 1991 and Regional Plan Rules and resource consent requirements.

7.3 Community Outcomes

This report considers the following outcomes:

**There is a safe environment for all**
- Harm to people from natural or 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

**There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all**
- Harm to the environment from the impacts of land use, use of water resources and air emissions is minimised
- Cultural values relating to water are acknowledged and respected
- The demand for water is kept to a sustainable level

7.4 Delegations

This report requests direction that will affect the future use of, and values associated with the Kaiapoi River. It therefore requires direction from Council to determine future priorities and actions.

Gerard Cleary
Manager Utilities and Roading
**MINUTES JOINT WORKING PARTY**  
**KAIAPOI RIVER REHABILITATION PROJECT**  
ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY AND WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL  
MEETING IN THE KAIAPOI SERVICE CENTRE COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
176 Williams Street, Kaiapoi  
Wednesday 25 October 2017 at 5:15pm – 7pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Oversee the work required to scope in-stream proposals for improving water quality, navigability, flood hazard management, amenity and recreation in the Kaiapoi River.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working Party Members</td>
<td>Neville Atkinson (Chair); Claire McKay (Environment Canterbury); Grant Edge (Waimakariri Zone Committee); Sandra Stewart (Kaiapoi Community Board).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Staff Advisors Present | Adrian Meredith; Brian McIndoe, Jason Butt, John Ellis (Environment Canterbury)  
Gerard Cleary, Owen Davies, Greg Bennett, Chris Brown, Janet Fraser (Waimakariri District Council) |
| Apologies | Amy Beran, Andrew Arps; Kevin Felstead. |
| Attachments | Adrian Meredith’s memo on river salinity investigations  
Greg Stanley’s report titled “Kaiapoi River Enhancement Project”  
CAREX report “Persistence and Ecological Consequences of Glyphosate to Control Aquatic Weeds in Waimakariri Lowland Waterways”. |

**Key Objective for the Working Party:**

Oversee preparation of a report, initially for consideration by the Kaiapoi Community Board, and then by Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council, setting out a possible costed programme of work that would be required to meet the water quality objectives, navigability requirements, flood hazard management, amenity and recreation imperatives for the Kaiapoi River.
Business

1. Welcome and Apologies

Neville chaired the meeting. Present were Neville Atkinson (Chair/ Kaiapoi Community Board); Claire McKay (Environment Canterbury); Grant Edge (Waimakariri Zone Committee); and Sandra Stewart (Kaiapoi Community Board).

Apologies were received from Andrew Arps, Amy Beran and Kevin Felstead.

Moved: Sandra Stewart  Seconded: Grant Edge

CARRIED

2. Confirmation of Minutes

Minutes of a meeting of the Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Working Party held on Thursday 9 February 2017

RECOMMENDATION

That the Working Party:

(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting of the Working Party held on Thursday 9 February 2017.

Moved: Grant Edge  Seconded: Neville Atkinson

CARRIED

3. Updates

Jason Butt-  Improvements underway downstream of Courtenay Confluence

Jason noted that a contract for works downstream of the Courtenay Confluence is currently in progress. Willows are currently being controlled by a contractor and works will be complete in about 2 months. Then open spaces will be infill planted with indigenous species where suitable light/space is available which will enhance existing habitat in this area.

Jason agreed to provide a species list with a stock-take of plants observed to be present along the banks/wetted edge margins of the Kaiapoi River. This will indicate plants that are naturally occurring on the river margins.

Jason noted the success of the planting trial will need to be revisited in coming weeks as temperatures rise and plant growth on the mud flats increases.
Amy Beran

Cultural Impact Assessment

The Working Party queried why creation of artificial eel habitat is recommended on the new gravel beach proposed at the river elbow bend. These are considered to be hard/solid structures input into the river and the benefits were not immediately clear. At a subsequent site visit on 1 December 2017 Joseph Hullen discussed with Working Party reps using ceramic/clay pipes rather than plastic pipes in the river to create this eel habitat.

Working Party members also enquired about what sediment trapping approaches could be used in the river during high points dredging to limit the influx of sediment into the water column?

Janet will pass these queries onto Amy/Joseph and seek some further explanation of why the habitat creation is recommended and seek ideas on suitable sediment trapping methods which would be supported during dredging.

Brian McIndoe

John Ellis

Dredging Kaiapoi River bed “high spots” between Williams Street bridge and Waimakariri confluence

Brian and John noted the broken ECAn dragline is not proposed to be repaired as repairs are considered uneconomic. Use of a drag-line is not considered efficient at the present time in comparison with cost and efficiency of using a long reach digger.

It was noted a long reach digger could undertake the “high points” river bed dredging, but would risk damage to the river banks.

Upon assessment of methods to undertake dredging of “high points” the preferred method is pontoon with a suction dredge and pump. Spoil would be piped onto land and dewatered, then collected for final disposal into the Kaiapoi Regeneration Zone or Askeaton Reserve. A suction pump has more control than the dragline or long reach digger methods in terms of precise sediment relocation and has reduced sediment discharge into the water column.

Jacobs consulting released a report on 16 October about the feasibility of dredging work proposed by Christchurch City Council within the Heathcote River. The proposed dredging in this river is for the purposes of floodplain management rather than navigation safety, but will provide useful information about dredging methods and options.

A suction dredge is considered a good environmental method of dredging. The suction dredge would lift sediment from the bed onto land and not release sediment into the river water column, unlike other methods.

The Working Party noted opportunities to combine dredging works for the river “high points” with the other dredging proposed for the floating pontoons as one project / contract.

Update on planned maintenance for Kaiapoi River including further willow control?

Brian noted willow control will continue in an ongoing programme along the banks of the river, to recommence again after Christmas at the end of the whitebait season in the area between the Mafeking Bridge and Williams St Bridge.
In addition, Brian noted a programme is being introduced by Greg Stanley (an ECan ranger) which includes replacement of dead willows and infilling spaces cleared during crown lifting with suitable native shrubs between the confluence with the Cam River upstream and the confluence with the Courtenay River downstream. This plan is costed at $10,000 per annum and will be in place for at least two years (the plan is attached to these minutes, for reference).

The proposed planting will be undertaken on the river banks rather than in the waterway. It will introduce an understory of plants beneath the willows as they are crown lifted and as damaged willow debris is removed.

The plan will “increase aesthetic value while also increasing the amount of leaf litter and the number of insects falling into the river. This will benefit the adult stages of native fish species as well as the avian community” (see attachment p.1). The programme includes maintenance until the new plants are established.

The intention is to include approximately 85% of the vegetation in the shorter, riparian shrub categories, while 15% of the enhancement will focus on installing the taller, more long-term species.

Proposed planting species include tall grasses (e.g. flax, south Island Toe Toe, cabbage tree) and shrubs (including coprosma, hebe and pittosporum). A small number of native trees will also be planted.

Brian agreed to report this programme in more detail back to the Kaiapoi Community Board. This will include discussion on how ECan can undertake additional willow control, infill shrub planting and weed control on the Kaiapoi River banks to provide an overall ongoing higher level of service for bank maintenance and enhancement for the Kaiapoi community.

**Adrian Meredith- Investigations into saline wedge in Kaiapoi River**

Adrian noted the periodic salinity occurring within in the water column from analysis of records from the salinity loggers on the Mandeville Bridge. He noted that the Kaiapoi River should now be considered a combined marine/saline and freshwater environment and managed as such, rather than managed as a solely freshwater river (see attached memo “Update on river water quality investigations”).

It was also noted that salt intrusion could have caused willows in some locations on the river banks to have sickened in previous years.

The presence of salt may also be causing an increased prevalence in some species in the mud flats including increasing observations of mud crabs. It may also be changing the nature of fisheries with increasing numbers of salmon and reducing trout.

Adrian noted that the deposition of sediment with high saline content onto land will affect the productive future use of that land. Effects of salinity in soils are noted to last for decades. Any decision on spoil deposition locations (in terms of the dredging options discussed earlier) will therefore need to take into account the likely implications of potential land use at each location in the long term.

It was also thought possible that the “high points” on the river bed could be reducing the level of saline intrusion upstream within the river.

Adrian commented this salinity and catchment scenario is unique within New Zealand. There is therefore no existing model to draw from in determining relevant actions for the Kaiapoi River management in a combined saline/freshwater environment.

The continuation of the planting trial, as proposed, would need to continue the use of salt tolerant species.
The increasing salination of the river water may be reducing rates at which copper, zinc and hydrocarbons are cohesing to river sediment which may help explain the sediment testing results (described later in these minutes) which note minimal contamination risk from metals during proposed disturbance of sediment (whilst dredging).

In terms of Council projects, the application of marine rather than freshwater grade works should be considered during river bed and banks infrastructure design projects.

Chris Brown commented that using sediment with a saline content to construct a BMX track or to “build up” the Askeaton Reserve ground levels will help reduce future maintenance and weeding requirements.

Comment on submission suggesting lowering Cam floodgate to help control the saline tidal intrusion

Adrian noted other cities in the world are using “tidal barrages” to prevent salt water from intruding upstream within a river. The Cam floodgate could however only feasibly be operated as a tidal barrage if its operation was converted to an electronic system. This may be the option referred to in the submission by Michael Bate. However, as the Cam floodgate currently requires manual operation, its use as a tidal barrage is considered infeasible in the river system at present due to the costs and labour requirement of operating a manual form of tidal barrage.

Owen Davies – CAREX results of glyphosate trials and effects on invertebrates and fish in Kaiapoi River tributaries

Owen updated the Working Party about results of a study recently completed by CAREX involving glyphosate spray trials and effects on aquatic weeds, stream invertebrates and fish. The report including study findings is attached to these minutes for information.

In the observed study reaches the study “could not detect any effect of glyphosate on stream invertebrate species richness, metrics such as the MCI and SQMCI or fish” (CAREX p.1).

Chris Brown - Kaiapoi Wharf update & redevelopment at Murphy Park

Chris commented that redevelopment is currently underway in Murphy Park. The implementation is subject to a decision being made on the Croquet Club future location. There is also still a need to decide the final rowing club location and potential relocation of the boat ramp.

Chris also noted potential conflict in bringing more boats into the upper reaches of the river which is a focal area for fishermen.

The Council has also been requested in any of its future river bank designs to provide structures for Whitebaiters to sit on.

The Saint Margaret’s Rowing Club have expressed an interest in remaining within the Kaiapoi River. They are currently fundraising to improve the pontoon access in the river and are seeking an improved boat ramp facility.
Neville Atkinson/ Janet Fraser - Consultation completed for Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation

Neville and Janet updated on the consultation undertaken. A number of the public dropped in to talk to the Working Party about the proposals during the Open Day. Dr. Henry Hudson was present during the day to respond to enquiries and worked through the proposals with the public.

Three submissions were receiving during the consultation process. Janet will organise a written response to each submitter, to be signed by Neville.

Claire noted that there is no ongoing funding for the Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Project from Environment Canterbury. It was agreed that WDC will prepare a submission to Environment Canterbury during the Long Term Plan process to seek ongoing funding from Environment Canterbury for the project.

Action: Janet to arrange the request for ongoing KRRWP funding in a submission to Environment Canterbury during the Long Term Plan submissions period. The submission will seek ECan funding for the KRRWP project including contributions for navigation and biodiversity.

Kaiapoi Wharf area contamination sediment testing results

Janet highlighted the sediment testing results undertaken at the proposed pontoon area just upstream of the redeveloped wharf.

The overall findings are that the risk of environmental impact from dredging activities would be low, in terms of the potential release of chemical contamination.

On the basis of the results, the sediment may be appropriate for application to land at locations other than an authorised landfill. The advice of a planner should be sought if this option is to be considered further.

4. General Business

4.1 Proposed 2017/18 Work Programme for Waimakariri District Council

It is proposed to continue the Kaiapoi River intertidal aquatic and lower river bank plantings using the available $25,000 funding from the Waimakariri District Council in 2017/18. The works would continue within the current “planting trial” area but also extend downstream as far as funding permits towards the Courtenay Confluence.

Recommendations and indicative costs for specific projects in the 2017/18 year are included in Table 4.1 below.

Given the proposed amenity works included within the attached Environment Canterbury led “Kaiapoi River Enhancement Project” report by Greg Stanley, the intertidal planting trial in 2017/18 will be modified to complement the proposed ECan planting and maintenance improvements. This will maximise the value and reach of both of the projects. This will also take account of the combined available funding for planting, amenity and weed control / maintenance that is now available from both organisations.

It is recommended the original planting trial is now evolved and refined into an ongoing improvements programme, based on (and evolving) the methods already established through the Immediate Steps funding contract between Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council.
The ongoing planting and maintenance programme could include continued intertidal and wetted edge planting of *Typha orientalis* (raupo) and *Eleocharis acuta* (spike sedge) and other aquatic species, taking account of the Environment Canterbury update on survival rates of each aquatic plant species and review of planting trial results.

A site visit of the planting trial area is proposed with the Working Party during the early stages of implementation to determine further methods and specific activities to be undertaken on site.

The following locations and activities are currently proposed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Potential Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville bridge north bank – both east and west of bridge</td>
<td>Intertidal planting to fill out existing light well in areas where willows were removed last year west and east of the bridge Yellow flag iris control Terrestrial planting on eastern side of bridge (small plants at toe of stop bank – where large willow was previously removed)</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car park area of St Margaret’s Rowing Club</td>
<td>Any works undertaken in consultation with WDC parks department- working with Chris Brown Weed control? Possible intertidal planting on exposed mud flats?</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central island</td>
<td>Break down and remove willow debris from around base of island visible at low tide (north and south facing) Dead willow in centre of island has created a light well which would support further plantings Island aquatic plantings appear somewhat successful – further planting is recommended</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy Park opposite fishing bank</td>
<td>Planting of existing mud flat / light well (very little raupo was planted here in previous trial); survival of plants is observed to be greater at river bend shoulder Could consider removing smaller wilding exotic trees &lt;2.5m to improve light and prevent exotic tree proliferation through the native planting area – site visit with Working Party to consider options? Terrestrial planting here is successful, continue to enhance with weed control and infill gaps with native plants</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam River mouth</td>
<td>Aquatic plantings towards high tide mark in areas with sunlight Further pruning of willows and exotic trees to let in light for existing plantings</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend planting and weed control downstream to Williams St bridge, and downstream of Williams Street bridge to the Courtenay confluence in accordance with Tonkin &amp; Taylor /</td>
<td>Extend aquatic and terrestrial plantings in locations recommended in the Tonkin &amp; Taylor/ Hudson reports (see Concept Design Plans for indicative locations) Extensive weed control required on lower banks to support terrestrial plantings in areas with existing light wells Extend planting and maintenance downstream as far as funding permits towards Courtenay Confluence?</td>
<td>$5,000-$6,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposed funding allocation is indicative and it is likely that funding for some projects may exceed the above estimates and for other projects may be less than estimated.

The planting is intended to physically develop the concepts provided by Dr Henry Hudson and Tonkin & Taylor, to use intertidal zone and side bar plantings to create margin roughness and naturally form a two stage low flow/flood channel within the river. This will trap and treat sediment suspended in the water column.

To continue the programme, it is intended to translocate a small number of mature raupo from the Kaiapoi Island area at the Courtenay Dam (where stands are abundant) into the aquatic planting areas. This is to seek to establish these at various inter-tidal depths and compare their viability with that of the juvenile nursery plants.

### 4.2 Rehabilitate Downstream of Courtenay Confluence (Downstream / East of Courtenay Dam) – Environment Canterbury

The proposal developed for this area by Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council staff, during a site visit on 20 November 2016, includes felling and discarding (or drilling and poisoning) willows in poor health, together with control of other exotic vegetation. This will open space around and expand the existing native vegetation stands. The proposal also includes infill planting with target species to complement the existing native vegetation (predominantly raupo) stands.

It is intended that this area will become a “showcase”, enabling the Working Party to visually demonstrate to the community the function & design of a two stage low flow and flood channel (e.g. sediment trapping on the flood channel margins), as intended by the planting trial. The project can continue east along the river margins as far as current funding will permit.

The Working Party previously noted support for the project, subject to undertaking a “stocktake” of indigenous vegetation species already present in the area.

A written proposal from Waiora Forest Landscapes has been provided to Environment Canterbury and initial willow drilling is currently underway as at October 2017.
### 4.3 Review of Consultation Responses

Three written submissions were received during the consultation on the river rehabilitation project.

The submissions are summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitter</th>
<th>Summary of Key Points of Submission</th>
<th>Staff Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Bate</td>
<td>Supports planting of the intertidal wetted mud flats (e.g. narrow and meander the channel) although notes concerns about water quality which may affect viability of this work.</td>
<td>The support is acknowledged and the proposed planting programme would continue to seek to establish these plants in locations specified in the Concept Design Plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would like to cease use of all chemical sprays in/near the waterways as this causes toxic spray residues to remain in the river bed sediment. Also rotting of vegetation causes enriched, nutrient laden water, excessive bed sedimentation and reduces oxygen levels in the water.</td>
<td>Owen updated the meeting on the results of CAREX glyphosate spray trials in the Kaiapoi River tributaries, and the effects this indicated on aquatic ecology and habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not support establishing intertidal plants between the central island and Murphy Park walkway as this is a popular area for whitebaiting.</td>
<td>The part of the channel between the island and bank is deep enough to naturally limit the infill of intertidal plants. Intertidal plants on the island would likely improve whitebait habitat if able to establish here and would not interfere with fishing access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Notes that re-alignment of the river elbow 90degree inner bend could alter river dynamics in the bend and risk filling in a deep fishing hole adjacent to the fishing bank.</td>
<td>However, fishing access on the bank adjacent to the St Margaret’s Rowing Club could be limited by terrestrial and aquatic plantings. Gaps for fishing access have been provided in this area although vehicle access to the area has been blocked off by bollards to create an environment more suited to a walkway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The Tonkin & Taylor and Environmental Management Associates report "Sediment Trap, Bank Reshaping and Drainage Wetland Design Concepts" states that the:

"survey cross-sections show an approximately 2m deep scour hole just downstream of the 90 deg bend. This is strong evidence of high hydraulic scour forces acting on the river bed due to the abrupt change in direction, and associated flow velocities" (p. 18).

"The effect of modifying the inner bend [e.g. lower and realign] results in a slight reduction in flow velocities in the main channel and outside bends and an increase in the inside bend velocities (p.20)."
See email from Dominic Fletcher with further advice regarding hydraulic effects of inner elbow bend re-alignment

Suggests we lower the Cam floodgate when the flow in the Waimakariri River drops to 48-50 cumecs to help prevent saltwater intrusion

Adrian Meredith provided an update on the effects of this option during the meeting.

Catherine Thomas

Supports the proposed improvements to water quality, planting native plants, providing better fishing access and improving boat access.

Will there be regulations to prevent expansion or reduce dairy farming and other potential polluting activities from damaging the Kaiapoi River further?

The support for the project is acknowledged.

The prevention of contaminants from entering the system from upstream sources is a challenging issue which is being addressed by other projects.

Ray (freitagray@gmail.com)

Proposals sound good but make sure it’s still suitable for boating /canoeing / paddling. A better launching area at Murphy Park would help. Concrete blocks destroy any crafts.

The support for the project is acknowledged.

Any planting and bank maintenance works near the rowing club at Murphy Park will be undertaken in consultation with the Parks Manager overseeing the redevelopment of the St Margaret’s Rowing Club parking area.

4.4 Recommendation for Dredging

As the above submissions did not directly comment on the dredging proposals for the river bed “high spots”, other earlier requests to the Working Party to undertake the dredging are noted, for reference.

The “email record of feedback about navigation safety from boat clubs as at 23 October 2014” was previously circulated with the agenda, and provided information about navigation difficulties experienced by those using the river.

It is noted that the Marico Marine report “Kaiapoi River Navigation Channel Concept Design” (which was circulated to the Working Party members prior to the public consultation earlier this year) also referred to an option of targeted dredging of high spots in the river bed as a method to improve safety for the coastguard navigating the river at low tide, when performing its coastal and river rescue functions.

The Marico report states “A number of high spots exist in the channel, where depths are currently 1.0m – 1.5m or less at low water and particular attention is required when navigating. Targeted dredging of these identified high spots could improve the safety of all vessels using the river, but particularly for Coastguard operations. This would also extend the tidal ‘window’ for any deeper draught vessels that may in future use the Kaiapoi River”. (Marico Marine, p.2)

The Appendix to this agenda includes comments from Jim Dilley Environment Canterbury Harbour Master regarding potential process, roles and funding responsibilities for dredging ‘High Spots’ in the Kaiapoi River bed, for reference.

4.5 Sediment Contamination Testing

A report prepared for the “Kaiapoi Wharf and Marine Precinct Project: Kaiapoi River Sediment Investigation” shows results of sediment sampling in the area adjacent to
Pontoon 1 (next to the wharf). There were 14 sediment samples collected from 3 boreholes at a depth of up to 2m below the surface of the sediment, with each sample taken at 400mm increments. The samples tested for contamination associated with current and historical land uses.

The following contaminants were analysed:

**Volatile and Semi-Volatile organic compounds** (VOC’s), (SVOC’s) including petroleum hydrocarbons (e.g. PAH’s, BTEX), Phenols and OCP pesticides.

**PH values**

**Heavy metals** (including chromium, mercury, tin, lead, zinc, copper, boron, arsenic)

The findings are:

- VOC and SVOC results were below laboratory detection limits and adopted criteria in all samples.
- pH values were all between 6 and 8 and considered neutral and not a constraint.
- The heavy metal results are all less than the NES soil contaminant standards for protection of human health under all land use scenarios.
- One sample returned a lead concentration that marginally exceeded the adopted sediment quality criteria for ecological protection.
- Sediment sample analytical results meet the acceptance criteria for disposal at Burwood Landfill.
- Background soil concentrations were taken from a point on the river bank adjacent to the proposed Pontoon 1 area and are the relevant comparator for assessment of suitability of spoil disposal to either cleanfill or to other land.
- All but three heavy metal samples met the clean-fill disposal criteria (e.g. results were less than the background soil concentrations of that metal).
- These three samples showed marginal exceedance of the reported background concentrations for Chromium, Lead and Zinc.
- In this case, the clean-fill operator could be approached to determine acceptability of the sediment for disposal based on averaged results.
- Material will almost certainly need to be dewatered prior to any re-use.
- There is no apparent link between the results obtained and the depth or location from which the sample was taken. There was no apparent difference in results when comparing samples taken from sediment and those taken from gravel (although only 2 samples were taken from gravel).

The overall findings are that the risk of environmental impact from dredging activities would be low, in terms of the potential release of chemical contamination.

On the basis of the results, the sediment may be appropriate for application to land at locations other than an authorised landfill. The advice of a planner should be sought if this option is to be considered further.

Environmental impacts of increasing turbidity in the river are relevant to any dredging activity and have not been addressed here.
4.6 Cultural Impact Assessment

A Cultural Impact Assessment has been provided for the Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Project by Mahaanui Kurataiao (see attached full Cultural Impact Assessment Report).

Key findings are summarised as follows, for reference:

- “The creation of sediment traps and linear wetlands throughout the Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation project area will add in excess of 5,000 square metres of plantings of native species, many of which intended to provide spawning habitat for inanga” (CIA p. 24).

- “The creation of areas of wet edge plantings of predominantly raupo, kapungawha/wiwi (schoenoplectus (sedge)) and harakeke (flax) on the exposed channel edge will provide spawning habitat for inanga, and provide habitat and food sources for tuna (freshwater eels) and various bird species” (CIA p.24).

- “Mass plantings of other species up the bank in the frequently flooded areas including ti kouka (cabbage tree), toe toe, carex secta and carex virgata and mikimiki will provide further habitat. These plantings will enhance mahinga kai values while also providing amenity value.

- “The re-alignment of the inner bank at the 90degree elbow bend in the river and creation of a corresponding outfall wetland on the opposite bank will potentially provide the opportunity to create “eel tunnels” and other refuge features for native fish species” (CIA p. 24).

- “Eel tunnels can consist of “U” shaped pipes of suitable diameters laid into gabion baskets at various levels, these pipes are then secured in place as rock fill is placed into the gabion basket. These tunnels should be located below the level of the mean low tide mark” (CIA p.24). Note: at a field trip held on Friday 1 December 2017 it was agreed that it would be better to use ceramic, clay pipes in the river rather than plastic pipes to form these eel tunnels. They must be installed below the low tide lowest level to be of any use.

- “Potential for insitu waka (canoe) or remnants of traditional pa tuna (eel weirs) to be located during works to realign the inner bank at the 90degree elbow bend in the river should not be underestimated when the dredging practices of the Waimakariri Harbour Board are considered…” (CIA p.17).

- “Regardless of the methodology used, the re-alignment of the inner bank at the 90degree elbow bend in the river will involve the disturbing or removal of top soil or sub-soils. This will raise the possibility of discovery of previously unrecorded pre-historic archaeological sites related to occupation” (CIA p.19).

- “Regardless of the methodology used, the Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation will involve the disturbing or removal of top soil and sub soils. This will raise the possibility for the potential discovery of burial sites” (CIA p.20).

- The CIA (p.42) seeks the following: 1) that a suitably qualified archaeologist approved by Heritage New Zealand be onsite to monitor earthworks and the removal of soil down to a level considered by the archaeologist to be below the ground level present during pre-European occupation; and 2) engagement of members of Ngai Tuahuriri who are trained in the recognition of archaeological sites to monitor earthworks and assist the [aforementioned] lead archaeologist (e.g. engagement of Cultural Monitor during excavations).
In the event of discovery of prehistoric archaeological deposits, the lead archaeologist will present to Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga Executive Committee an excavation plan and timetable for comment and input (CIA p.42).

That any artefacts, taonga and other cultural material associated with pre-historic archaeology, be repatriated to Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga and the final storage or display of these items be determined by Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga.

Use of sediment control measures when excavating the proposed sediment trap upstream of Mafeking bridge is recommended, in accordance with the “Environment Canterbury Erosion and Sediment Control Guidelines”, including avoiding excavating during periods of forecast significant wet weather, silt fence to protect dewatering stockpile, a staked or floating silt fence installed around the outer edge of the trap using a boat or platform and other suggestions (CIA p. 25/26).

“Dredging of the Kaiapoi River to excavate identified high spots will also disturb silt and sediments that potentially contain hazardous materials and consequentially affect water quality of the surrounding Kaiapoi River environs” (CIA p.25)

Use of sediment control measures when excavating the high points in the river bed in accordance with “Environment Canterbury Erosion and Sediment Control Guidelines”. A suitable Erosion and Sediment Control Plan and Environmental Management Plan (Silt and Sediment Control Plan) that is consistent with the objectives and policies contained in the Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan must be developed by the contractor and approved by Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council.

Adoption of a Restoration Re-vegetation Planting Plan that utilises taonga plant species that would historically occur within the project area and that addresses:

i) Enhancement of Biodiversity
ii) Protection of Cultural and Historic Values; and
iii) Protection of in stream values.

Requests that no in-stream works be scheduled to occur during the whitebait season which runs from 15 August to 30 November (CIA p.42)

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT the Working Party:

(a) Approves the Cultural Impact Assessment (CIA) provided by Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd and notes it will be used to inform the proposed planting, maintenance and amenity programme in 2017/18 (outlined in Table 4.1) and other future projects as endorsed by the Working Party and approved by Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council.

(b) Notes the Waimakariri District Council will arrange a site visit at the Kaiapoi River with Ngai Tuahuriri and Mahaanui Kurataiao representatives as soon as is practicable, in order to commence preparation of a Restoration Revegetation Planting Plan and to seek immediate advice to inform project implementation in the summer of 2017/18.

(c) Notes the Cultural Impact Assessment also recommends development of a Wahi Taonga / Wahi Tapu and Urupa protocol which will need to be progressed prior to the projects requiring earthworks in the river bed / banks.

(d) Notes the Cultural Impact Assessment recommends the use of a Cultural Monitor (engagement of member/s of Ngai Tuahuriri) who is/are trained in the recognition of archaeological sites to monitor earthworks and the need for a Cultural Monitor will be discussed with Ngai Tuahuriri prior to commencement of any excavation that is part of the Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Project (including excavating river bed high points, sediment trap dredging and re-alignment of inner elbow bend) prior to implementation.

(e) Acknowledges the public submissions received during the consultation period.
Approves the continuation of the aquatic intertidal and terrestrial planting and weed control/ general maintenance and amenity programme proposed for 2017/18 as recommended in Table 4.1 (including commencing development of a Restoration Revegetation Planting Plan and Ngai Tuahuriri site visit) using the Waimakariri District Council $25,000 available funding in 2017/18.

Notes the proposed funding in table 4.1 is indicative and final allocations may differ among the recommended projects following more detailed project planning with the contractor/s and Environment Canterbury staff and actual costs of resource consent processing (if required).

Notes the Waimakariri District Council will organise a site visit with the Working Party members and other interested stakeholders as soon as is practicable, to immediately inform the project implementation in 2017/18.

Notes the current improvements underway to the river bed (flood channel) and lower banks area downstream of the Courtenay Confluence by Environment Canterbury using $25,000 available funding.

Recommends that the Waimakariri District Council and Environment Canterbury each consider providing ongoing funding of $25,000 per annum through their Long Term Plans to enable continued staged implementation of the Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Project.

Endorses the concept option described in the “Marico Marine Navigation Channel Concept Design” report (Executive Summary and Annex A) to dredge high spots in the river bed at locations indicated in the attached Concept Design Plans, which will improve safety at low tide for the Coastguard and other river users and recommends this option to the Waimakariri District Council and Environment Canterbury using available project funding in 2018/19 and 2019/20 as a priority project for implementation.

Notes a full hydrographic survey prior to dredging may not be necessary (see Appendix 2 for benefits and risks of proceeding without survey) and notes that staff will further investigate dredging options and methods including whether dredging can proceed without hydrographic survey and report back to the Working Party with further details on all options, methods, estimated spoil quantities and revised costs.

Notes staff will seek to reuse spoil from excavations within the Askeaton Reserve and/or within the Kaiapoi Regeneration Zone subject to further consideration of the effects of salinity on soil use and will now proceed to seek the required approvals for the spoil deposition at both of these locations.

Endorses the future concept option to create a gravel beach with drainage outfall wetland at the 90 degree elbow bend (outside bend), to include creation of “eel tunnels” within gabion baskets placed below the mean low tide mark (p. 24 CIA) and recommends the Waimakariri District Council fund this work in the summer of 2020/21 from its existing project budget.

Endorses the proposed lowering and realignment of the 90 degree elbow bend project, subject to: (1) further consultation with North Canterbury Fish and Game Council, and (2) notes the potential for discovery of wahi taonga during excavation and further consultation with Ngai Tuahuriri on a possible option for a cultural monitor to oversee any excavations at the inner elbow bend, and recommends this option to the Waimakariri District Council and Environment Canterbury for future project funding from 2021/22, for consideration through the Long Term Plans.

Endorses the concept design option to excavate a major sediment trap and slow water channel with planting areas upstream of the Mafeking Bridge as outlined in the Concept Design Plan (Mafeking Bridge to Mandeville Bridge) and recommends this option to the Waimakariri District Council and Environment Canterbury for future project funding from 2021/22, for consideration through the Long Term Plans.

Requests Waimakariri District Council and Environment Canterbury staff together investigate the need for, and if required, obtain all necessary resource consents for undertaking sediment excavation in the Kaiapoi River “high spots” in the locations shown in the attached Concept Design Plans during 2017/18.

Notes a memo on saline intrusion within the Kaiapoi River has been prepared for the Working Party by Adrian Meredith (see attached).

Notes that WDC and ECan staff will jointly prepare a draft future strategy for the Kaiapoi River, for review by the Working Party.
 Moved: Neville Atkinson   Seconded: Claire McKay

CARRIED

6. Other General Business

7. Closing and Next Meeting Date and Time

Thursdays were generally preferred for future meetings, from 4:30pm onwards (comments noted from 9 February 2017 meeting).
Appendix 1:

Navigation Channel “High Spots” Dredging Possible Roles and Funding Options

Note: Recommended option is highlighted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✗ Determine navigation level of service sought by community</td>
<td>WDC</td>
<td>➢ Proposed public consultation (April to May 2017) includes three development options; 1) dredge basin around wharf, and around new berths/pontoons (short term: benefits from no hydro surveys required) 2) above plus dredge channel high spots to achieve 1.5m minimum channel depth at low flow; with option to either (see Appendix 2): a) dredge without hydrosurvey; or b) dredge following full channel hydrosurvey 3) dredge whole channel to meet identified future channel depth requirement (&gt;1.5m: needs hydro surveys and additional channel marks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✗ Determine the preferred approach for dredging channel “high points”</td>
<td>WDC</td>
<td>➢ WDC &amp; ECan to agree what the future channel requirements are, therefore what safety obligations will need to be addressed: including: -PIANC standard (roughly a minimum of 1.8 x length of vessel to turn around 2.3 x beam (width) of a vessel for a single direction channel); or -PIANC standard (roughly a minimum of 3.5x beam (width) for a two way channel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✗ ECan works with WDC to determine what services are required and who will provide those services</td>
<td>ECan/ WDC</td>
<td>➢ WDC build/excavate the facility/s and undertake associated channel improvements, ECan includes the facility/s into its Safety Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✗ Implement identified berth facility, navigation channel and service level requirements</td>
<td>WDC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Oversee safe use of public and commercial usage of navigation facilities (i.e. vessels getting to and from the facility) - Ongoing collaboration

- Responsible for developing public and commercial facilities (i.e. a berthing facility and a channel to access it) - WDC - WDC operates and maintains their facility (i.e. renting berths to boat owners).

**Appendix 2:**

**Dredging Channel High Points Without Hydrographic Survey: Benefits and Risks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ Lower cost option</td>
<td>➢ More difficult to identify required excavation area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Enables easy staging and funding of excavation over several years</td>
<td>➢ Over or under-excavation could occur in relation to navigation requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Practical, pragmatic option</td>
<td>➢ No accurate or defensible records of dredging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Takes account of local knowledge</td>
<td>➢ No benefit until all of the excavated areas are cleared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Does not meet best practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Cannot guarantee provision of minimum depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Does not provide publishable channel depth parameters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>which could be marketed to potential new users</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COURTENAY TO WAIMAKARIRI CONFLUENCE

- Option of excavation of bar at confluence to improve navigation safety/access

- Kaiapoi East Red Zone (review Red Zone Recovery Plan for management options)

- Option of river bed excavation to remove 'high spots'

- Askeaton Boat Ramp (earthquake damaged) (repair options to be determined in conjunction with Red Zone redevelopment)

- Option of excavation of bar at confluence to improve navigation safety/access
MANDEVILLE BRIDGE TO COURTENAY CONFLUENCE

Legend:
- Excavation Areas
- Planting Areas

Proposed Floating Pontoons (channel excavation will be required)

Wharf Redevelopment

Coastguard Launching Ramp

Option of river bed excavation to remove ‘high spots’

Meander channel with inter-tidal zone plantings

Willow control & infill with native plants

Kaiapoi East Red Zone

Kaiapoi South Red Zone
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report is to brief Council on a project Environment Canterbury are proposing to undertake on Cones Road and Millton Avenue to fill gaps in the secondary stopbank, and also to seek approval for the work which will be carried out within Road Reserve.

1.2 The work proposed involves filling on Cones Road and Millton Avenue to raise the roads. This will fill gaps in the current secondary stopbank system. The roads will be lifted to the height of the existing secondary stopbanks in order to contain flood flow, should a breach of the Ashley River primary stopbanks occur.

Attachments:
ii. ECan Ashley – Cones Rd Millton Ave Memo (Trim 180409037665)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180415040538;

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

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

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

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

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 Environment Canterbury have been working with Waimakariri District Council staff on this proposed project to fill the gaps in the secondary stopbank system on Cones Road and Millton Avenue.
3.2 Work is required in this vicinity as the width of the flood channel inside the stopbanks of the Ashley River narrows from 1km to 300m at the Cones Road Ashley Bridge. This narrowing creates a risk of breach in the primary stop banks. Should the primary banks be breached the secondary stop bank system provides additional protection.

3.3 Secondary stopbanks have previously been installed in this area, referred to as “Breakbank” by Environment Canterbury. There are two gaps which remain in the stopbank system. These are at Cones Road and the other at Millton Avenue. Both gaps are largely situated within the road reserve.

3.4 The Manager Utilities and Roading and the Development Manager have held several meetings and workshops with Environment Canterbury and Good Earth Matters (Environment Canterbury’s consultant) to discuss the project and options for filling the gap.

3.5 The options to fill the gaps in the stopbanks which have been discussed at the workshops include:
  - Flood gates
  - Temporary barriers (i.e. inflatable)
  - Stockpiles of fill material
  - Raising the road to the full height of the stopbanks

3.6 A safety in design assessment was also undertaken which looked at the possible options and considered the following aspects:
  - Safety of the Community and the overall reliability of the flood protection system
  - Road & user safety
  - Provision for emergency services
  - Overall deployment
  - Warning times.

3.7 A risk matrix was developed for the different options and consequently it was agreed that the preferred option which provided the best level of service and safety outcomes was to lift the road. This option provided the required flood protection and a safer road environment while also allowing for unimpeded access for emergency services. This option does not rely on personnel to deploy the flood protection system in an extreme event.

3.8 ECan are proposing to carry out the works between June and November 2018 with the exact sequencing to be confirmed. The work is to be carried out in three phases:
  - Minor works in Taggart’s yard on Cones Road (outside of Road Reserve) is to be carried out between June / July 2018
  - Raising Cones Road
  - Raising Millton Avenue

3.9 ECan are proposing to close one section of road at a time to allow the work to be carried out in a safe and efficient manner. This proposal is supported by staff as this will allow for traffic to be detoured via the alternate road while the work is underway.

3.10 The exact timing of the phases of work is still to be confirmed. It is desirable to have Millton Avenue open for the Rangiora A&P Show which is to be held on 19 & 20 October 2018.

3.11 Town entry signage will be carefully relocated to a suitably visible position complete with appropriate plantings.
4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The horizontal curvature for the prosed road has been designed for a 110km/h operating speed which is higher than the current posted speed limit of 80km/h. This is considered appropriate for this location.

4.2. Both roads will be raised to allow for a smooth transition in height over several hundred metres.

4.3. Waimakariri District Council roading engineers have reviewed the design. We are satisfied that the design provides for road safety and complies with the engineering code of practice. Waimakariri District Council engineering approval will be required for the final design.

4.4. The pedestrian and cycling path to the west of Milton Ave will be relocated in this area to cross over the top of the stopbank. The path will be constructed at a gradient suitable for disabled access.

4.5. A traffic management plan will need to be developed and approved prior to any work commencing within the Road Reserve. This will need to be carefully considered and monitored as there is the potential for conflict at the River Road Cones Road intersection. It will also have an impact on traffic flows in the wider Rangiora area.

4.6. The issue of flood break out from the Ashley River in this area referred to as “Breakbank” has been identified as a key flood protection project by ECan.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.2. Environment Canterbury have presented to both the Rangiora Ashley Community Board and the Utilities & Roading Committee to outline the proposed project and timeframes. Both were supportive of this project and had a number of comments and questions that will be taken into account. These included impact of traffic, public communication and amenity features in the area.

5.3. **Wider Community**

5.4. Staff will work with Environment Canterbury to ensure that a high level of communication is carried out with the community and to ensure that the wider transport sector are notified of the temporary traffic management changes while the work is undertaken.

5.5. It is noted that the Rangiora A&P Show is to be held on the 19 & 20 October 2018. It is desirable to have the work complete on Millton Avenue and the road open for this event.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.2. ECan have funding available in the 2017/18 and 2018/19 financial years to carry out this work. The total project cost is in the order of $1.1 million.

6.3. There is no funding required from Waimakariri District Council for this project.

6.4. **Community Implications**

6.5. The project has the potential to cause disruption to traffic due to proposed road closures which will impact on travel routes. Staff will work with Environment Canterbury to carry out
public communications to help minimise the impacts on the Community as well as the wider transport sector. Liaison will also be carried out with the Hurunui District Council, the Trucking Association and the Heavy Haulage Association.

6.6. **Risk Management**

6.7. A comprehensive Traffic Management Plan will be developed and implemented to manage traffic disruption.

6.8. Following filling of the gaps in the secondary stopbank system, the risk of flooding from a breach will be significantly reduced.

6.9. **Health and Safety**

6.10. A risk assessment has been documented as part of the options assessment phase of the project and will be further considered in more detail as part of the Engineering Approval process which is to follow.

6.11. Environment Canterbury will require that their contractor has an approved Site Specific Health & Safety Plan prior to work commencing on site.

6.12. Waimakariri District Council will review and issue the traffic management plan for the works. Staff will monitor traffic throughout the construction. Any issues will be addressed through modifications to the traffic management plan.

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**

This project will be subject to the *Resource Management Act 1991* and Regional Plan Rules and resource consent requirements.

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 approve works within the Road Reserve.

Gerard Cleary          Joanne McBride  
Manager, Utilities & Roading  Development Manager
Dear Gerard,

Cones Road & Milton Avenue – Road Raising

The following is a summary of the proposed changes to Cones Road and Milton Avenue which were discussed with yourself, Joanne McBride and Bill Rice last week. David Bridges and I are more than happy to come and discuss this project with the community board and WDC Utilities and Roading Committee on April 11 and 17 respectively. Please feel free to share this letter to these groups in advance if necessary.

Background:
This project relates to the construction of the secondary stopbanks built in the area referred to as ‘Breakbank’ on the South side of the Ashley River in the vicinity of the Rangiora traffic bridge and rail bridge. Stopbank construction was completed in two stages between May 2013 and March 2015. Stage 1 comprised of work located upstream of Milton Avenue while Stage 2 comprised of the work located between Milton Avenue and the rail bridge.

![Figure 1: Project location plan](image)

The design for the secondary stopbanks is to cater for a 500m3/s breach of the primary stopbank system upstream of the traffic bridge. The breach flow will be conveyed between the
new banks and the existing primary stopbank before being redirected to the main channel in the vicinity of the rail bridge as shown in Figure 1.

There remain two ‘gaps’ in the secondary system in the locations where Cones Road and Milton Avenue pass through. The purpose of this project is to address these gaps.

**Milton Avenue:**

The proposed work includes raising of Milton Avenue to the height of the adjacent secondary stopbank, a change of approximately 3m. The horizontal alignment of the road will not be changed. A large vertical curve has been incorporated into the design of the raised road so that the speed limit and safety of the current road remains the same. When driving from Rangiora, a small rise will be noticed as the stopbank is approached, followed by a gentle gradient down towards the bridge.

The footpath will be reconstructed to follow the road at a gradient that is sufficiently low for disabled people to use it. Safe sight distances will be maintained from the driveway entrance to the BMX recreation area. The dog park and riding for disabled sites will not be affected by this work.

Overview drawings attached as Appendix A.

**Cones Road:**

The proposed work includes raising of Cones Road to the height of the adjacent secondary stopbank, a change of approximately 1.5m. The horizontal alignment of the road will not be changed. A large vertical curve has been incorporated into the design of the raised road so that the speed limit and safety of the current road remains the same.

Safe sight distances will be maintained from the driveway entrance to the Taggart Earthmoving yard.

Overview drawings attached as Appendix A.

**Funding:**

The proposed work will be funded by the Ashley River Rating District, an Environment Canterbury managed flood protection scheme. Funds have been allocated to span the current financial year and next financial year. At this stage, we are confident the project can be completed within the allocated funding of $1.1 million.

**Timing:**

It is proposed to advertise the entire package of work as a single contract on Monday April 16th 2018. The full tender process is programmed to be completed at the end of May, leading to a start date for construction of mid June 2018.

Physical works will comprise three separable portions of the works contract.

- **Stage 1:** Minor upgrade works outside of the road reserve at the Taggart Earthworks site in June / July.
- **Stage 2:** Cones Road raising in July / August / September. This will require the closure of Cones Road (Milton Ave open).
- **Stage 3:** Milton Avenue raising in September / October / November. This will require the closure of Milton Ave (Cones Road open).
We stress that a route from Rangiora to the bridge will remain open throughout the contract works period. No work will be permitted to occur on Milton Avenue until the Cones Road separable portion of the contract is complete. There will be minimal disruption to motorists as a result of this work being undertaken, current speed limits will be maintained on both Milton Ave and Cones Rd once work on each is completed.

Public Communication:

Prior to works commencing, Environment Canterbury will publish details of the work and expected timing for the various components in the relevant newspaper and social media sites. Consideration will be made as to the inclusion of electronic sign boards for the detour routes. Every effort will be made to keep the public informed of the likely disruption and job progress.

Overall, this project provides significant benefit to Rangiora and the wider district in the form of a more resilient flood protection scheme. It has been endorsed by the Ashley River Rating District Committee. The last major flood which breached the primary stopbank at this location was in 1953, significant growth has occurred on the floodplain since then. This is an important part of the ongoing evolution of flood protection from the Ashley River.

I trust that this provides the level of detail you are looking for. If you have any questions, comments or suggestions, please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

Yours Sincerely,

Shaun McCracken
Regional Lead, River Engineering (CP Eng.)
Environment Canterbury

Appendix A – Overview drawings
1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report recommends that the Council adopts the Waimakariri District Council Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018, following community consultation. The bylaw consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Special Consultative Procedure of the Local Government Act 2002, with 10 submissions received.

1.2 The bylaw review hearing panel first convened on 27 February 2018 to hear submissions and convened again on 20 March 2018 to deliberate on submissions and prepare its recommendations. The associated staff report to the Hearing Panel on 20 March can be viewed on TRIM 180119004273 (v3), including the summary of submissions and staff recommendations. The summary of submissions and recommendations is also attached to the Appendix of this report for reference. All proposed changes to the bylaw following consultation are outlined in the attached revised “Waimakariri District Council Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018”, for adoption.

1.3 The proposed bylaw will protect the public infrastructure investment by controlling access to stormwater and drainage reticulation and facilities and through requiring approval for any works on Council systems. In addition, the bylaw protects the public from flood hazard through “avoiding nuisance” associated with activities around watercourses, overland flow paths, flood plains or stop banks. It protects the environment by specifying provisions to avoid discharge of contaminants.

Attachments:

i. Waimakariri District Council Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018 Track Change Version from Consultation (Trim 171107120824).

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018 Review Hearing Panel recommends:

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180329034013.
Adopts the Waimakariri District Council Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018.

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

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

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The Council is currently updating the 2011 Stormwater Bylaw. The bylaw review hearing panel has now completed the public consultation on the proposed revised Waimakariri District Council Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018.

3.2 The Local Government Act 2002, Section 160, provides for the use of the Special Consultative Procedure outlined in Section 83 to review and amend the bylaw. Now that consultation is complete, in accordance with the Special Consultative Procedure, the hearing panel is recommending the bylaw to the Council for approval. Once adopted by Council the 2018 version will replace the Stormwater Bylaw 2011.

3.3 Prior to the establishment of the Stormwater Bylaw in 2011 there was no local legislation in place to control the quality of stormwater discharges into the Council’s reticulation or receiving environment. The bylaw has been developed for the primary purpose of protecting public health and safety, and improving the quality of the environment.

3.4 The proposed revised bylaw is now substantially revised from the existing 2011 version. Some key proposed changes shown between the 2011 and 2018 versions are:

- Extending the existing bylaw to cover rural land drainage systems as well as urban reticulated stormwater systems
- Clarifying the provisions for acceptance of stormwater and land drainage water into a Council system
- Extending the provisions for pollution prevention plans throughout the District to better manage discharge of contaminants into Council systems from medium-risk activities / sites, at or from source
- Extending the requirement for high-risk activities / sites throughout the District to obtain Environment Canterbury consent for discharges that enter a water body via a Council system
- Some provisions to extend the bylaw to private systems and activities on private property
- Provisions to prevent interference with Council systems
- Provisions to avoid damage from excessive use of herbicide, or from stock or vehicle access to watercourses managed by the Council
- Requirement for private owners/occupiers to maintain private systems, watercourses, overland flow paths, floodplains and stop banks in good operating condition and to avoid nuisance
3.5 The proposed revisions will protect the public infrastructure investment by controlling access to reticulation and facilities and requiring approval for any works on Council systems. In addition, the bylaw protects the public from flood hazard through “avoiding nuisance” associated with activities around watercourses, overland flow paths, stop banks or flood plains. It protects the environment by specifying provisions to avoid contaminants from discharging into or from the stormwater or land drainage systems.

3.6 The 2018 version of the bylaw has been drafted to seek to respond to common issues experienced during the ongoing operation and maintenance of the Council’s stormwater and land drainage systems. These include avoiding activities which interfere with Council systems or watercourses managed by the Council, such as vehicle or stock damage or excess spraying of open drains.

3.7 The bylaw is also intended to address some of the effects of managing private stormwater or land drainage systems. This is so the bylaw can support the role of the Council in resolving situations where the actions of one party affect other properties and downstream Council systems or the receiving environment.

3.8 The proposals within the bylaw are intended to assist the Council to implement its stormwater network discharge consents which it is required to obtain under provisions of the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan (CLWRP). Consent applications for existing stormwater discharges from the District’s urban reticulated stormwater systems are currently being prepared and are required to be lodged with Environment Canterbury by 30 June 2018, or other later date as agreed with Environment Canterbury.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. The hearing panel considered the submissions and staff recommendations and are now recommending to Council a number of changes to the bylaw to respond to requests raised in submissions. The changes proposed as a result of submissions are summarised as follows:

- Clarify that the requirement for resource consent will be mandatory for all new operating phase stormwater discharges defined as “high-risk” into a Council system

- Clarify that the requirement for Pollution Prevention Plans will be mandatory for all new operating phase stormwater discharges defined as “medium-risk” into a Council system

- Clarify that consents and Pollution Prevention Plans will only be required for existing high and medium-risk operating phase stormwater discharges if specifically requested by Council, to address concerns identified during sub-catchment contaminant source investigations, consent compliance monitoring or from a service request

- Reduce the scope and range of sites included in the high-risk site activity definition in Schedule 1 of the bylaw, and applies the definition only to operating phase discharges

- Amend requirements for construction phase discharges into Council systems so that any construction occurring on potentially contaminated land (subject to advice from Environment Canterbury) may require an Environment Canterbury consent

- Require evidence of compliance with a Pollution Prevention Plan for a medium-risk site every three years at the time the plan is reviewed
• Amends an objective to clarify that the bylaw is intended to assist the Council to implement its stormwater network discharge consents and assist the Council meet future consent conditions

• Amends Section 5 relating to Acceptance of Stormwater and Land Drainage Water to clarify that this section only applies to new or altered connections to a Council system

• Include a new reference to the “Environment Canterbury Erosion and Sediment Control Toolbox for Canterbury” (see http://esccanterbury.co.nz/)

• Amend Section 16 to specify a requirement to avoid nuisance from management of private systems or private management of watercourses, overland flow paths, flood plains or stop banks located on private property, and removes the reference to maintaining the “free flow of water”.

4.2 Several other proposed changes were recommended by staff and are supported by the panel. Following ongoing review of possible methods to implement the bylaw during the consultation, staff propose the following further amendments: 1) amend Section 2.3 to more clearly set out the systems and situations which are covered by the bylaw; 2) amend Section 7 to more clearly set out responsibilities for private and Council connection and discharge points and their associated maintenance; 3) amend Section 11.1 to require Council approval of any Erosion and Sediment Control Plan required for construction phase discharges into Council systems; and 4) amend Section 12 to separate those activities which require some form of Council written approval from activities which are forbidden. These requested changes will provide more certainty during bylaw implementation.

4.3 Following the hearing on 27 February, staff met with Environment Canterbury officers on Monday 5 March to workshop further evidence that Environment Canterbury submitted at the hearing and sought to reach agreement on issues raised. As a result of this workshop and further staff review of the evidence, some further recommended changes were incorporated into the attached draft. Further, during the hearing on 27 February the hearing panel discussed other possible changes to the bylaw which are also included in the revised version.

4.4 Of the above, changes proposed by staff to respond to the Environment Canterbury evidence are: a) separating out the sections of the bylaw relating to “operating phase discharges” from those relating to “construction phase discharges” and including a reference to “operating phase discharges” in Schedule 1; b) adding an explanatory note following clause 11.3 which outlines the process for assessing risk from construction phase discharges from potentially contaminated land; and c) amending clause 5.1(b) to note that new connection approvals will be assessed by the Council subject to clause 6.1.

4.5 Changes were also included in the draft bylaw taking account of comments from members of the hearing panel and discussions with the legal advisors present at the hearing on 27 February, and in further correspondence received from Corcoran French on 16 March, prior to the re-adjournment of the panel on 20 March. These proposed changes are:

• amends clause 5.1 to add “every person seeking a new or altered connection to a Council system…” to clarify situations covered by this section;

• amends clause 5.1 (b) to add “with such approvals assessed subject to requirements of Sections 5.1 and 6.1 of this bylaw”, following advice received from Corcoran French;
• amends clause 6.1 (h) to include “any approved pollution prevention plan that has been provided in accordance with section 9” in the list of requirements to be met for design, construction and operation of new or altered systems;

• amends section 6.3 to state that it applies to “existing sites being redeveloped,…”, following advice received from Corcoran French;

• amends section 8.1 to include “herbicide” in the explanatory note detailing examples of contaminants which are covered under the bylaw;

• amends clause 12.1.2 to replace “alter” with “impede”, to clarify circumstances where the use of herbicide affects the flow of water such that it is required to be managed through the bylaw;

• amends the section 12 title to read “Activities Requiring Approval” instead of “Restricted Activities”, and amends clause 12.2 to change “prohibited activities” instead to “the following activities are forbidden” to avoid using terminology from the Resource Management Act which has a different meaning in that Act from the meaning of the term within the bylaw;

• Amends the last sentence of Schedule 1A of the bylaw to correctly refer to Schedule 1B, following advice received from Corcoran French.

4.6 Having considered the views of submitters, panel members, legal advisors and staff, the proposals in this report are now considered to provide the most cost effective and certain process for all parties discharging stormwater and land drainage water into Council systems and to clarify roles and responsibilities of all parties. In particular the changes clarify requirements for applicants and the Council for managing high-risk activity discharges.

4.7 The high-risk operating phase category in the bylaw clearly identifies activities which require the highest level of scrutiny through the consent process, whilst medium-risk activities can appropriately be assessed by staff using the pollution prevention plan requirements and criteria. The proposals would establish a framework for high-risk site management which best uses the skills and resources available in the region, without needing to duplicate the expert science based consenting services currently available within Environment Canterbury within every territorial authority.

4.8 The proposals in this report and attached bylaw are also considered to provide the best outcome for the environment. This is through ensuring the highest risk activities receive a more stringent assessment and greater level of control through the consent process. The proposal is consistent with current practice and the policy intent of the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan, as it continues to provide for ongoing Environment Canterbury consenting of stormwater discharges in exceptional circumstances, as is applicable for the high-risk operating phase category of activities identified in Schedule 1.

4.9 Enforcement Options

4.10 It is anticipated that enforcement to give effect to the stormwater network discharge consent conditions will be undertaken through applying the Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018. The bylaw and consents will therefore operate together to assist the Council to do its part to achieve the objectives and policies of the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (2014) (NPSFM). They are intended to improve water quality outcomes in the District, over time, by improving the quality of the urban stormwater discharges.
4.11 The Council is currently only able to legally enforce this bylaw through court action. At present it can seek to improve water quality in the District or protect flood management infrastructure by proceeding with court prosecutions in the case of major bylaw offences. A full discussion of other enforcement options for minor offences is provided in the report which notified the bylaw for consultation (TRIM 170907097266).

4.12 In summary, that earlier report notes, following adoption of the bylaw, that staff will seek a legal avenue to issue infringement fines of up to $1,000 per offence under the revised bylaw provisions, as an alternative to court prosecution. This could be achieved through development of new regulations made by Order in Council by the Governor-General which specify particular infringement offences and fines which can be levied under the bylaw. The Council will seek to initiate lobbying for this change from the Canterbury Mayoral Forum and Canterbury Regional Stormwater Forum.

4.13 A further option may be available to issue infringement fines of up to $400 per offence under provisions of the Litter Act 1979. Advice from Corcoran French lawyers indicates the definition of “litter” within the Act includes contaminated substances in liquid form, such as spilled oil. Staff could investigate more widely the possible use of the Litter Act in terms of future Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018 enforcement for discharges of various types of contaminants into the Council systems, including discharge of liquid contaminants and suspended sediment, although the fine is unlikely to cover the costs of any remedial works.

4.14 The Council can also continue to refer pollution issues to Environment Canterbury to enforce directly via its own infringements system, if the discharge contravenes Section 15 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

4.15 Council Options

4.16 The Council has the option of amending the bylaw prior to adoption, or adopting the bylaw in the form currently recommended by the hearing panel.

4.17 The Local Government Act 2002, Section 158, requires the first review of a bylaw made under the Act to be undertaken no later than five years after the bylaw was made, if the bylaw was made after 1 July 2003. The review date for the Stormwater Bylaw 2011 (in force from 1 October 2011) is therefore 1 October 2016. Any bylaw that is not reviewed within the specified timeframe is revoked two years after the last date on which it should have been reviewed. The Stormwater Bylaw 2011 will therefore be revoked on 1 October 2018, if not reviewed prior to this date.

4.18 The Council could delay the final adoption of the bylaw until closer to 1 October 2018 so that any agreements made with Environment Canterbury during the processing of the stormwater discharge network consents, including any draft consent conditions and agreed contaminant discharge limits could be reflected in the bylaw. However, staff advise that the negotiation with Environment Canterbury over stormwater network discharge consent conditions and compliance methods may take months, if not years to resolve. Therefore the panel recommend the Council now proceed to adopt and enact the bylaw so that it may come immediately into force. The bylaw can be reviewed at any future time when needed to reflect the conditions of the stormwater network discharge consents.

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

5.1 Groups and Organisations

5.2 10 submissions were received on the draft bylaw. These were heard by the hearing panel at its meeting on 27 February 2018 and further considered during the deliberations meeting on 20 March 2018. All submissions are summarised in the Appendix One “Summary of Submissions and Staff Recommendations” table at the end of this report.

5.3 Further evidence was provided on the draft bylaw by Environment Canterbury expert advisors on 16 February 2018. A separate analysis of the recommendations in that evidence, and associated proposed changes to the draft bylaw are included in Appendix Two “Environment Canterbury Evidence and Staff Recommendations” table at the end of this report.

5.4 The staff report to the Hearing Panel on 20 March can be viewed on TRIM 180119004273 (v3) and the earlier report to the hearing panel on 27 February can be viewed in TRIM 180119004273[v2].

5.5 Wider Community

5.6 The bylaw was notified for public consultation by the Council on 24 October 2017. Views of the community have been sought through public consultation in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002, using the Special Consultative Procedure. The public were notified of this proposal through public notices in the Northern Outlook and the North Canterbury News, and information on the Council’s website. A full page advertisement was also included in the North Canterbury News and Northern Outlook during the consultation period. Copies of the proposed revised bylaw and statement of proposal were also available at service centres and libraries.

5.7 During the consultation period the Council wrote to the adjoining Councils, its drainage maintenance contractor (SICON), Environment Canterbury and Community and Public Health. It also presented the draft bylaw proposals to the Waimakariri Zone Water Management Committee and to a joint Community Board members meeting. Staff also circulated an email with the bylaw proposals to members of the Drainage Advisory Groups. A consultation meeting was held with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga which included discussion about the bylaw proposals on 19 October 2017 (see minutes of meeting in TRIM 171018113150).

5.8 The 10 submitters to this draft bylaw were acknowledged in writing and each was provided the opportunity to speak to the hearing panel in person.

5.9 If the Council chooses to adopt the draft bylaw following its consideration of recommendations from the hearing panel, public notice of the adoption of the bylaw will be provided as required by Section 157 of the Local Government Act 2002.

6 IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1 Financial Implications

6.2 The review of the Stormwater Bylaw 2011 is being carried out using existing staff resources and existing budgets.

6.3 There will be operating cost increases to the Council over time as a result of implementing the Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018. These will be required in order to:
• Roll out a process to assess, approve and review pollution prevention plans throughout the District

• Provide approvals for the activities which can now be managed under new provisions of Section 12 of the bylaw

• Increased monitoring and assessment of activities now covered by the bylaw provisions

• The bylaw is a key monitoring and enforcement tool for the implementation of pending Stormwater Network Discharge Consents for each major town in the District. These are required to be lodged with Environment Canterbury by 30 June 2018 and will also incur additional costs for implementation.

6.4 The Council may introduce user charges in the future to cover the costs of providing these assessments and approvals under Section 18 of the proposed bylaw, as practicable. These fees and charges would be introduced through the Annual Plan consultation process at a later date.

6.5 It is anticipated that full operating costs could be in the order of an additional $100,000 per year, including salary costs. These costs will not come into full effect until 2025 and are subject to the outcome on the role territorial authorities will play in terms of consenting discharges from high-risk sites and construction phase discharges. These additional costs are not included in the Long Term Plan.

6.6 Community Implications

6.7 The Council may introduce user charges in the future to cover the costs of providing assessments and approvals under Section 18 of the proposed bylaw, as practicable. These fees and charges would be introduced through the Annual Plan consultation process at a later date, so that affected parties become aware of the requirements and costs before they are applied. Implementation of the bylaw will be phased in over time, with an emphasis on public education and ongoing liaison with affected parties to seek to effect positive behaviour change. This approach should improve the quality of water discharging into the environment over time.

6.8 Risk Management

The draft bylaw and revisions following consultation have been subject to review by Corcoran French Lawyers, which include identifying any risks to the Council associated with revising and applying the bylaw. The results of the reviews have been incorporated into the attached revised version for adoption. Corcoran French, in correspondence dated 16 March 2018 reviewed the consultation process undertaken and associated proposed changes to the bylaw and concluded that “we consider that the original proposal has not changed such that the Bylaw has to be re-notified” (refer TRIM 180410038264 for discussion). The Corcoran French review also provides certainty to the Council that the bylaw provisions are reasonable and the revised document will be able to be implemented.

6.9 Health and Safety

The revised bylaw will contribute to improved health and safety in the district through assisting Council with mechanisms to improve its management of quality and quantity of stormwater and land drainage water discharging into the environment. The changes are intended to assist the Council to reduce flood risk and water contamination.
7 CONTEXT

7.1 Policy

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

Policy 4.16A of the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan (CLWRP) requires the Council to account for and assume responsibility for the quality and quantity of all stormwater discharged from its reticulated stormwater systems by 2025. This includes management of discharges into the Council stormwater systems from high-risk activities or sites. This bylaw gives effect to the policy by providing avenues for the Council to assume responsibility for medium-risk activity / site discharges directly into its networks. The Council’s approach to accounting for and assuming responsibility for the high-risk discharges is to specify its requirements including for some properties and activities to be required to obtain the Environment Canterbury consent in exceptional circumstances, such as those identified as high-risk in Schedule 1, in order for Council to approve discharges from these sites and activities into its systems.

7.2 Legislation

The Waimakariri District Council proposes to make this bylaw under provisions of Section 145 and 146 of the Local Government Act 2002. These provisions state that:

Section 145

General bylaw-making power for territorial authorities

A territorial authority may make bylaws for its District for 1 or more of the following purposes:

(a) protecting the public from nuisance:
(b) protecting, promoting and maintaining public health and safety:
(c) minimising the potential for offensive behaviour in public places.

Section 146

Specific bylaw-making powers of territorial authorities

Without limiting Section 145, a territorial authority may make bylaws for its District for the purposes-

(b) of managing, regulating against, or protecting from, damage, misuse, or loss, or for preventing the use of, the land, structures, or infrastructure associated with 1 or more of the following:

(iii) wastewater, drainage, and sanitation:
(iv) land drainage:

In addition, Section 64 of the Health Act 1956 empowers the Council to make bylaws in relation to:

“(a) improving, promoting, or protecting public health, and preventing and abating nuisances:
(f) prescribing the sanitary precautions to be adopted in respect of any business or trade:”.

7.3 Community Outcomes

The proposed Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018 will contribute to each of 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, sustainable and affordable manner.
- Harm to the environment from sewage and stormwater discharges is minimised.

7.4 Delegations

The Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018 is local legislation. The final version needs to be adopted at a Council meeting so that it can be enacted and implemented in accordance with requirements of the Local Government Act 2002.
# APPENDIX ONE: Summary of Submissions and Staff Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitter</th>
<th>Point of Submission</th>
<th>Staff Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Change to Bylaw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Board – Kaiapoi Tuahiwi</td>
<td>The Board supports the draft Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018. The Board believes the bylaw proposals are clear and well thought through. The Board would also wish to reiterate the importance of ongoing communication and the provision of public information particularly for those properties that may be affected by the proposed bylaw.</td>
<td>Acknowledges the Community Board submissions. Staff are preparing a full page newspaper advertisement / flier with guidance for industry and the general public on how to prevent contaminants from private properties and activities from entering the stormwater systems which then discharge into local waterways. Staff are likely to publish the advertisement once the bylaw is adopted. This will assist with implementation and public awareness of impacts of private activities on waterways. Staff will also explore opportunities to publish this flier on the website and make it available at service centres and libraries. More specific proposals will arise in future years which will be required to implement the bylaw. Affected properties will be further consulted at that time. The draft bylaw was circulated to members of the Drainage Advisory Groups during the consultation</td>
<td>No change is proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Board– Oxford Ohoka</td>
<td>The Board is supportive of the draft bylaw and believe the proposal is heading in the right direction to support ongoing improvement of our waterways. Furthermore the board thanks staff for the very informative presentation and briefing on 30 November 2017. The Board would wish to reiterate the importance of ongoing communication and the provision of public information particularly for those properties and Drainage Advisory Committees that may be affected by the proposed bylaw. The Board also emphasise the importance of early communication and engagement with stakeholders at the formative stages of any bylaw.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitter</td>
<td>Point of Submission</td>
<td>Staff Recommendation</td>
<td>Proposed Change to Bylaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Board - Rangiora Ashley</strong></td>
<td>The Board supports the draft bylaw and thanks staff for the very informative presentation on 30 November 2017. The Board believes that the bylaw proposals are clear and well thought through. Vigilance and the ability to rectify problems quickly will be important if the intent of the bylaw is to be achieved. The need for appropriate and responsive enforcement action will be a key factor. The Board would also wish to reiterate the importance of ongoing communication and the provision of public information particularly for those properties that may be affected by the proposed bylaw. The Board also notes the engagement of staff with the Drainage Advisory Boards and that this is also extremely important so as to alleviate any concerns or queries going forward and also achieve compliance.</td>
<td>period. The Council will continue to work with the Groups on implementing aspects of the bylaw within each drainage rating area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Board – Woodend Sefton</strong></td>
<td>Thanks staff for the very informative presentation and briefing on 30 November. The Board would wish to reiterate the importance of ongoing communication and the provision of public information particularly for those properties that may be affected by the proposed bylaw.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitter</td>
<td>Point of Submission</td>
<td>Staff Recommendation</td>
<td>Proposed Change to Bylaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Edge Landscape Projects Ltd  | **Support of Bylaw**  
On the whole I think this bylaw will help achieve its aims of meeting the requirements of the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan (CLWRP) and National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPSFM) 2014. | Thanks the submitter for supporting the intent of the bylaw.                         | No change is proposed.        |
| Edge Landscape Projects Ltd  | **Internationally Accepted “Systems” Approach**  
I would like the Council to adopt an internationally accepted “systems” approach to Rural and Urban Drainage Management that is sustainable, flexible and adapted to our local situation. | Acknowledges the submission. The Council is consulting the community through the Long Term Plan 2018 to 2028 about its role in water drainage systems management. It is asking the public whether the Council is doing enough in the “Water Management” space, including managing waterways, managing flooding and improving quality of stormwater discharges. The responses to this consultation may provide the Council with a mandate to take a wider role in management of waterway systems, including integrating the management of rural and urban drainage systems with downstream waterways (where these waterways are not otherwise managed by Environment Canterbury). | No change is proposed.        |
| Edge Landscape Projects Ltd  | **Sub-catchment Management Plans**  
In my opinion, sub-catchment management plans and Stormwater Plans are going to be the most valuable tools in providing some certainty for the community and agencies in achieving an | Acknowledges the submission and notes that the WDC is preparing “Interim” Stormwater Management Plans to address quality and quantity issues for discharges from urban reticulated stormwater systems. The WDC will also prepare more comprehensive (future) Stormwater Management Plans by 2025 to develop more systematic | No change is proposed.        |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitter</th>
<th>Point of Submission</th>
<th>Staff Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Change to Bylaw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edge Landscape Projects Ltd</td>
<td>integrated approach to landscape and water management.</td>
<td>approaches and programmes to improve stormwater discharge quality, with $20 million budgeted for future implementation from 2025 to 2035/40. Environment Canterbury are understood to be responsible for developing sub-catchment management plans for integrated management of the receiving environment, including urban and rural waterways and aquatic ecosystems.</td>
<td>No change is proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge Landscape Projects Ltd</td>
<td>Definitions</td>
<td>Acknowledges the submission. The proposed comprehensive mapping project for all waterways is outside the scope of the Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018.</td>
<td>No change is proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge Landscape Projects Ltd</td>
<td>Resourcing and Funding</td>
<td>The Council is currently consulting through the Long Term Plan 2018 to 2028 about its current role and funding commitments for managing waterways. It is consulting the community about whether additional funding should be provided for it to become more extensively involved in this work.</td>
<td>No change is proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge Landscape Projects Ltd</td>
<td>Climate Change Impacts</td>
<td>Acknowledges the submission. As noted above, the Council is consulting its involvement in waterway management through the Long Term Plan.</td>
<td>No change is proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitter</td>
<td>Point of Submission</td>
<td>Staff Recommendation</td>
<td>Proposed Change to Bylaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Canterbury</td>
<td><strong>Pollution Prevention Plans</strong></td>
<td>Staff welcome support for the roll out of a pollution prevention plan (PPP) process for non-complying medium-risk sites in the District.</td>
<td>No change is proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment Canterbury support use of these plans for medium-risk sites and would also encourage their use for high-risk sites.</td>
<td>WDC does not intend to require PPPs for high-risk sites, as they are not considered to be adequate. It would like these to continue to be separately consented by Environment Canterbury. The Council also clarifies that it will not request an existing “high-risk” site owner or activity to obtain an Environment Canterbury consent unless a specific issue with the discharge is identified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is an opportunity to link the requirements of PPPs to the limits placed on future resource consents for discharges from Council networks to the environment.</td>
<td>The Council will be implementing PPPs in coming years for non-complying medium-risk sites. It will seek to align the requirements within each PPP with the resource consent conditions for the stormwater network discharges, once the limits are known.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff propose to make the Pollution Prevention Plan process mandatory only for new medium-risk sites and activities. It is proposed that Council, at its discretion, will decide whether to request the PPP for non-complying discharges from existing medium-risk sites. This would be in response to an issue identified with the management of the site’s stormwater discharges through issues reported via service requests or through the Council’s contaminant source sub-catchment investigations that will be required as a part of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitter</td>
<td>Point of Submission</td>
<td>Staff Recommendation</td>
<td>Proposed Change to Bylaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Canterbury</td>
<td>Timing of Review</td>
<td>implementing its stormwater network discharge consents.</td>
<td>No change is proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledges the submission but notes staff do not support a delay in the bylaw review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>timeframe. This is because the processing timeframe for the network consents is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>uncertain, with delays possible to and beyond 1 October 2018. The 2011 bylaw will be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>revoked on 1 October 2018 if the revised bylaw is not confirmed by that date. The</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council would then be left with no protection from contaminant discharges into its</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>systems until the revised bylaw was adopted. The bylaw requires all discharges into its</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>systems to meet all operative consent conditions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff are simultaneously preparing the Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bylaw 2018 report for the hearing panel whilst completing the lodgement process for the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora stormwater network discharge consent application, which will form a template</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for the stormwater network management agreements to be rolled out across the other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>towns. The bylaw is able to be easily reviewed in future years if changes are needed to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>align it with the network consent conditions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The bylaw is able to be easily reviewed in future years if changes are needed to align</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>it with the network consent conditions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Canterbury</td>
<td>High-Risk Activities</td>
<td>Staff note that, notwithstanding the recommendations in the Environment Canterbury</td>
<td>See following revisions shown as track changes in attached revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>submission, the consenting of high-risk site discharges into Council systems is legally</td>
<td>bylaw, as recommended by staff:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>able to continue to be undertaken by Environment Canterbury. It is also noted that</td>
<td>Section 9.2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Environment Canterbury indicate in their submission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See following revisions shown as track changes in attached revised bylaw, as recommended by staff:

Section 9.2:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitter</th>
<th>Point of Submission</th>
<th>Staff Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Change to Bylaw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment Canterbury</td>
<td>Environment Canterbury considers that it is only in exceptional circumstances that a discharge should require a resource consent from Environment Canterbury. Exclusion from the network consent and bylaw provisions could be provided on a “case by case” basis. The bylaw requirement is considered onerous as some high-risk sites may have previous soil contamination analysis undertaken that demonstrates contaminants below background concentrations. The submission notes, with regard to some of the sites identified as “High-Risk”, the requirement for consent from ECAn is likely to be excessive. To provide a more flexible approach the Council could consider obtaining third party advice to approve or certify that potential high-risk sites are applying appropriate stormwater treatment mitigations and management within the site. If certification was provided then the owner would not need to apply for resource consent from Environment Canterbury. A cost recovery mechanism could be considered within the bylaw to explore such approval and certification using LGA s150. This may be less expensive for an applicant than proceeding with an ECAn consent.</td>
<td>that a resource consent for discharge into a reticulated stormwater system should be required from Environment Canterbury in exceptional circumstances. Staff note Environment Canterbury has the in-house expertise, legal mechanisms, resources and access to the most effective enforcement options to enable it to best manage and enforce the requirements for high-risk sites and for potentially contaminated land. Staff recommend that Council continues to refer high-risk sites to Environment Canterbury for consenting. This is the current approach and is consistent with sites that discharge directly into the receiving environment. However, staff propose a change to the definition of high-risk sites in Schedule 1 to reduce the scope and range of sites that will require consent for operational discharges. This should go some way to addressing concerns in the Environment Canterbury submission. This change would include removing the reference in Schedule 1 (A) to: a) sites on the Listed Land Use Register; and b) sites not permitted to be developed or redeveloped under the Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011…”. These would instead be referenced in Section 11 and apply only to the identification of potentially contaminated land. Staff also recommend the high-risk site definition in Schedule 1 (A) is applied only to “Operating Phase”</td>
<td>“The owner/occupier undertaking any existing medium-risk activity on any site as defined in Schedule 1 and that connects to a Council system shall, if requested by the Council, prepare and implement a site specific Pollution Prevention Plan…”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 10.2:

“The owner/occupier undertaking an existing high-risk activity on any site as defined in Schedule 1 which causes a discharge, either directly or indirectly, into any Council system shall, if requested by Council:

a) apply for and obtain a resource consent from Environment Canterbury for the discharge; and…”

Section 11.3:

The owner/occupier undertaking a construction activity on any site which would discharge into any Council system shall apply for and obtain a resource consent from Environment Canterbury for any construction phase stormwater discharge from that site into the...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitter</th>
<th>Point of Submission</th>
<th>Staff Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Change to Bylaw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stormwater discharges (applied via Section 10) and not to “Construction Phase” discharges from potentially contaminated land (applied via Section 11).</td>
<td>Staff have already extensively reviewed and shortened the list of activities considered to be high-risk from the Schedule 3 “Hazardous Industries and Activities List” of the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan, referenced in Schedule 1 (A). Staff have reclassified a number of “high-risk” activities as “medium-risk” to reduce the scope of activities that will be considered to be “high-risk” as included in the draft bylaw. Subsequent changes to the Construction Activities Section 11 are proposed, as some construction phase stormwater discharges from potentially contaminated land may also require resource consent from Environment Canterbury, though no longer defined as “high-risk” sites. Staff support an Environment Canterbury proposal to provide advice about construction activities on potentially contaminated sites where it considers the risks to the stormwater systems and receiving environment are less significant. This advice could allow the Council to potentially reclassify a construction phase discharge on potentially contaminated land under Section 11 as “low-risk” in accordance with detailed advice received from Environment Canterbury. That would enable Council to accept the construction phase discharge into its network without an Environment Canterbury consent. Staff have recently been made aware that Christchurch City Council have developed a Council system, if requested by the Council, where that construction is on: a) any site where an activity listed in the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan Schedule 3 “Hazardous Industries and Activities List” is occurring; and/or b) Any site on the Canterbury Listed Land Use Register; and/or c) Any new development site, or re-development of an existing site, that is not permitted under the Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule 1 (A):</td>
<td>“A) High-Risk activities and sites include sites where an activity is occurring that is described in the current version of the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan Schedule 3 “Hazardous Industries and Activities List”, unless any such activity or site is specifically identified as “medium-risk” in Schedule 1B of this bylaw.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitter</td>
<td>Point of Submission</td>
<td>Staff Recommendation</td>
<td>Proposed Change to Bylaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Canterbury</td>
<td>Network Utility Drains</td>
<td>memorandum of understanding (MOU) with Environment Canterbury regarding providing similar advice and it is proposed that a MOU is also developed between Waimakariri District Council and Environment Canterbury. A further longer term option available to Council, through its leadership role within the Canterbury Regional Stormwater Forum, is to investigate the establishment of a shared services arrangement to provide independent certification, advice, monitoring, compliance and enforcement services for high-risk sites on behalf of all territorial local authorities in Canterbury. Enforcement would be directly under RMA S15 rather than under the stormwater bylaws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | | Acknowledges the submission. Staff recommend the Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018 “Private System Maintenance” requirements of Section 16 should apply to Environment Canterbury flood protection and flood control works in a similar way to other privately managed systems. The bylaw requires private systems to be maintained in an operational state to avoid nuisance. Staff recommend that the Environment Canterbury flood protection and flood control works, including major drainage networks are redefined as “private systems” (previously defined as “Council systems”) for the purposes of this bylaw, so that the requirement to operate these systems to avoid nuisance will apply. This will assist the Council to consistently apply the bylaw in situations where an issue arises in managing the interface between Environment and... | Amends the bylaw definitions for “Council system” and “Private system”, to clarify that “drains that are managed by the New Zealand Transport Agency, Kiwirail or Environment Canterbury are deemed to be part of a private system”.

Environment Canterbury would prefer that the Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018 does not apply to network utility drains which are covered by the ECan Flood Protection and Drainage Bylaw 2013, to avoid unnecessary duplication. An explanatory note to this effect is recommended to be added within the bylaw Section 2.3. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitter</th>
<th>Point of Submission</th>
<th>Staff Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Change to Bylaw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Private System Maintenance</td>
<td>Agrees with the submission and amends Section 16 to clarify that private maintenance of watercourses, overland flow paths, stop banks or flood plains must be operated to avoid nuisance rather than to “ensure the free flow of water”. Staff recommend deleting the reference to “free flow of water”. The requested change will provide future opportunities for enhancement including enabling additional stormwater treatment, wetland development or retention areas which would have been prevented by the original requirements of clause 16.3.</td>
<td>Amends clause 16.3 to state: “The owner/occupier of a premises on which there is a watercourse, stop bank, overland flow path or flood plain must maintain that watercourse, stop bank, overland flow path or flood plain in an operational state which does not cause or contribute to nuisance”. Adds an explanatory note to Section 16 to state that: “the alteration or construction of works on a watercourse, overland flow path, flood plain or stop bank may require a consent from Environment Canterbury in accordance with the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan. Activities within the beds of lakes and rivers may be subject to rules in...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury and other private systems which have downstream impacts on Council systems, other private properties or which affect the receiving environment. Staff have reviewed the proposed bylaw and do not see any situation where duplication with Environment Canterbury’s Flood Protection and Drainage Bylaw 2013 will occur, noting that only Section 16 of the bylaw would apply.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitter</td>
<td>Point of Submission</td>
<td>Staff Recommendation</td>
<td>Proposed Change to Bylaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Environment Canterbury | **Erosion and Sediment Control Plan**  
The Erosion and Sediment Control Guidelines have been updated and are now referred to as the “Erosion and Sediment Control Toolbox for Canterbury” which could also be referenced in the bylaw with the link provided. | Agrees with the submission and adds the recommended new toolbox reference to the bylaw. | Amends the bylaw Section 6.1 (g), Section 9.3.3, Section 11.2 and definitions to reference the updated toolbox. For instance, Section 11.2 be amended to state:  
“The Erosion and Sediment Control Plan required under clause 11.1 must be prepared and implemented in accordance with the current version of the Environment Canterbury Erosion and Sediment Control Toolbox for Canterbury”. |
| Environment Canterbury | **Title**  
Recommends amending the title to “Stormwater and Drainage Bylaw 2018”, given these terms “Stormwater” and “Land Drainage” are separately defined. | Acknowledges the submission but does not support this change to the bylaw title. The title instead has been amended to read “Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018”. The new title intends to encompass a wide range of activities including management of watercourses and avoidance of effects on the receiving environment. This full range of bylaw activities are not captured within either of the definitions for “stormwater” or “land drainage”. | No change is proposed. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitter</th>
<th>Point of Submission</th>
<th>Staff Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Change to Bylaw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment Canterbury</td>
<td><strong>Buried Services</strong></td>
<td>Agrees with the submission but notes this request may be better addressed outside the scope of the bylaw as it applies to more than just stormwater or Council owned assets. This requirement could be included in any authority or resource consent issued under Environment Canterbury’s Flood Protection and Drainage Bylaw 2013 for works near Environment Canterbury assets.</td>
<td>No change is proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville Residents Association</td>
<td><strong>New Development Requirements</strong></td>
<td>The amended new Section 6 of the bylaw now sets out the various stormwater drainage design standards and other requirements for drainage systems for new development areas. This is a new section of the bylaw, updated from the 2011 version to provide a full reference for developers on best practice design standards and requirements for drainage systems in new developments. The Engineering Code of Practice states that post-development peak flows for all intensity events shall be less than pre-development flows. Flows are required to be retained within basins in new development areas until the discharges to surface water quantities (if any) match or are less than the pre-development flows. Effects of surface water flows on groundwater recharge rates are also required to be assessed through consent processes for new stormwater infrastructure.</td>
<td>No change is proposed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Council has included a new operating allowance of $150,000 per year within the flood response budget, in the Long Term Plan 2018 to 2028. This rate would be charged to all the District’s properties, averaging $6 per property per year and will be used to deal with areas that are not currently in a drainage rated area that contribute to downstream issues in a flood event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitter</th>
<th>Point of Submission</th>
<th>Staff Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Change to Bylaw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville Residents Association</td>
<td>2011 Bylaw: Include Objectives</td>
<td>Acknowledges the submission. Staff do not support the requested change to this section. The intent and meaning of the proposed Objectives in the 2018 bylaw are considered to be the same as those requested to replace them from the 2011 bylaw. The 2018 version has updated references to standards, plans and terminology. See comparison:</td>
<td>No change is proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Include from the 2011 bylaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objectives: 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objective 3.1: The objective of this bylaw is to provide a mechanism to control the discharge of contaminants into public drains.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objective 3.2: The bylaw is needed to ensure that the Council can maintain the aquatic health of its drains, and meet the appropriate standards relating to its discharges from communal stormwater systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objectives: 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1 The purpose of the bylaw is to provide a mechanism to assist the Council to achieve the following key objectives:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Control the discharge of contaminants into any Council stormwater system or land drainage system;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Enable the Council to meet relevant objectives, policies and standards specified within the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan and any consent condition with which the Council is required to comply, which controls the quality or quantity of discharges from any Council system into the receiving environment;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitter</td>
<td>Point of Submission</td>
<td>Staff Recommendation</td>
<td>Proposed Change to Bylaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville Residents Association</td>
<td><strong>2011 Bylaw: Include Construction</strong></td>
<td>Acknowledges the submission. Staff do not support the requested change to this section. The intent and meaning of the “construction activities” section in the 2018 bylaw is considered to be the same as that requested to replace it from the 2011 bylaw. The 2018 version has updated references to standards, plans and terminology. See comparisons: Construction Activities: 2018</td>
<td>No change is proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Include from the 2011 bylaw</td>
<td>5.1 Any person who carries out any earthworks as defined in the District Plan related to either construction activity or development, which may lead to stormwater run-off into public drains, and which is contaminated with soil particles or causes water to scour the soil, shall ensure that erosion and sediment control activities are implemented in accordance with good practice as described in Environment Canterbury’s Erosion and Sediment Control Guideline 2007.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction Activities: 2011</td>
<td>11.1 An Erosion and Sediment Control Plan must be prepared and implemented by the owner/occupier of any premises where construction activities are occurring where there is a discharge, either directly or indirectly, into any Council system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.2 The Erosion and Sediment Control Plan required under clause 11.1 must be prepared and implemented in accordance with the current version of the Environment Canterbury Erosion and Sediment Control Toolbox for Canterbury.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville Residents Association</td>
<td><strong>2011 Bylaw: Include Minimum Quality Standard:</strong></td>
<td>Acknowledges the submission. Staff do not support the requested change to this section. The definition of contaminant in the proposed 2018 bylaw and its application as proposed in Section 8 are intended to prevent discharge of any form of contaminant whatsoever into any Council system. This is described below.</td>
<td>No change is proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Include Minimum Stormwater Quality: 2011</td>
<td>6.1 The owner/occupier of any land or any person causing a discharge to the Council’s stormwater system, including any discharge from a private drain or private common drain that in turn discharges to a public drain, shall ensure that it does not;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Section 4: Definitions “<strong>Contaminant</strong>” includes any substance (including gases, odorous compounds, liquids, solids, and microorganisms) or energy (excluding noise) or heat, that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Submitter Point of Submission

- Contain any chemicals in quantities sufficient to be toxic to aquatic plants and animals, paint, oil, grease, pesticides, fertiliser, tannins, detergent, grass clippings, rubbish, litter, or heavy metals, or
- Cause the production of conspicuous oil or grease films, scums or foams, or floatable material, or
- Cause a conspicuous change of colour or visual clarity, at that point which is 30 times the receiving drain channel’s width downstream from the point of discharge into the public drain, or
- Cause an emission of objectionable odour, or
- Cause adverse effects on aquatic life, or
- Contain suspended solid concentrations in excess of 100mg/litre at that point which is 30 times the receiving drain channel’s width downstream from the point of discharge into the public drain, or
- Contain any hazardous substances, waste water or trade wastes.

**except where the discharge:**

- Is a discharge of dye or tracer material for investigative purposes, or
- Is a discharge of water from the testing or emptying of pipelines, tanks or bunds where potable or stream water has been used, and no welding residues, disinfection chemicals or other chemical contaminants contained within the pipeline will be discharged to the receiving water body, or
- Is a discharge of overflow bore water to surface water bodies, if the rate of discharge

### Staff Recommendation

Either by itself or in combination with the same, similar, or other substances, energy or heat:

- When discharged into water, changes, or is likely to change the physical, chemical, or biological condition of the water into which it is discharged, or
- When discharged onto or into land or into air, changes or is likely to change the physical, chemical or biological condition of the land or air onto or into which it is discharged.

### Proposed Change to Bylaw

Section 8:

8.1 No person or premises may discharge directly or indirectly a contaminant into a Council system, including by way of private system to a Council system, if the discharge is likely to cause nuisance or adversely affect the operation of the system or receiving environment, including having an adverse effect on aquatic life, unless the discharge is approved by the Council or is expressly authorised by an operative resource consent.

*Explanatory note: Contaminants as defined in Section 4 of this bylaw include (but are not limited to) sediment, concrete, cement slurry, sewage, effluent, solvents, soap, detergents, dissolved metal, hazardous material, fungicide, insecticide, litter and green waste.*

8.2 The Council may require premises that do not comply with clause 8.1 to implement the following controls:

- The modification of the premises to reduce or avoid the discharge of the contaminant;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitter</th>
<th>Point of Submission</th>
<th>Staff Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Change to Bylaw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is no more than five litres per second and the discharge has not been contaminated prior to discharge, or</td>
<td>b. The installation and use of treatment and mitigation measures or devices;</td>
<td><strong>8.3</strong> Any owner, occupier or person who is present on a premises subject to a control made under clause 8.2 must comply with that control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k. is a discharge from a swimming pool (excluding swimming pool filter backwash water) which is free of chemicals, algae, leaves, dirt or other debris. (Any discharge with these contaminants must be discharged to the sewerage system.) Swimming pool water is considered free of chemical contaminants when a pool has been left open to sunlight for 14 days, the level of chlorine does not register on any home testing kit, and no smell of chlorine remains, or</td>
<td>c. The proactive maintenance of the private system, including the provision of and compliance with a site specific management plan approved by Council.</td>
<td>The 2018 version is recommended by staff as it is intended to assist the Council to manage the full range of possible contaminants which may enter the stormwater or drainage systems, rather than only those contaminants specifically noted in the 2011 list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l. is a specific discharge which is authorised to be permitted under specific resource consent, or</td>
<td></td>
<td>In redrafting the 2018 bylaw staff are seeking to move away from a list of specified contaminants and the water quality standards and limits these were previously based on, which are subject to change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m. is from an activity for which the best practicable option is already in place, or</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prescriptive contaminant lists are also difficult for the public to understand. Those used in 2011 were drawn from the Waimakariri River Regional Plan and Natural Resources Regional Plan, both of which have already been (NRRP) or are about to be (WRRP) superseded by the CLWRP and the associated stormwater network discharge consent limits required under this plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n. is from a moderate risk industrial or trade process (as defined in schedule 1) and complies with an approved pollution prevention plan, or is from a high-risk activity (as defined in schedule 1) and complies with a Resource Consent which has been obtained from Environment Canterbury.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed 2018 bylaw allows the control of discharge of any contaminant as defined in Section 4 to be linked directly to any relevant consent condition including any specific contaminant limit which is proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitter</td>
<td>Point of Submission</td>
<td>Staff Recommendation</td>
<td>Proposed Change to Bylaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville Residents Association</td>
<td><strong>2011 Bylaw: Include Schedule 1 –</strong> Moderate risk sites: 2011</td>
<td>Acknowledges the submission. Staff do not support this requested change as the 2018 version has been developed to align its definition of high-risk activities with the CLWRP HAIL list. The 2018 Schedule 1 now identifies potential medium-risk sites as those that do not require on-site pre-treatment systems prior to discharge such as laboratories, engine reconditioning workshops, motor vehicle workshops and engineering workshops with metal fabrication. Medium-risk sites would usually be activities undertaken inside buildings where any discharges associated with the activity are unlikely to enter the stormwater system. The 2018 version is considered to better reflect actual risks posed by each type of activity in accordance with common site practices for that activity. The stated requirements for pollution prevention plans / ECAn consents is now better targeted to the risks posed by each type of activity.</td>
<td>No change is proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville Residents Association</td>
<td><strong>Amend bylaw application</strong> Amend 2.3 to state:</td>
<td>Acknowledges the submission. It seems the submission asks for the bylaw to apply to “Council” as well as private activities affecting watercourses, flood plains, overland flow paths or the receiving environment. The Council has its own various operating and management / regulatory responsibilities and requirements with respect to its management of watercourses, flood plains, overland flows and receiving environment. Many of these are in operating procedures or its Code of Practice and are not specified.</td>
<td>No change is proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitter</td>
<td>Point of Submission</td>
<td>Staff Recommendation</td>
<td>Proposed Change to Bylaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAlpines Ltd</td>
<td>1) <strong>Introduction</strong> – Include a preamble explaining the bylaw is required to assist the Council obtain and implement its stormwater network discharge consents.</td>
<td>Agrees with the submission but notes that the scope of the bylaw covers more than solely stormwater network discharges. The bylaw is not required but will assist the Council to implement its Stormwater Network Discharge Consents and will provide a method for the Council to comply with its consent conditions.</td>
<td>The change to objective 3.1c as set out below is considered adequate: “Enable the Council to meet relevant objectives, policies and standards specified within the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan and any consent condition with which the Council is required to comply, which controls the quality or quantity of discharges from any Council system into the receiving environment;”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAlpines Ltd</td>
<td>2) <strong>Contaminants</strong> - See Points (4) (a) (vi) and point (8.1) Amend the definition of “contaminant” so that it reflects limits likely to be in the stormwater network consents, by way of attached schedule. The schedule does not necessarily have to have any limits [upon date of bylaw adoption].</td>
<td>Acknowledges this submission. Staff do not support the suggested change to the definition of “contaminant” as currently proposed within the bylaw. An explanatory note is included in the bylaw so that its intent and application can be understood by the public. The definition as proposed is necessary to ensure that any form of discharge whatsoever from private property that is found to contaminate the stormwater or drainage.</td>
<td>No change is proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitter</td>
<td>Point of Submission</td>
<td>Staff Recommendation</td>
<td>Proposed Change to Bylaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>water can be addressed through the bylaw, not just those contaminants on a pre-determined list. The Council is responsible under the network consents for every contaminated discharge that enters the stormwater system from any private property. Using a schedule instead of a broad definition is not supported as it would limit Council to only preventing discharge of substances into the networks that are specifically included in the schedule. It potentially would expose the Council to liability for any substance not listed. The network consents may also include broad definitions of contaminants and require avoidance of many different contaminant “forms”. A technical schedule would be unable to be easily applied by the public and require regular amendment every time a limit is changed within a consent condition and/or underlying Plan Standard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAlpines Ltd</td>
<td>3) System Capacity – the clause 5.2 implies that if the Council has not planned for an adequate drainage capacity then the potential connectors cannot join and discharge into the network. Amend 5.2 to reflect that sometimes the Council’s network has insufficient capacity and that the Council will provide potential connectors with a timetable for the service to be available.</td>
<td>Acknowledges the submission. Staff do not support the suggested change as the onus is on developers and new applicants seeking to connect to the stormwater networks to manage and attenuate their flows and provide any necessary upgrades so that there is no adverse effect on existing connections. The Council does not expect existing ratepayers to programme and fund an oversizing of their existing networks so as to accommodate future growth. The Council will undertake any necessary capacity upgrades in conjunction with developer/s and any timetable will depend on financial contributions received</td>
<td>No change is proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitter</td>
<td>Point of Submission</td>
<td>Staff Recommendation</td>
<td>Proposed Change to Bylaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAlpines Ltd</td>
<td>4) Global Consents Reference – clause 6 should reference the global consents</td>
<td>Agrees and notes the global consents are already referenced in clause 6.1 (h) which states that any proposed new stormwater or land drainage system and any proposed alteration to any existing system must be designed, constructed and operated in accordance with any resource, building or other consents relevant to the proposed works;</td>
<td>No change is proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAlpines Ltd</td>
<td>4) Pollution Prevention Plans – the requirement to provide evidence of compliance with a Pollution Prevention Plan is too vague. Landowners require certainty over what is required and some will not do anything unless they are required to provide concrete evidence. Recommends amending clause 9.4 to require evidence to be submitted every, say five years.</td>
<td>Agrees and recommends that evidence be provided of Pollution Prevention Plan implementation during each three yearly PPP review, as part of review process.</td>
<td>Amends clause 9.4 to require that evidence of compliance “shall be provided to the Council every three years at the time the Plan is reviewed, or at any other time upon request of Council”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAlpines Ltd</td>
<td>5) Vehicle Crossings – It is assumed that approval to construct a vehicle crossing over a watercourse will be dealt with as part of a Vehicle Crossing application, and not require a separate application.</td>
<td>Agrees and confirms that approval to cross a watercourse will require a Vehicle Crossing Permit (e.g. resource consent) if located within the road reserve. Separate approval will be required for crossings not located within the road reserve. It is also noted that resource consent may still be required from Environment Canterbury for the works. The bylaw creates controls for the Council to be able to address illegal drain crossing structures. Usual action is to direct an applicant to obtain all necessary permits for any crossing of a waterway and to require removal</td>
<td>No change is proposed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Burton Consultants on behalf of the “Oil Companies” comprising Z Energy, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitter</th>
<th>Point of Submission</th>
<th>Staff Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Change to Bylaw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **High-Risk Sites** - The submission seeks to ensure that where ECan is providing consent to high-risk sites that there is no duplication in relation to the Council controlling the quality of the inputs through the bylaw. Clause 10.3 effectively allows Waimakariri District Council to impose any range/type of conditions in regards to water quality and quantity via clauses 6.3 and 6.4. The Oil Company submission considers these requirements to be repugnant to the law and unreasonable, as water quality aspects of a discharge are regulated by ECan through the consent process, as intended through the Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018 clauses 10.1 and 10.2 consenting requirements for high-risk sites. The WDC bylaw as set out would also render the regional resource consent process redundant. Amendments to Section 10 of the bylaw are therefore required in order to clarify that discharges from high-risk sites / activities shall only comply with the bylaw in so far as it relates to the quantity of the discharge. The submitter seeks relief 3.1 (a) (i) (2.5) of: Staff acknowledge concerns raised in the submission but do not support the associated “relief sought” from the applicant. Instead, staff recommend an amendment to Section 10.2 of the bylaw to clarify that a requirement for an Environment Canterbury consent will not be mandatory for existing high-risk sites, but will only be requested by the Council if a particular issue is identified with the discharge during sub-catchment contaminant source modelling, consent compliance monitoring or via a service request. The submitter considers clauses 6.3 and 6.4 are unreasonable to apply to “high-risk” discharges if these are also subject to separate resource consent from ECan. This is because the WDC will be an “affected party” and legally it cannot use the bylaw to require its own conditions using its “affected party” status within the RMA consent process. Staff propose to address this concern through an amendment to clause 6.3 which would narrow the circumstances in which it would apply to site redevelopments or existing discharges. This clause would only be applied if necessary to assist the Council meet its consent conditions. In addition, this clause would only apply if activities and discharges within a property are not subject to specific conditions: Amend clause 10.2 to state: 10.2 The owner / occupier undertaking an existing high-risk activity on any site as defined in Schedule 1 which causes a discharge, either directly or indirectly, into any Council system shall, if requested by Council: a) apply for and obtain a resource consent from Environment Canterbury for the discharge...” Amend Clause 6.3 to state: 6.3 “For existing sites being redeveloped, Council may require retrofit stormwater mitigation and/or implementation of site specific management plans or practices to treat and/or retain stormwater runoff from all or some part of existing impervious areas, in order for Council to comply with consent conditions which control the quality or quantity of discharges from any Council system into the receiving environment”.

Amend clause 10.2 to state:

10.2 The owner / occupier undertaking an existing high-risk activity on any site as defined in Schedule 1 which causes a discharge, either directly or indirectly, into any Council system shall, if requested by Council: a) apply for and obtain a resource consent from Environment Canterbury for the discharge...

Amend Clause 6.3 to state:

6.3 “For existing sites being redeveloped, Council may require retrofit stormwater mitigation and/or implementation of site specific management plans or practices to treat and/or retain stormwater runoff from all or some part of existing impervious areas, in order for Council to comply with consent conditions which control the quality or quantity of discharges from any Council system into the receiving environment”.

Amend Clause 6.3 to state:

6.3 “For existing sites being redeveloped, Council may require retrofit stormwater mitigation and/or implementation of site specific management plans or practices to treat and/or retain stormwater runoff from all or some part of existing impervious areas, in order for Council to comply with consent conditions which control the quality or quantity of discharges from any Council system into the receiving environment”.

Amend Clause 6.3 to state:

6.3 “For existing sites being redeveloped, Council may require retrofit stormwater mitigation and/or implementation of site specific management plans or practices to treat and/or retain stormwater runoff from all or some part of existing impervious areas, in order for Council to comply with consent conditions which control the quality or quantity of discharges from any Council system into the receiving environment”.

Amend Clause 6.3 to state:

6.3 “For existing sites being redeveloped, Council may require retrofit stormwater mitigation and/or implementation of site specific management plans or practices to treat and/or retain stormwater runoff from all or some part of existing impervious areas, in order for Council to comply with consent conditions which control the quality or quantity of discharges from any Council system into the receiving environment”.

Amend Clause 6.3 to state:

6.3 “For existing sites being redeveloped, Council may require retrofit stormwater mitigation and/or implementation of site specific management plans or practices to treat and/or retain stormwater runoff from all or some part of existing impervious areas, in order for Council to comply with consent conditions which control the quality or quantity of discharges from any Council system into the receiving environment”.

Amend Clause 6.3 to state:

6.3 “For existing sites being redeveloped, Council may require retrofit stormwater mitigation and/or implementation of site specific management plans or practices to treat and/or retain stormwater runoff from all or some part of existing impervious areas, in order for Council to comply with consent conditions which control the quality or quantity of discharges from any Council system into the receiving environment”.

Amend Clause 6.3 to state:

6.3 “For existing sites being redeveloped, Council may require retrofit stormwater mitigation and/or implementation of site specific management plans or practices to treat and/or retain stormwater runoff from all or some part of existing impervious areas, in order for Council to comply with consent conditions which control the quality or quantity of discharges from any Council system into the receiving environment”.

Amend Clause 6.3 to state:

6.3 “For existing sites being redeveloped, Council may require retrofit stormwater mitigation and/or implementation of site specific management plans or practices to treat and/or retain stormwater runoff from all or some part of existing impervious areas, in order for Council to comply with consent conditions which control the quality or quantity of discharges from any Council system into the receiving environment”. |
"Any consented discharge shall not be required to comply with the requirements of the bylaw in regards to the quality of the discharge" and 3.1 (a) (ii) of:

"Any consented discharge under clauses 10.1 and 10.2 shall not be required to comply with the requirements of the bylaw in regards to the quality of the discharge, including the need to submit a pollution prevention plan".

In addition the submitter asks that any concerns WDC may have as an affected party via the RMA process should be limited to capacity and/or effects on the integrity of the network only.

alterations or upgrades already imposed through a separate Environment Canterbury consent. The clause would allow the Council to consider the wider implications for its network associated with a range of activities and contaminants generated across an entire site. It is possible that Environment Canterbury high-risk site consents would only control activities and discharges from a certain part of a site but not for an entire site or range of activities.

Likewise, clause 6.4 is not intended to be imposed on an existing site unless, in a manner similar to clause 6.3, the Council needed to require such a change to meet a consent condition.

The relief sought by the Oil Companies is not considered appropriate, as it would remove the need for the high-risk site discharges to comply with Section 8 rules to prevent discharge of contaminants. Under Section 8 the discharge of a contaminant from a high-risk site into the Council system could be authorised by an operative privately held consent. If the high-risk discharge was subsequently found to contain a different contaminant not approved for discharge through that consent, and if the relief sought was granted, then the bylaw provisions for water quality in Section 8 would not apply and the Council would be liable for the contaminant.

It is prudent that Section 8 continues to apply to all discharges, including contaminant discharges from high-risk sites. This section provides the Council with management options in the event the discharges from
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Submitter</strong></th>
<th><strong>Point of Submission</strong></th>
<th><strong>Staff Recommendation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Proposed Change to Bylaw</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oil Companies</td>
<td><strong>Interface between draft bylaw and Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan</strong>&lt;br&gt;Policy 4.16A of the CLWRP states that “operators of reticulated stormwater systems implement methods to manage the quantity and quality of all stormwater directed to, and conveyed by the reticulated stormwater system, and from 1 January 2025 network operators account for and are responsible for the quality and quantity for all stormwater discharged from that reticulated system”.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;The relief sought (3.1) (a) (iii) is:&lt;br&gt;“Where Waimakariri District Council is required to provide approval as an affected party to any regional resource consent to discharge into the stormwater network concerns will be limited to the effects on the capacity and integrity of the network and not the quality of the discharge”.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;And 3.1 (a) (iv):&lt;br&gt;“The bylaw will be reviewed in 2023. Consistency with the Environment Canterbury Land and Water Plan will be achieved to ensure that there is a</td>
<td>Acknowledges the submission and notes that the approach the WDC is proposing as outlined in the bylaw is to require high-risk site owners to continue to obtain ECCan consents for these discharges into its networks. ECCan has the appropriate technical expertise, resources and most effective enforcement infringement powers under RMA Section 15 to implement the controls for quality of discharges from high-risk sites. Staff do not consider the relief sought (e.g. exclude Council’s ability to consider the quality of the discharge through the RMA consent process, or review of the bylaw by 2023) to be appropriate. The current consenting pathway for high-risk sites can be modified so that it can usefully continue to be applied to effectively manage discharges from high-risk sites.</td>
<td>See above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitter</td>
<td>Point of Submission</td>
<td>Staff Recommendation</td>
<td>Proposed Change to Bylaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Companies</td>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong> – the Oil Companies generally support the objectives other than 3.1 which states “Enable the Council to meet the relevant Objectives, Policies and Standards for discharges from any Council stormwater system into the receiving environment;” and seeks relief (3.1) (a) (v): “Enable the Council to meet the relevant Objectives, Policies and Standards for discharges from any Council stormwater system into the receiving environment insofar as they meet the Council’s global consent conditions”.</td>
<td>Agrees with the submission and amends the bylaw to explain that the objectives, policies and standards referred to are those within the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan and as specified in any stormwater network discharge consent conditions with which the Council must comply.</td>
<td>Amends Objective 3.1 (c) to state: “Enable the Council to meet relevant objectives, policies and standards specified within the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan and any consent condition with which the Council is required to comply, which controls the quality or quantity of discharges from any Council system into the receiving environment.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Companies</td>
<td><strong>Private System Definition</strong> – “Private System” as defined means “any land drainage system or stormwater system that drains water from a privately owned premises to a receiving environment or up to the point of connection with a Council system”. It is recommended that this definition be amended to only cover private systems which discharge into Council systems, as private systems discharging to all other receiving environments are/should be regulated by ECAn if they are not permitted activities under CLWRP.</td>
<td>Acknowledges the submission but notes that the WDC is in many instances requested by private property owners to help find solutions to private drainage issues, including assisting to resolve disputes between private property owners in circumstances when one upstream discharge causes an adverse effect on another downstream property. Clause 16 of the bylaw has been drafted to seek to avoid these adverse effects from private discharges which cause nuisance and it supports the Council’s practical operational role in resolving these issues. Environment Canterbury is ultimately responsible for the discharge of these discharges.</td>
<td>No change is proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitter</td>
<td>Point of Submission</td>
<td>Staff Recommendation</td>
<td>Proposed Change to Bylaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Oil Companies | **Acceptance of Stormwater** - Section 5 provides the criteria for new connections to the Council systems, including requirements to upgrade systems, provide alternative systems within the premises or provisions for Council to decline new applications. It is recommended this statement be amended to clarify that the bylaw does not apply to existing lawful connections and discharges, and only applies to new connections or redevelopments when an existing discharge has an altered capacity and/or altered contaminant loading. Acknowledges the submission and notes the bylaw as drafted is intended to apply only to “additional new connections”, or “altered connections” where there is a change in discharge quantity or in a contaminant loading. It is proposed to amend this section to clarify that these criteria only apply to new or altered connections. The criteria will apply where the premises either has no existing connection, or has an existing connection for which it is seeking to alter the discharge volume or its contaminant load. | | Amends the bylaw Section 5.1 to state: “Every person seeking a connection to a Council system shall be entitled to have the stormwater or land drainage water from the premises accepted by the Council subject to:  
b. The owner of the premises has prior written approval from the Council for the new or altered connection(s);  
c. There being sufficient capacity within the Council system to accommodate the additional new or altered connection(s);  
d. The additional new or altered connection(s) must be at least cost neutral to the existing scheme members...”  
A further explanatory note is also added to state:  
*An altered connection refers to an increase in the quantity of, or contaminant loading within,* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitter</th>
<th>Point of Submission</th>
<th>Staff Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Change to Bylaw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga | Manage Sediment Within Commercial and Industrial Premises - Extract from Rangiora Stormwater Network Consent Cultural Impact Assessment: recommendation (2):  
Waimakariri District Council revise its Council bylaws to include a requirement for all commercial and industrial premises serviced by the Rangiora Stormwater Network, are required to have sealed surfaces, and containment bunds to minimise the amount of mobilised soils and dust finding its way into the stormwater network. | Agrees and considers that these requirements could be imposed on any commercial or industrial premises under the terms of the proposed bylaw.  
The revised bylaw will enable the Council to require these requested actions through the following sections:  
a) 8.1 to 8.3 which provide rules to prevent discharge of contaminants and which may require associated on site treatment mitigations;  
b) Section 9 which requires approved pollution prevention plans for medium-risk activity sites; and  
c) Section 16 which sets out requirements for maintenance of private stormwater systems to avoid “nuisance” which includes avoiding damage to aquatic ecosystems.  
The bylaw is not prescriptive, however the prime objective is to ensure water quality meets the required standard at the point of connection to the Council drainage system. | No change is proposed. |

*stormwater being discharged from the site.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Point of Evidence</th>
<th>Staff Recommendation</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of the “high-risk” and “medium-risk” categories with a single “at-risk” category for <strong>operating phase</strong> stormwater discharges</td>
<td>Does not support the requested change and retains the separate high and medium-risk definitions, as proposed.</td>
<td>The revised bylaw (Schedule 1) now defines operating phase stormwater discharges from the HAIL list in Schedule 3 of the CLWRP as either “high-risk” or “medium-risk”, based on the type of activity and whether it may require an on-site system to treat stormwater prior to discharge. This provides certainty to all parties undertaking each category of activity included within the LWRP Schedule 3 about the requirements for, and status of their activity under the bylaw. This avoids the need for a case by case assessment for every activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of the “high-risk” and “medium-risk” categories with a single “at-risk” category for <strong>construction phase</strong> stormwater discharges</td>
<td>Agrees with the evidence and amends the bylaw to clarify that operating phase discharges will be treated and assessed differently from construction phase discharges. Within clause 11.3 an “at-risk” category of activities is proposed to be created where the Council could choose to require the owner/occupier to obtain an Environment Canterbury consent for the discharge, following receipt of technical advice (from Environment Canterbury) about the contamination risk on each site. This advice could potentially be provided under terms of a proposed new Memorandum of Understanding between the Council and Environment Canterbury which would allow risks associated with potentially contaminated land to be assessed on a case by case basis. This is explained in a proposed new “explanatory note” attached to the bylaw.</td>
<td>It is proposed that Environment Canterbury and Council staff work together following the adoption of the bylaw to establish a Memorandum of Understanding which would provide for technical contaminated land advice to be provided to the Council. This would assist it to determine whether a construction phase discharge on potentially contaminated land would need an Environment Canterbury consent for discharge into the Council system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schedule 3 HAIL activities occurring on land used for residential purposes</strong></td>
<td>Agrees with the evidence, in part. Construction phase discharges from residential sites where HAIL activities are occurring are considered to be “at-risk” of, or from, contamination. Advice will be sought on the actual risk (see above) and resource consent from Environment Canterbury may be requested. Operating phase discharges on any site (residential or commercial) where HAIL activities are occurring have already been classified in Schedule 1 in terms of whether on site pre-treatment is required within the property. Therefore no change is recommended for HAIL activities on residential land with operating phase discharges and these will be required to meet the applicable section 10 requirements, if the particular activity undertaken is classified as “high-risk” in Schedule 1.</td>
<td>It is proposed that Environment Canterbury and Council staff work together following the adoption of the bylaw to establish a Memorandum of Understanding which would provide for technical contaminated land advice to be made available to the Council. This is to assist the Council to determine whether a construction phase discharge on potentially contaminated land would need an Environment Canterbury consent for discharge into a Council system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development of an approval process for new or altered connections, as described in Section 5</strong></td>
<td>Agrees with the evidence, in part. Clause 5.1(b) covers the approvals required for new or altered connections but does not specify any particular conditions needed to obtain this approval. It is noted that, in practice, the Council would determine its approval conditions for new or altered connections in accordance with clause 6.1. It is recommended that the bylaw is amended to make the linkage between sections 5 and 6 clear.</td>
<td>The approval process for connection to a Council system should be subject to conditions. These would be determined by the Council in accordance with clause 6.1. The bylaw can be amended to make the linkage between these sections clear. The approval process would apply when determining conditions for new or altered connections. It is not proposed to extend this process, as suggested in the evidence, to cover approvals for all “at-risk” sites. This is due to the very significant additional workload and costs this would impose for both the Council and the site owner/occupier in determining the risk posed by each discharge, as discussed above. The approval process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Add a “revocation” clause to Section 5 which would allow the Council to revoke an existing approval of an “at-risk” discharge, thereby enabling regional Council enforcement to be undertaken under the Resource Management Act.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does not support the requested change and does not include a “revocation” clause within the bylaw.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If a discharge does not meet an existing approval (e.g. a contaminant is discharged for which the Council has not provided approval) then there is no “approval” considered to be in place under LWRP Rule 5.93A and the activity is not permitted under the Council’s network consent or under the bylaw. In this circumstance the Council would either: a) liaise with the owner/occupier to find a suitable stormwater treatment mechanism, taking into account the characteristics of the site and nature of the discharge; or b) refer the non-complying discharge to Environment Canterbury for enforcement if a solution cannot be agreed with the discharger.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enforcement under the bylaw would be undertaken as a last resort, due to costs and timeframes involved with court prosecutions.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Seeks additional requirements for pollution prevention plans:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a) PPPs for all “at-risk” activities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b) Amend clause 9 so that PPPs include protocols to respond to accidental discovery of contamination</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c) Scientific evidence to justify content and appropriateness of PPPs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d) SQEP to be engaged to provide input to all PPPs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does not support the requested changes. The requirements for pollution prevention plans are set out in Section 9 and are already considered to provide sufficient direction to owners/occupiers. The PPP provisions are intended to only be applied to medium-risk sites where the specialist input suggested in the evidence may not be necessary.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The approach proposed by staff provides flexibility during implementation in accordance with the nature of activities on the site. The requirements as currently proposed would only be applied to “medium-risk” sites, rather than all “at-risk” sites, as discussed above.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The suggestion to require scientific evidence in each pollution prevention plan, and to require the input of a Suitably Qualified and Experienced Person for every pollution prevention plan may not be necessary for every medium-risk site. These requirements are usually part of an ECan consent process and as such, are more applicable to management of high-risk sites. This level of scrutiny and assessment as suggested in the evidence is not considered necessary for all medium-risk sites.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The level of assessment for medium-risk sites will be determined by Council on a case by case basis as suited to the activities occurring on each site. For medium-risk sites it may be apparent that contaminants are fully contained within a building or structure within a site and scientific expertise may not needed in order to demonstrate this.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The protocols for responding to accidental discovery of contamination at the site are a part of 9.3 as currently drafted and no further changes are recommended.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STORMWATER DRAINAGE AND WATERCOURSE PROTECTION BYLAW 2018

DRAFT Bylaw for Adoption by Council Public Notification
1 TITLE, AUTHORITY AND COMMENCEMENT

1.1 This bylaw shall be known as the Waimakariri District Council Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018.

1.2 This bylaw shall come into force on the 14th day of [May insert Month] 2018.

1.3 This Bylaw supersedes and revokes the Stormwater Bylaw 2011.

1.4 The Council resolved to review the Stormwater Bylaw 2011 on 24 October 2017. This revised Bylaw was confirmed following a special consultative procedure by resolution at a meeting on [1 May 2018 insert date].

2 INTRODUCTION

2.1 This bylaw is made by the Waimakariri District Council in exercise of the powers and authority vested in the Council by Section 146 of the Local Government Act 2002.

2.2 This bylaw applies and operates throughout the Waimakariri District.

2.3 This bylaw applies to the following:

- Council or private stormwater systems;
- Council managed or private land drainage systems or watercourses;
- Privately managed stormwater systems, land drainage systems, watercourses, flood plains, overland flow paths or stop banks;
- Private activities affecting watercourses, flood plains, overland flow paths or the receiving environment.

2.4 This bylaw does not derogate from the Building Act 2004, the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996, the Health Act 1956 and the Resource Management Act 1991 and any of those Acts’ subsequent amendments or applicable Regulations.

Explanatory Note: This bylaw interacts with the Waimakariri District Council Wastewater Bylaw in seeking to reduce wastewater overflows. The Wastewater Bylaw seeks to prevent stormwater inflow into the wastewater systems by addressing defects in the wastewater reticulation, non-complying wastewater or stormwater connections and poorly designed gully traps. These steps all assist to prevent wastewater overflows that can adversely affect the receiving environment.

The Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw 2018 supports these provisions by requiring effective operation and maintenance of Council and private stormwater and land drainage systems and separate operation of the stormwater and wastewater systems.
3 OBJECTIVES

3.1 The purpose of the bylaw is to provide a mechanism to assist the Council to achieve the following key objectives:

a. Control the discharge of contaminants into any Council stormwater system or land drainage system;

b. Prevent the unauthorised discharge of stormwater into any Council stormwater or land drainage system;

c. Enable the Council to meet relevant objectives, policies and standards specified within the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan and any consent condition with which the Council is required to comply, which controls the quality or quantity of discharges from any Council stormwater system into the receiving environment;

d. To protect the land, structures and infrastructure of Council and private stormwater and land drainage systems;

e. To define the obligations and responsibilities of the Council, private property owners and occupiers and the public in matters related to the discharge of stormwater and land drainage water, and the management of stormwater systems and land drainage systems.

4 INTERPRETATION

a. In this bylaw:

i. “Approval or approved” means approval or approved in writing by Waimakariri District Council either by resolution of Council or by a Council officer.

ii. “Best practicable option” means the best method for preventing or minimising the adverse effects of any stormwater discharge on the environment, as determined by the Council, having regard to:

   a. the nature of the discharge or emission and the sensitivity of the receiving environment to adverse effects; and
   
   b. the financial implications of an option compared with other options.

iii. “Catchment Management Plan” is a plan providing an overview of the stormwater system(s) and water quality issues within a catchment to provide a framework for future stormwater management.

iv. “Connection” means an approved discharge from a premises of stormwater into a Council stormwater system or land drainage water into a Council land drainage system that is subject to Council’s approved and applicable rates and charges.

v. “Construction activities” means any activities involving the disturbance of the surface of any land but excludes farming and forestry activities.

vi. “Contaminant” includes any substance (including gases, odorous compounds, liquids, solids, and micro-organisms) or energy (excluding noise) or heat, that either by itself or in combination with the same, similar, or other substances, energy or heat:
a. when discharged into water, changes, or is likely to change the physical, chemical, or biological condition of the water into which it is discharged, or
b. when discharged onto or into land or into air, changes or is likely to change the physical, chemical or biological condition of the land or air onto or into which it is discharged.


viii. “Council system” means a land drainage or stormwater system which is under the control of the Council. For the purposes of the bylaw, drains within New Zealand Transport Agency, Kiwirail or Environment Canterbury owned land are deemed to be part of a Council system.

ix. “Customer” means the person discharging stormwater or land drainage water into the Council system.

x. “District Plan” means the Waimakariri District Plan.

xi. “District” means the Waimakariri District.


xiii. “Erosion and Sediment Control Plan” means a plan that has been prepared in accordance with the Environment Canterbury Erosion and Sediment Control Toolbox for Canterbury Guidelines.

xiv. “Flood plain” means an area which is predicted to flood in a storm event.

xv. “Ground soakage system” means a system that provides for stormwater to soak into the ground.

xvi. “High-Risk Activities” are those activities defined as High-Risk in Schedule 1 of this Bylaw.

xvii. “Land drainage system” means any combination of surface or subsurface pipes, channels, drains or canal systems that have been constructed for the primary purpose of collecting or draining water from agricultural or rural land and ancillary structures; or controlling or permanently lowering the water table; and which conveys and discharges that water to the receiving environment.

xviii. “Land drainage water” means water arising from the drainage of water from the soil profile, or excess surface water from agricultural or rural land. It excludes stormwater, which is separately defined.

xix. “Medium-Risk Activities” are those activities defined as Medium-Risk in Schedule 1 of this bylaw.

xx. “Natural servitude” means a state where low-lying land is obliged to receive surface water which drains naturally from land situated at a higher gradient (surface water includes all naturally occurring water which results from rainfall or water flowing onto the site, including percolating water).

xxi. “Nuisance” has the same meaning as Section 29 of the Health Act 1956, and includes a person, thing, or circumstance causing stress or annoyance or unreasonable interference. In the context of this bylaw the term nuisance includes, but is not limited to:

a. Danger to life;
b. Danger to public health;
c. Flooding of any building floor or sub-floor, or public roadway;
d. Damage to property;
e. An effect on the efficient operation of a stormwater or land drainage system;
f. Damage to any facet of a stormwater or land drainage system;
g. Erosion or subsidence of land;
h. Long or short term adverse effects on the environment; or
i. Adverse loss of riparian vegetation; or
j. Wastewater overflow to land or water; or
k. Anything that causes a breach of any stormwater discharge consent condition binding Council.

xxii. “Offence” includes any act or omission in relation to this bylaw or any part thereof for which any person can be prosecuted.

xxiii. “Owner/occupier” means any persons acting in general management or control of the land, or any plant or machinery on that land.

xxiv. “Overland flow path” means any secondary flow path that is:
   a. illustrated in a catchment management plan or on any Council drainage plan or record; or
   b. the overland route taken by any concentration of, or significant sheet flow of stormwater or land drainage water on its way to a flood plain, stormwater system, land drainage system or watercourse.

xxv. “Person” includes an individual person (corporation sole) and also a body of persons, whether corporate, incorporate or non-corporate.

xxvi. “Point of connection” means the point on the Council system that marks the boundary of responsibility between the customer and the Council, at which the customer(s) private system connects to and discharges stormwater or land drainage water into the Council system.

xxvii. “Pollution Prevention Plan” means a Council-approved plan which identifies actual or potential risks relating to the discharge of contaminants from a specific site or operation, and the management strategies implemented or proposed to mitigate these risks.

xxviii. “Premises” means either:
   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 to which a building consent has been or may be issued, or
   b. 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.
   d. Individual units in a building which are separately occupied and/or leased.

xxix. “Private system” means any land drainage system or stormwater system that drains water from a privately owned premises to a receiving environment or up to the point of connection with a Council system. For the purposes of the bylaw, drains that are managed by the within New Zealand Transport Agency, Kiwirail or Environment Canterbury owned land are deemed to be part of a private Council system.

xxx. “Receiving environment” means any surface water body or land into which stormwater or land drainage water is conveyed.

xxxi. “Stop bank” means an embankment to prevent flooding.

xxxii. “Stormwater” means runoff that has been channelled, diverted, intensified or accelerated by human modification of the land surface or rainfall runoff from the external surface of any structure as a result of precipitation, and excludes land drainage water, which is separately defined.

xxxiii. “Stormwater system” means the system provided by the Council or private property owner/occupier for the management of stormwater runoff, which includes any combination of open channels, drains, underground pipes and
basins, ponds, wetlands, kerb, channel and swales up to and including the point of discharge, but excluding the receiving environment.

xxxiv. “Stormwater Management Plan” is a plan to improve the management of water quality and water quantity in a defined area.


xxxvi. “Watercourse” means every open river, stream, creek, floodway, culvert, channel and open drain through which stormwater or land drainage water commonly flows, whether continuously or not, and which may be either managed by the Council publicly or privately managed.

xxxvii. “WDC” means the Waimakariri District Council.

b. Terms and expressions defined in the Act shall, when used in this bylaw, have the same meanings as those in the Act, unless they are alternatively defined in this bylaw.

c. If any requirement in relation to any person or activity specified in this bylaw differs from a requirement in any other legislation, regulation, consent condition, standard or Regional or District Plan provision then the more stringent requirement shall apply.
PART 1: ACCEPTANCE, DESIGN AND CONNECTIONS

5 ACCEPTANCE OF STORMWATER AND LAND DRAINAGE WATER

5.1 Every person seeking a new or altered connection to a Council system premises shall be entitled to have the stormwater or land drainage water from the premises accepted by the Council subject to:

a. The premises being located within a drainage rated area (designated in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002) which is serviced by a Council stormwater or land drainage system;

b. The owner of the premises has prior written approval from the Council for the additional new or altered connection(s), with such approvals assessed subject to requirements of Sections 5.1 and 6.1 of this bylaw;

c. There being sufficient capacity within the Council system to accommodate the additional new or altered connection(s);

d. The additional new or altered connection(s) must be at least cost neutral to the existing scheme members and annual rates generated from the additional connection(s) must be sufficient to cover the life cycle costs of the new assets and the variable costs of the service;

e. Fulfillment of the requirements of this bylaw, including obtaining any relevant consent, implementing any pollution prevention plan that the customer is required to obtain, and meeting all requirements of the Resource Management Act 1991, Building Act 2004 or any other acts or regulations;

f. Payment of the appropriate fees and charges applicable to the connection(s).

Explanatory Note: A premises within a drainage rated area will either have a direct connection to a council system, or will have a private system that discharges to a council system within the drainage rated area. The customer is required to maintain the private system prior to the point of connection to the Council system.

In the areas outside of drainage rated areas, the principles of natural servitude apply and stormwater and land drainage water that discharge to a private system or receiving environment are subject to the applicable clauses within section 16 and to the Building Code.
An altered connection refers to an increase in the quantity of, or contaminant loading within, stormwater being discharged from the site.

5.2 If an application to connect to a Council system does not meet the requirements of clauses 5.1 (c), (d) or (e) then the Council may:

a. Require an upgrade to the system at the cost of the customer(s); or
b. Require that an alternative stormwater or land drainage system is provided within the premises in accordance with section 6; or
c. Decline the application and advise the customer(s) of the reason(s) why the application was declined.

6 DESIGN AND VESTING

6.1 Any proposed new stormwater or land drainage system and any proposed alteration to any existing system must be designed, constructed and operated in accordance with:

a. Council’s Engineering Code of Practice;

b. Any relevant Catchment Management Plan prepared by Environment Canterbury or Waimakariri District Council;

c. Any relevant Stormwater Management Plan prepared and approved by the Waimakariri District Council;

d. The Waimakariri District Plan;

e. The Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan;

f. The Regional Coastal Environment Plan for the Canterbury Region;

g. The Environment Canterbury Erosion and Sediment Control Toolbox for Canterbury Guidelines;

h. Any approved pollution prevention plan that has been provided in accordance with Section 9;

i. Any resource, building or other consents relevant to the proposed works;

j. Any written conditions imposed by Council when approving the works;

k. Waimakariri District Council standard construction specifications.

6.2 As-built plans showing details of all new or altered systems must be provided to Council within the timeframe specified in Council’s written approval or Engineering Code of Practice.

6.3 For existing sites being re-developed, Council may require retrofit stormwater mitigation and/or implementation of site specific management plans or practices to treat and/or retain stormwater runoff from all or some part of existing impervious areas, in order for Council to comply with consent conditions which control the quality or quantity of discharges from any Council system into the receiving environment.

6.4 The Council may specify areas in the District, or may impose controls on any premises, whereby stormwater disposal must be undertaken by ground soakage, unless site conditions prevent it.
7 POINT OF CONNECTION

The point of connection to the Council’s system is shown in Figure 1. There may be only one point of connection for each premises unless prior written agreement is provided by the Council.

7.1

7.2 The Council owns and is responsible for the maintenance and all repairs to the of any Council system, including any pipe and fittings up to the point of connection, except:

7.2.1a. The customer is responsible for clearing of blockages or repairing damage from trees on the customer’s own property, up to the point of discharge.

7.2.2b. The customer owns and shall be responsible for the maintenance and all repairs to the private stormwater or private land drainage system within the customer’s property and on the customer’s side of the point of connection.

Except where the private system is within public land, the following applies:

7.2.2a. The Council is responsible for any damage to the system caused by a Council contractor or a Council asset (such as a street tree).

b. The customer is responsible for clearing of blockages or repairing damage from trees or other customer assets on the customer’s own property up to the point of connection.

7.3 There may be only one point of connection for each premises unless prior written agreement is provided by the Council.

Figure 1: Stormwater Drainage Point of Connection Examples
PART 2: MANAGEMENT OF CONTAMINANTS

8 DISCHARGE OF CONTAMINANTS

8.1 No person or premises may discharge directly or indirectly a contaminant into a Council system, including by way of private system to a Council system, if the discharge is likely to cause nuisance or adversely affect the operation of the system or receiving environment, including having an adverse effect on aquatic life, unless the discharge is approved by the Council or is expressly authorised by an operative resource consent.

Explanatory note: Contaminants as defined in Section 4 of this bylaw include (but are not limited to) sediment, concrete, cement slurry, sewage, effluent, solvents, soap, detergents, dissolved metal, hazardous material, fungicide, herbicide, insecticide, litter and green waste.

8.2 The Council may require premises that do not comply with clause 8.1 to implement the following controls:

a. The modification of the premises to reduce or avoid the discharge of the contaminant;

b. The installation and use of treatment and mitigation measures or devices;

c. The proactive maintenance of the private system, including the provision of and compliance with a site specific management plan approved by Council.

8.3 Any owner, occupier or person who is present on a premises subject to a control made under clause 8.2 must comply with that control.

8.3 PART 2A: OPERATING PHASE DISCHARGES

9 MEDIUM-RISK ACTIVITIES / SITES

9.1 The owner/occupier undertaking any new medium-risk activity on any site as defined in Schedule 1 that connects to a Council system shall prepare and implement a site specific Pollution Prevention Plan. This plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Council and fully implemented prior to connecting into the Council system.

9.2 The owner/occupier undertaking any existing medium-risk activity on any site as defined in Schedule 1 and that connects to a Council system shall, if requested by the Council, prepare and implement a site specific Pollution Prevention Plan. This plan shall be submitted for Council approval no later than six months after being requested by the Council, or such later date as agreed with Council. The plan shall be fully implemented within six months of being approved by the Council.

9.3 The Pollution Prevention Plan if required under 9.1 or 9.2 above shall include:

9.3.1 A site assessment identifying all actual and potential sources of contaminant discharge, including surface coatings;

9.3.2 Suitably-scaled plans showing the site layout, boundaries, all stormwater, land drainage and wastewater drainage including the point of connection or discharge to the Council stormwater, land drainage or wastewater systems, and relevant buildings and outdoor spaces (including identification of their use);
9.3.3 Identification and installation requirements of the best practicable options proposed to ensure that potential contamination of all discharges are minimised. The application of current, nationally accepted standards, such as the Auckland Regional Council’s Guidelines TP10, the Christchurch Waterways and Wetlands Drainage Guide or Environment Canterbury’s Erosion and Sediment Control Toolbox for Canterbury Guidelines will be taken into account by the Council when assessing pollution prevention plans;

9.3.4 Site specific spill prevention and spill response procedures;

9.3.5 A description of the maintenance procedures proposed, actions to be taken and/or infrastructure to be developed.

9.4 Evidence of ongoing compliance with any Pollution Prevention Plan shall be provided to the Council every three years at the time the Plan is reviewed, or at any other time upon request of Council.

9.5 Any Pollution Prevention Plan prepared pursuant to this section shall be reviewed by the owner/occupier or operator of the activity to which the plan relates, at three yearly intervals after implementation. The review shall identify any changes to the matters covered in clause 9.3, and with a timeframe of action. The reviewed pollution prevention plan shall be forwarded to the Council for approval within its three yearly review timeframe. The Council may include further terms and conditions within the revised Pollution Prevention Plan to ensure the activity is being undertaken in accordance with clauses 9.3 and 8.1. Once approved, the plan shall become binding.

9.6 Notwithstanding clause 9.5, the Council may require that any Pollution Prevention Plan shall be revised where there have been significant changes to an activity or failure to meet any requirement of clause 8.1.

10 HIGH-RISK ACTIVITIES / SITES

10.1 The owner/occupier undertaking any new high-risk activity on any site as defined in Schedule 1 shall apply for and obtain any necessary resource consent from Environment Canterbury which would for a discharge either directly or indirectly into any Council or private stormwater or land drainage system shall apply for and obtain a resource consent from Environment Canterbury for the discharge.

10.1.1 Any such consent shall be provided to Council, no later than six months after being requested by the Council, or at such a later date as agreed with Council.

10.3 Any owner/occupier whom is required to obtain a resource consent from Environment Canterbury consented discharge under clauses 10.1 or 10.2 shall also comply with the requirements of this bylaw except for the need to submit a Pollution Prevention Plan.
11 CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES

11.1 An Erosion and Sediment Control Plan must be prepared and implemented by the owner/occupier of any premises where construction activities are occurring where there is a discharge, either directly or indirectly, into any Council system. This plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Council and fully implemented prior to discharging into the Council system.

11.2 The Erosion and Sediment Control Plan required under clause 11.1 must be prepared and implemented in accordance with the current version of the Environment Canterbury Erosion and Sediment Control Toolbox for Canterbury Guidelines.

11.3 The owner/occupier undertaking a construction activity on any site which would discharge into any Council system shall apply for and obtain a resource consent from Environment Canterbury for any construction phase stormwater discharge from that site into the Council system, if requested by the Council, where that construction is on:

- a) any site where an activity listed in the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan Schedule 3 “Hazardous Industries and Activities List” is occurring; and/or
- b) Any site on the Canterbury Listed Land Use Register; and/or
- c) Any new development site, or re-development of an existing site, that is not permitted under the Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011.

11.4 Explanatory note: Construction phase discharges referred to in clause 11.3 refer to construction activities on sites where there may be potentially contaminated land on all or part of the site that is discharging construction phase stormwater into the Council system. These sites and associated discharges are considered to be “at-risk” of, or from, contamination. The risks posed by any such discharges from the site may be subject to verification, and the Council, following receipt of technical advice, may require the owner/occupier to obtain a resource consent from Environment Canterbury for the discharge. It is noted that Schedule 1 of the bylaw (defining sites as either high-risk or medium-risk) does not directly apply to assessment of risk posed by sites generating construction phase discharges.

PART 3: PROTECTION OF SYSTEMS AND WATERCOURSES

12 ACTIVITIES REQUIRING APPROVAL

12.1 RESTRICTED ACTIVITIES

12.1.1 Approval in writing must be obtained from the Council before any of the following occur:

- 12.1.1.1 Any works on a Council system or a watercourse managed by the Council;
12.1.2 Any modification to a bank structure, including widening, deepening, damming, diverting or planting or removing any vegetation from any part of a Council system or from the banks of any watercourse managed by the Council, including use of herbicide in such a way as to impede or alter the flow of water or destabilise the bank structure; or

12.1.3 The erection of a structure, or placement of any material or planting of any vegetation (e.g., tree or hedge) where these impede access by machinery or apparatus used to clean, maintain or improve any part of a proposed or existing Council system; or

12.1.4 The erection of any new vehicle or stock crossing over a watercourse managed by the Council;

12.1.12 The following activities are forbidden:

12.1.2.1 Any alteration, interference with or obstruction of any Council system;

12.4.12.2.2 Allowing any stock or vehicles to do anything that damages or is likely to cause damage to any Council system or watercourse managed by the Council;

13 WORKS IN PROXIMITY TO SYSTEMS

13.1 Any person who proposes to undertake any works or activities that may result in damage to any part of a Council system, including excavation works, must obtain Council’s approval before beginning such works.

13.2 The person undertaking the works or activities is responsible for locating any buried services.

13.3 Any person who damages or causes disruption to any Council system is liable for the full costs of any repairs and associated costs incurred as a result of the damage or disruption. Any possible damage or disruption to any Council system must be reported to the Council immediately.

13.4 Following any works in proximity to a Council system, bedding and backfill must be reinstated in accordance with the Engineering Code of Practice.

PART 4: ACCESS, MAINTENANCE AND MONITORING
14 SYSTEM ACCESS

14.1 An owner/occupier shall allow Council access to and about all facets of all Council systems for the purposes of monitoring, testing and maintenance in accordance with Sections 171-173 and 182 of the Local Government Act 2002 (or other such notice as otherwise arranged with any owner/occupier).

14.2 In emergency conditions, or for the purpose of ascertaining whether a stormwater or land drainage system is being misused or this bylaw is not being complied with, an owner/occupier shall allow Council access to and about all facets of the system in accordance with sections 171-173 and 182 of the Local Government Act 2002.

15 WATER QUALITY MONITORING

15.1 Council may independently monitor, sample and analyse discharged stormwater or land drainage water and recover costs from the property owner/occupier, where failure to comply with any Pollution Prevention Plan relating to the property is evident.

15.2 Where it is suspected that any discharge within the District is in breach of any part of sections 8 to 11, the Council may independently monitor, sample and analyse discharged stormwater or land drainage water, and where an offence is proven, may recover the costs of investigating, sampling and analysing the discharge, from the property owner/occupier.

16 PRIVATE SYSTEM MAINTENANCE

16.1 All private systems must be designed, constructed, managed and maintained by the owner/occupier, at the owner/occupier’s expense or by some other arrangement acceptable to the Council.

16.2 The owner/occupier of a private system must ensure that it is maintained in good operating condition and does not cause or contribute to nuisance.

16.3 The owner/occupier of a premises on which there is a watercourse, stop bank, overland flow path or flood plain must maintain that watercourse, stop bank, overland flow path or flood plain in an operational state which does not cause or contribute to nuisance ensures the free flow of water.

16.4 Explanatory note – the alteration or construction of works on a watercourse, overland flow path, flood plain or stop bank may require a consent from Environment Canterbury in accordance with the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan. Activities within the beds of lakes and rivers may be subject to rules in regional plans in accordance with Section 13 of the Resource Management Act 1991.
PART 6: OFFENCES, PENALTIES AND ENFORCEMENT

17 OFFENCES

17.1 Every person who breaches this bylaw commits an offence and is liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding $20,000.00 as set out in section 242 of the Local Government Act 2002.

18 FEES AND CHARGES

18.1 The Council may in accordance with the Local Government Act 1974 and Local Government Act 2002 set charges or fees to recover the cost of any of the following:

18.1 a. Processing the assessment of Pollution Prevention Plans, their review, approvals and monitoring of compliance with the plans;
  b. Processing the assessment of any other approval, consent, or any other monitoring, investigation, sampling or analysis charge that is required under any part of this bylaw;
  c. Processing the assessment, approval or monitoring of any Erosion and Sediment Control Plan required under this bylaw.

19 REMEDIES

19.1 In the event of a breach of statutory or other legal requirements including this bylaw, the Council may serve notice on the owner/occupier advising the nature of the breach and the steps to be taken within a specified period to remedy it. If after the specified period, the owner/occupier has not remedied the breach, the Council may charge a re-inspection fee.

19.2 At any time after the specified period in 19.1 has elapsed, the Council may carry out any remedial work required in order to make good the breach, and recover from the owner/occupier all reasonable costs incurred in connection or associated with the remedial work together with any resulting damages.

19.3 If however the breach is such that public health or safety considerations or nuisance, or risk of consequential damage to council assets is such that delay would create or be likely to create unacceptable results, the Council may take immediate action to rectify the defect, and recover all reasonable costs and damages from the owner/occupier.
SCHEDULE 1 – MEDIUM-RISK AND HIGH-RISK ACTIVITIES AND SITES (OPERATING PHASE DISCHARGES)

A) High-Risk activities and sites include sites where an activity is occurring that is any of the following:
   i. Any activity described in the current version of the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan Schedule 3 “Hazardous Industries and Activities List”;
   ii. Any site on the Canterbury Listed Land Use Register;
   iii. Any new development site, or re-development of an existing site, that is not permitted under the Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011;

   unless any such activity or site is specifically identified as a “medium-risk” as defined in Schedule 1B of this bylaw below.

B) Medium-Risk activities and sites include any of the following:
   i. Aggregate and material storage/stockpiled yards which are subject to erosion and/or leaching of contaminants,
   ii. Commercial analytical laboratory sites,
   iii. Construction and maintenance depots (that exclude areas used for refueling or bulk storage of hazardous substances),
   iv. Demolition yards that exclude hazardous wastes,
   v. Dry cleaning premises,
   vi. Engineering workshops with metal fabrication,
   vii. Engine reconditioning workshops,
   viii. Food and beverage manufacturers,
   ix. Motor vehicle workshops,
   x. Any other activity or premises that has failed to meet the requirements of Section 8, unless that activity or site is otherwise defined as a “high-risk” in Schedule 1(a).
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR INFORMATION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: DRA-06-02-01 /180419042535

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 1 May 2018

FROM: Owen Davies, Drainage Asset Manager

SUBJECT: Siena/Sillano Drainage Works

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

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to inform Council of an upcoming staff submission to the LTP for additional capital works budget of $150,000 for drainage works in Siena Place and Sillano Place, Mandeville.

1.2. High ground water levels in the area have caused ongoing drainage issues which are likely to continue into the coming winter.

1.3. The extra budget is required to complete the remedial works in this financial year as the drainage issues are likely to get worse over winter, particularly if we get further significant rainfall.

1.4. The remedial drainage work is estimated to cost $150,000 in total. It is proposed that this is funded from the Ohoka Rural Drainage account ($94,000), the Roading Capital Works account ($28,000) and the remaining through existing approved budgets funded by NZTA ($28,000).

Attachments:
i Siena Place and Sillano Place Drainage Report - DRA-06-02-01/ 180413040226

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180419042535

(b) Notes that staff will request a new capital works budget of $94,000 under the Ohoka Rural Drainage account in the 2017/18 financial year, for the proposed Siena/Sillano drainage works through the LTP deliberations.

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

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

3.1. There has been a prolonged period of high groundwater conditions within the Waimakariri district which has caused a number of unforeseen drainage issues.

3.2. Above average rainfall has raised the groundwater levels and resulted in resurgent groundwater (springs) operating in the Mandeville area.

3.3. Figure 1 below shows the running previous 12 month rainfall totals for Kaiapoi

![Kaiapoi 12 Month Rain Total](image)

3.4. The Kaiapoi rainfall 12 month accumulated total is beginning to trend down, however the however the total is high for this time of year, heading into the winter season.

3.5. Figure 2 below shows the ground water level in a bore located approximately 10 km north of Mandeville, which Council monitors. The undercurrents begin to flow when the water level in the bore reaches -10m below ground level (shown by the red dashed line). The water level has steadily climbed from a low point in November 2016 and is likely to remain above -10m throughout the winter.
3.6. The Mandeville area was significantly affected by heavy rainfall events and high groundwater levels in June and July 2014, and again in July and August 2017. A number of Siena and Sillano Place residents have reported stagnant water and insects through the latter half of 2017 and into 2018.

3.7. The cul de sac heads were repaired and resealed following a prolonged period of high groundwater levels back in 2015.

3.8. In response to calls from residents, Council staff engaged Beca to investigate and report on a number of flooding and groundwater resurgence issues in the Mandeville area – refer attachment i - Siena Place and Sillano Place Drainage Report.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. Do Nothing – this option will not address the ground water flooding in Siena Place and Sillano Place in a timely manner. Concerns from the residents/landowners will not be addressed. Further damage to the road surface is likely.

4.2. Undertake the Sienna and Sillano drainage works in 18/19 financial year – This option allow further investigations and design to be carried out by staff and would address the flooding issues with a reasonable time frame. This is the preferred option.

4.3. The Manager Utilities and Roading has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

5.2. Views have been sought from the Mandeville Residents Association, the Ohoka Drainage Advisory Group and residents in Siena Place and Sillano Place. All are supportive of Council undertaking drainage work to reduce the risk of flooding and high groundwater.

A group of local residents including Mr James Ensor, Mr Des Lines and Mr Tom McBrearty have been actively working with Staff and Beca to find solutions to a number a drainage issues in the wider Mandeville area.

Individual property owners will be consulted with, where the works directly relate to their property, before proceeding.
5.3. **Wider Community**

5.4. The wider Mandeville Community have been engaged through a number of public meetings. Community sentiment supports Council taking action sooner rather than later.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

   **Cost Estimates**
   - Construction Estimate $106,000.00
   - Engineering Fees $10,000.00
   - Project contingency $34,000.00
   **TOTAL** $150,000.00

   **Funding Split**
   - Ohoka Rural Drainage $94,000.00
   - Roading WDC $28,000.00
   - Roading NZTA $28,000.00

6.2. The increase in budget will increase the Ohoka Rural Drainage Rate by 2.6%. This extra would take effect from the 19/20 financial year onwards.

6.3. The Roading portion of the work will be funded from existing approved budgets therefore will have no rate implications.

6.4. **Community Implications**

6.5. The community’s expectations will not be met if the work does not go ahead within a reasonable time frame. Drainage staff would be likely to receive more service requests in relation to this issue if the work does not proceed.

6.6. **Risk Management**

6.7. There is a risk of further damage to the road if the work is delayed. Even if the weather remains dry, the high ground water is likely to persist through winter and spring.

6.8. There is a minor risk that the 2017/18 Roading maintenance budget will be overspent and that staff will need to request further budget from NZTA.

6.9. **Health and Safety**

6.10. Safety in Design will be formally considered and documented as part of the detailed design stage for any construction works.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.3. The Local Government Act 2002 sets out the power and responsibility of local authorities, including the Council’s role in providing drainage services.

7.4. **Community Outcomes**

- There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all
- Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner

7.5. **Delegations**

7.6. As this is unbudgeted capital expenditure, Council approval of the budget through the LTP, is required for this work to proceed.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEMO

FILE NO AND TRIM NO: DRA-06-02-01/180413040226  
DATE: 06 April 2018  
MEMO TO: Kalley Simpson, 3 Waters Manager  
FROM: Amber Murphy, Consultant Engineer  
SUBJECT: Siena Place and Sillano Drainage

1. **Introduction**  
The purpose of this memo is to describe the drainage in the northern extents of Siena and Sillano Place, and the issues, options and recommended works.

The Siena and Sillano Place area is a rural residential area in Mandeville, immediately west of Bradleys Road and north of Tram Road, and within the ‘Bradleys Road’ drainage catchment.

The Siena and Sillano Place properties have a history of drainage issues, and extended ponding of water including following the 2014 and 2017 high groundwater and rain events.

2. **Catchment description**  
The Mandeville area was significantly affected by heavy rainfall events and high groundwater levels in June and July 2014, and again in July and August 2017. The preceding wet weather raised the groundwater levels and resulted in resurgent groundwater (springs) operating on a semi-permanent basis. High runoff during 2014, and moderate runoff during 2017 storm events caused significant nuisance flooding of roads and properties. In the case of Siena and Sillano Place, ponded and stagnant water has been observed through the latter half of 2017 and into 2018.

![Figure 1 - Location of northern Siena and Sillano Place area in catchment](image-url)
No 10 Road has a reasonably defined road centreline and is taken to be the western extent of the Bradleys Road catchment for design purposes for calculating drain and culvert flows (ie the primary catchment). The upslope catchment extends past Earlys Road, which will contribute to overland flows in large rainfall events. The catchment is very long and narrow when extended to Earlys Road. The ground slopes generally from west to east in the catchment at an approximate grade of 1 in 180.

The historic major drainage path for the catchment is from No 10 Road across farmland northwest of Siena Place and then along the stockwater race which flows down Siena Place to Bradleys Road.

In 2014 it was identified the stockwater race lacked capacity to carry the design flows calculated from the design storm events and there was significant flooding along the route following the June 2014 rainfall events. The water race was breached along the back boundary of No 60 and 67 Velino Place and No 67 Siena Place and flowed overland through properties on the west side of Siena Place and then down Siena Place to Bradleys Road. The high groundwater level following the June 2014 rainfall events caused significant nuisance flooding and standing water along Siena Place during July and August 2014 which resulted in minor damage to the carriageway. Following the 2014 flood events, Council constructed a drainage channel along the western side of Siena Place, to convey drainage flows to Bradleys Road. The Bradleys Road drain was also increased in capacity following the 2014 flood event. (Refer to Figure 3).
The secondary flow paths from Flood Hazard mapping are shown in Figure 4. The northern overland flow path has been cut-off by the San Dona development (particularly evident at Siena Place), and then intercepted by Bradleys Road drain.

3. **July and August 2017**

Resurgent groundwater has been flowing in Mandeville since mid-2017 and continues. Figure 5 shows long term groundwater levels from an Environment Canterbury shallow groundwater monitoring bore (M35/0143) approximately 10km up-gradient of Mandeville. When the groundwater level in well M35/0143 is at 10m below ground level, the water table in Mandeville and Ohoka is generally at or above the ground surface and resurgence flows are likely. It can be seen in Figure 4 that the groundwater level measured in mid-2014 was the highest on record, and the groundwater level at present-day and through 2017 is near that maximum.
The 2017 resurgence groundwater flow was observed to be flowing strongly through the latter part of 2017 and into 2018. It was observed along the Bradley's Road drain (from the Wards Road SMA), the Siena Place drainage channel and stockwater race, and the channel to the north of Siena Place properties.

Swift flow was observed through Bradley's Road, the downstream section of Siena Place drainage channel, and the channel to the north of Siena Place properties. However some sections of channel in the northern Siena Place channel were observed to be stagnant at times (and weed growth establishing), demonstrating these areas do not have the ability to drain.
In addition, the high groundwater levels in Siena and Sillano Place have resulted in the groundwater reaching surface levels, and ponding through private properties. Seepage was also observed at the Siena and Sillano cul-de-sac heads, resulting is visibly wet pavement, and grassed areas being boggy or experiencing grass die-off.

Following the post-2014 Council upgrades to the area, the hazard during flood events has not been raised as a concern by residents. The Bradleys Road and Siena Place drainage channels have had the capacity to convey flood water away from roads and properties during rainfall events. Residents have noted significant concerns related to the nuisance and health risks of the resurgence flows and ponded stagnant water.
4. Previous Work

Previous drainage investigations by Council are described below.

Flooding Mitigation Works and Funding DRA-16-02.01 / 141009110892, 2014
- The key issues for the Mandeville area are insufficient drain capacity for rural residential areas and resurgent groundwater (experienced throughout this winter).
- Recommended upgrade works to Bradleys Road, Whites Road, Siena Place and Millfield/San Dona
- Recommended a future long term flow diversion (No 10 Road, or Tram and Bradleys Road) be investigated
Mandeville Area Drainage Improvements – Bradleys Drain Catchment DRA-6-02.06/140821089353, 2014

- Considered four drainage upgrade options:
  1. Upgrade the Existing Drainage
  2. Divert Resurgence Flow along No 10 Road and Upgrade Existing Drainage
  3. Divert Resurgence Flow along Tram Road and Upgrade Existing Drainage
  4. New Drain along Wards Road and Upgrade Existing Drainage

- The resurgent flow crossing No 10 Road adjacent to Redfern Lane was been gauged at 300 l/s

Following 2014, Council upgrade works have been completed to:
- Bradleys Road drain upgrade (Siena Place to Ohoka South Branch)
- Bradleys Road drain upgrade (Wards Road to Siena Place)
- Siena Place upgrade (new channel from stockwater race at 67 Siena Place, along west side of Siena Place, to Bradleys Road)
- Wards Road drainage upgrades (Dawsons Road to Bradleys Road)
- Millfield resurgent channel culvert upgrades

5. Investigations

A site walkover of Siena and Sillano Place was undertaken on 17 October 2017. This included visiting the Bradleys Road and Velino Place intersections, 100 Siena Place, and 1 Sillano Place.

A second site walkover was undertaken on 31 October 2017. This included visits to 10 and 18 Sillano Place.

Topographic survey of the existing drainage channels from
  a) Siena Place cul-de-sac head through 100 Siena Place, and
  b) Sillano Place cul-de-sac head through 10 Sillano Place

to the drainage channel to the north of the Siena Place properties was completed on 16 November 2017. The confluence of this channel and the Bradleys Road drain were also surveyed. Refer to Attachment 1.

6. Maintenance issues and localised capacity constraints

The performance and condition of the post-2014 upgrade works is generally good. In addition the channel to the north of Siena Place properties is well maintained. There is little need for any maintenance works (grass and vegetation is trimmed, weed cleared, fences and pipe and culverts clean).
There were some exceptions:

a) The culvert at the southern end of Siena Place (at confluence with Bradleys Road drain) was partially blocked by weed and overgrown grass.

b) The culvert under Vilino Place was not fully utilised due to weed and sediment deposition immediately upstream. The culvert itself was clear and at an appropriate level.

c) Residents observed stagnant water along 52 and 60 Siena Place.

d) Seepage at the Siena and Sillano cul-de-sac heads causing visibly wet pavements.

e) Stagnant water, weed growth, silt deposition, and anaerobic smells in the swales surrounding the Siena and Sillano cul-de-sac heads.

f) Limited flow through the drains from the cul-de-sacs to the channel to the north of Siena Place properties (through 100 Siena and 10 Sillano Place).

g) At 10 Sillano Place the culvert’s (0.2m diameter) was perched approx 0.2m.
h) Through 10 Sillano Place, the channel to the north of Siena Place had some overgrown vegetation
i) Wet ground and ponded water within private properties in the northern extents of Siena and Sillano Place

The stagnant water and limited flow through the existing drains demonstrate there was insufficient gradient (land too low, or not connected to drainage system) available for those areas to drain via gravity.
7. Maintenance

To address the issues a) and b) related to the existing Siena Place drainage channel the following was undertaken as maintenance works:

- Culvert at Bradleys road confluence: clearance and cleaning
- Velino Place culvert: sediment and vegetation removal immediately upstream (approx 20m)

In addition, the Council’s GIS should be updated to reflect the true position of the drainage channel to the north of Siena Place.

8. Short term upgrade options

Three options have been identified to improve the remaining identified issues in the northern Siena Place and Sillano Place area. Due to the scope of these options, all could be conceivably short term works and initiated by Council promptly if funding is available. It is recommended the design is progressed to a detail that will enable pricing and construction by a competent contractor (detail of culvert sizes, drain inverts, and bank slopes).

1. Issue c): Replace the existing solid under channel pipe with a new slotted pipe subsoil drain to ensure sufficient drainage is achieved in this area.
2. Issues d) e) f): Regrade drain through 100 Siena Place
   - Regrade the channel from the channel to the north of Siena Place, through 100 Siena Place to the Siena cul-de-sac head.
   - A grade of 1:200 is achievable with no change to the downstream channel, by lowering the channel to match the downstream channel’s invert of RL 32.32 m. Currently, there is an abrupt drop in level at the confluence, refer to Figure 15.
   - This equates to approximately 0.2-0.35m cut at the invert along the drain. It is proposed the stable channel banks of the drain remain in place, and the existing subsoil outlets, and instead sediment is cleaned from the invert only.
   - The culvert at the 100 Siena Place driveway (current 0.25m diameter) will need to be replaced (and lowered by 0.4m), it should also be upsized to match the additional drain capacity and shape. At this time the culvert can be connected to private subsoils to alleviate Issue i) private drainage issues within 100 Siena Place.
• The regraded drain should be connected to the swales surrounding the cul-de-sac head. This will require the upgrade of two additional culverts at the 93 Siena Place driveway, and the 100 Siena Place drive entrance (currently 0.25m diameter).
• To address issue d), the regraded drain should be connected to the cul-de-sac head soak pit, via a subsoil. This will require road surface restoration works.
• Refer to Figure 16 and Attachment 2 for potential design of the drain re-grade.

Figure 15 - existing dropoff at the downstream end of 100 Siena Place drain

3. Issues d) e) f) g): Re-grade drain through 10 Sillano Place

- Regrade the channel from the channel to the north of Siena Place, through 10 Sillano Place to the Sillano cul-de-sac head.
- The downstream end can be lowered by 0.4m to RL 31.56m, by removal of the perched culvert (diameter 0.2m). This relates to a cut from 0.05m to 0.4m at the invert along the drain.
- Issue g): The perched culvert at 10 Sillano Place (access to 18 Sillano Place) will need to be replaced at a lower level. The culvert is current 0.2m diameter. It should also be upsized to match the additional drain capacity and shape.
- The regraded drain should be extended to the swales surrounding the cul-de-sac head. This will require a minor cut from the swales.
- To address issue d), the regraded drain should be connected to the cul-de-sac head seepage, via a subsoil. This will require road surface restoration works.
- Refer to Figure 16 and Attachment 3 for potential design of the drain re-grade
- Issue i): Vegetation maintenance through 10 Sillano Place should be completed once works in 2. and 3. are complete. Until that time the issue is not causing any restrictions. It is recommended that a discussion with property owners is had regarding ongoing maintenance activities (eg maintenance works undertaken by property owners should include overgrown vegetation cut-back along channel length to prevent flow restrictions).
9. **Long term upgrade options**

No long-term issues have been identified that are not addressed by the proposed short term options. To ensure public expectations are clear, discussion with the property owners should be completed to explain the ongoing groundwater conditions they can expect in the Mandeville area.

10. **Recommendations**

It is recommended short term upgrades and maintenance works are progressed in the northern Siena and Sillano Place area.

10.1. **Maintenance works**

a) Clean culvert at Bradleys road confluence

b) Remove sediment and vegetation for 20m immediately upstream of the Velino Place culvert

c) Update the Council’s GIS of the channel to the north of Siena Place

10.2. **Short term works**

Progress design of the following options to the detail required for pricing and construction by a competent contractor:

d) Replace the solid underchannel pipe with a slotted subsoil p outside 52 and 60 Siena Place

e) Regrade drain through 100 Siena Place, upgrade 3 off. driveway culverts and install subsoil to cul-de-sac head

f) Regrade drain through 10 Sillano Place, upgrade outlet culvert and install subsoil to cul-de-sac head

10.3. **Future long term works**

None identified.
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. If Council decides as part of the 2018-28 LTP process that it is going to offer additional kerbside collection service choices for rubbish and/or organics bins, a public engagement process will be necessary to ascertain which services individual ratepayers wish to receive for their properties.

1.2. This report seeks Council approval to delegate to the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party (SHWWP) the authority to approve the engagement methodology and materials for this process.

1.3. This report also proposes that some other issues associated with the forward planning for a new solid waste services contract will be taken to the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party in the first instance. For example, bin ownership will be considered by the SHWWP before being brought to the Council for their consideration. This is consistent with the SHWWP Terms of Reference.

Attachments:

i. Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2017 report (Trim 171123127385)
ii. Draft time line for procurement of the new solid waste services contract (Trim 180417041613)
iii. Terms of Reference for the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party (Trim 161214128948)

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180403034992.

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

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

Circulates this report to the Community Boards for their information.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 At its meeting on 5 December 2017 Council considered a report from the Waste Management & Minimisation Plan 2017 Hearings Panel and, amongst others, adopted the following resolutions that required reporting back to Council:

- Notes that the final draft version of the 2017 Waste Management & Minimisation Plan will be brought to the Council for approval after the 2018-2028 LTP has been approved
- Requests staff to bring further advice to the Council following the LTP consultation regarding the option of the Council or the Contractor owning the bins.
- Requests staff to bring the proposed engagement method and material for asking property owners which service option they choose to Council for approval prior to release.
- Requests that staff provide information on proposed fees and charges for properties to change their future service option following their initial choice
- Requests staff, prior to the introduction of the new services, to enquire of each eligible household which services they wish to use. If no choice is made the default position will be that the property continues to receive a fortnightly recycling service and has access to the Council’s user pays fortnightly bag collection service.

3.2 Staff have commenced work in order to complete the necessary work programme to ensure that replacement solid waste services contracts are in place when the current contracts reach the end of their term at the end of June 2019. Should the additional bin collection services be included in the final LTP, the engagement materials and methodology will need to be fit for purpose. The chosen services will need to be incorporated into the rating database to ensure rates are correct for, and the right services are provided to, individual properties as from 1 July 2019.

3.3 This work is beginning in advance of the final Council decision about the services to be provided, but adjustments can be made to draft documents post adoption of the LTP, should that be required.

3.4 A workshop was held with the SHHWP on 5th April, at which staff presented the general direction proposed with respect to project management of the procurement and engagement processes, proposed level of reporting to the SHHWP, procurement and engagement planning.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The resolutions noted in 3.1 require that staff report directly back to Council on a number of issues. However the approval procedure for the engagement programme may need to be iterative before the material and process is finally signed off. It is therefore considered to be more efficient to delegate the authority for approval of this process to the SHWWP.

4.2. It is also appropriate, and consistent with the working party’s Terms of Reference, that the SHWWP should consider the other two issues from the 5 December Council resolutions.
prior to their being brought to the Council. The working party would then make recommendations to Council regarding bin ownership and proposed fees and charges for changing service options, at the appropriate time.

4.3. A timeline for the replacement of the solid waste contracts (Attachment ii), reflects this proposed methodology.

4.4. The alternative of having all three issues go directly to Council has a higher risk of delays to the programme.

4.5. The Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party considered this matter at their workshop on 5 April, and were supportive of this approach.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

The waste industry will be consulted with as part of the tendering process.

The proposed engagement process will include meetings with residents/ratepayers/property managers in lifestyle and retirement villages and other properties where bin servicing will not be straight-forward, to determine the best servicing solution for each site.

5.2. **Wider Community**

There has been significant consultation with the wider community as part of the WMMP and LTP processes.

We propose that Council undertakes significant engagement with ratepayers in the lead up to the implementation of the new kerbside collection, to ascertain what services will be required for individual properties.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

There will be sufficient funding available in the Kerbside Collection Account’s general operating budget to cover the costs of the proposed engagement process, in the event that the Council includes the additional bin collection kerbside collection services when it adopts the final 2018 LTP.

There is approximately $20,000 available for the initial phase of the engagement process in the current financial year, and around $40,000 available in the 18/19 financial year for the remainder of the engagement process.

6.2. **Community Implications**

If the Council approves the additional bin collection kerbside collection services in the LTP, it will be important to:

- Engage with ratepayers in a way that will meet the community’s expectations;
- Encourage ratepayers to provide the Council with their service choice, whether it be to continue using WDC bags or private collectors or receive one or two more Council bins; and
- Enable each property’s service choices to be incorporated easily into the rating database so that the chosen services will be provided when the new collection contracts commence.
6.3. **Risk Management**

The recommendations in this report are considered to reduce the risk of delays to the programme for establishing a new waste kerbside collection service contract on July 2019.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

Health & safety is an important component in the solid waste contracts to ensure the safety and wellbeing of the public, contractors and Council staff.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

Terms of Reference – Council and Committees: Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party S-TR 0070 Issue 6 (Attachment iii). These terms of reference give delegated authority to the Working Party “to decide on all matters relating to Solid and Hazardous Waste that do not have an effect on the Annual Plan and Budget”. The engagement materials and process fall into this category. Where any decisions need to be ratified by the Council, e.g. bin ownership and fees & charges for service changes, the SHWWP will consider options and make recommendations to the Council.

7.2. **Legislation**

Local Government Act 2002

S30: Power to appoint committees, subcommittees, other subordinate decision-making bodies, and joint committees. Under S-TR 0070 the Council has appointed the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party to be responsible for considering issues relating to Solid and Hazardous Waste.

S32 Delegations. Under S-TR 0070 the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party is responsible for deciding on all matters relating to Solid and Hazardous Waste that do not have an effect on the Annual Plan and Budget.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

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

- Waste recycling and re-use of solid waste is encouraged and residues are managed so that they minimise harm to the environment. ¹ ³ ⁴

7.4. **Delegations**

The Council has the ability to grant delegated authority to the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party for specific purposes and in accordance with the working party’s terms of reference.

Kitty Waghorn
Solid Waste Asset Manager

Simon Collin
Infrastructure Strategy Manager
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek Councils approval of the recommendations of the hearing panel, following public consultation on the draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan 2017.

1.2. On 6th June 2017, Council received report No 170501042046, and approved the proposed draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan 2017 (TRIM 170516049172) and its companion document the Waste Assessment (TRIM 170516049162) for release for public consultation, and agreed to initiate a Special Consultative Procedure for the Waste Management & Minimisation Plan.

1.3. The central issue within the draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan 2017, was consideration of a number of options for additional kerbside collection services, which would provide householders with a choice of services that would best serve their needs.

1.4. An extensive advertising campaign was carried out to publicise the kerbside collection options that were being considered, and submissions were sought. A significant number of submissions were received, with 35 submitters wishing to be heard.

1.5. At the conclusion of the this consultation process and hearings, the panel resolved to recommend to Council that it insert Option C into the draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan 2017 as the preferred suite of kerbside collection services to be offered to those households currently receiving the Council's recycling and refuse bag collection service.

1.6. This option also has the most significant likely impact on improved waste diversion from landfill.
Attachments:

i. Amended Draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan 2017—recommended amendments have been included. (171123127465).

ii. Council report approving consultation for the Draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan 2017 (170501042046[v1]).


iv. Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2017 consultation report to Hearings Panel (170807083752[v01]).

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 171123127385.

(b) **Approves** the following inclusions and amendments in the 2017 Waste Management & Minimisation Plan

1. Insert Option C as the preferred kerbside collection service in Section 5.4 comprising service choices of: rates-funded recycling bin, collected fortnightly; user-pays WDC rubbish bag OR rates-funded rubbish bin, collected fortnightly; AND/OR rates-funded mixed organics bin, collected weekly.

2. Insert the below targets in Section 2.2

   a. Reduce annual per capita waste to landfill from 294kg per capita in 2015/16 to 236kg *per capita* by 2029

   b. Increase the annual per capita quantity of materials diverted from 170kg per capita in 2015/16 to 228kg *per capita* by 2029

(c) **Notes** that the final draft version of the 2017 Waste Management & Minimisation Plan will be brought to the Council for approval after the 2018-2028 LTP has been approved

(d) **Notes** that the Long Term Plan solid waste budgets, Solid Waste Activity Management Plan and solid waste section in the Infrastructure Strategy will be prepared using the kerbside collection methodology as approved in 2(b)i.

(e) **Includes** a proposal in the Draft LTP to change the rating policy so that motels and other similar businesses only pay for one recycling targeted rate per property. Additional bins, if requested, would be provided and rated at the standard charges

(f) **Requests** staff to bring further advice to the Council following the LTP consultation regarding the option of the Council or the Contractor owning the bins.

(g) **Requests** staff to bring the proposed engagement method and material for asking property owners which service option they choose to Council for approval prior to release.
(h) **Requests** that staff provide information on proposed fees and charges for properties to change their future service option following their initial choice.

(i) **Requests** staff, prior to the introduction of the new services, to enquire of each eligible household which services they wish to use. If no choice is made the default position will be that the property continues to receive a fortnightly recycling service and has access to the Council’s user pays fortnightly bag collection service.

(j) **Increases** the level of education to the public on the reduction of waste including diversion to green waste.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**


3.2. An extensive publicity campaign was carried out to engage the public on the central issue of additional kerbside collection services. Significant public response was received, (3,148 submissions) and this is summarised in the staff report to the Hearings Panel (170807083752).

3.3. Two hearings meetings were held, on the 28th and 31st August 2017, and three subsequent deliberations meeting were held. The minutes of all five meetings are recorded in document 170828092879.

3.4. The panel concluded that it would recommend to Council that kerbside collection Option C be the preferred kerbside collection service, which provides the greatest choice to householders as to the services they may wish to use.

3.5. This option permits householders to keep using refuse bags, if they wish to, but also offers a full suite of wheelie bin collections for refuse, recycling and organics for those that prefer a higher level of service.

3.6. This option also has the most significant likely impact on improved waste diversion from landfill, which would be reflected in higher waste reduction targets in the draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan 2017, if Council adopts the recommendations of the hearings panel.

3.7. In anticipation of the Council adopting the recommendations of the hearings panel, draft Long Term Plan solid waste budgets, Solid Waste Activity Management Plan and the solid waste section in the Infrastructure Strategy are all currently being prepared on the basis of the Option C kerbside collections.

4. **PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS**

4.1. To accommodate any changes that might arise from the final LTP outcome, recommendation (c) from the panel has been changed from:

**Notes** that the final draft version of the 2017 Waste Management & Minimisation Plan will be brought to the Council for approval in December 2017, to

**Notes** that the final draft version of the 2017 Waste Management & Minimisation Plan will be brought to the Council for approval after the 2018-2028 LTP has been approved

4.2. To better align with LTP process recommendation (e) from the panel has also been amended from:
Changes the rating policy so that motels and other similar businesses only pay for one recycling targeted rate per property. Additional bins would be provided and rated, on request, to

Includes a proposal in the Draft LTP to change the rating policy so that motels and other similar businesses only pay for one recycling targeted rate per property. Additional bins, if requested, would be provided and rated at the standard charges

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. The views of the community have been sought through public consultation in accordance with Section 83 of the Local Government Act 2002, using the Special Consultative Procedure. The public were notified of this proposal through articles and public notices in the Northern Outlook, North Canterbury News, the Kaiapoi Advocate, the Oxford Bulletin, Oxford Observer and via information on the Council’s website including an online calculator tool. A display was set up in the Rangiora Service Centre, information appeared on the Districts digital screens and on Facebook and Twitter. Drop in sessions were run in Pegasus, Mandeville, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. Information was also mailed out to all households within the current kerbside collection area and a Questions and Answers Booklet was available at all Service Centres and Libraries.

5.2. Information was provided in person to two separate meetings of Greypower, Greypower subsequently sent a list of questions to Council which were answered in writing.

5.3. A breakdown of the submissions and the preferences expressed for the three different options is as follows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number of Submissions</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option C</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Option selected</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,604</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4. Copies of the draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan and statement of proposal were made available at service centres and libraries. All of the submitters to this draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan were acknowledged in writing and each was provided the opportunity to speak to the hearing panel in person.

5.5. If the Council adopts the recommendations of the hearings panel, the draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan 2017 will be updated to incorporate the changes. However, since the consultation process for the 2018-2028 LTP provides a further opportunity for the public to provide feedback on the kerbside collection proposals, the Waste Plan cannot be finalised until after the 2018-2028 LTP has been adopted.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. There are no direct financial implications arising from the Council adopting the recommendations of this report. However should the result of the LTP consultation process and decision making be that the Option C kerbside services are made available to the public in 2019, there will be an impact on the rates for those households that choose to use the offered bin service(s).
6.2. Those effects are detailed in section 5 of the 6th June report (170501042046[v1])

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**
This matter is a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance Policy. In addition, it is a requirement of the Waste Minimisation Act that the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan is consulted upon via a special consultative procedure if there are significant changes made during the review.

7.2. **Legislation**

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

- Waste recycling and re-use of solid waste is encouraged, and residues are managed so that they minimise the harm to the environment.

---

Simon Collin  Kitty Waghorn
Infrastructure Strategy Manager  Solid Waste Asset Manager

On behalf of
Cr. R. Brine
Chair: Waste Management & Minimisation Plan Hearing Panel
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive tender, assess and write report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report deadline 21 Nov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council approves tender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second round confirming what the public want</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor prepares for contract start. Refuse Station and Collection contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contract Starts**
1. **Membership**

Seven (7) Councillors, one of which shall be the Portfolio Holder of Solid Waste. The Mayor.

2. **Quorum**

Four members.

3. **Terms of Reference**

3.1 The Working Party will be responsible for considering issues relating to Solid and Hazardous Waste.

3.2 Delegated authority is given to the Working Party to decide on all matters relating to Solid and Hazardous Waste that do not have an affect on the Annual Plan and Budget.

4. **Objectives**

4.1 To ensure the effective implementation of the Waste Management Plan.

4.2 To plan for future directions and initiatives in waste management and minimisation.

4.3 To advise the Utilities and Roading Committee on issues that affect the Annual Plan budget.

4.4 To evaluate the delivery of Councils services, including Refuse and Recycling Collection, and transfer stations.

4.5 To manage the liaison with the Canterbury Waste Joint Committee and the Canterbury Regional Landfill Joint Committee.

4.6 The minutes of each Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party meetings are to be attached to agendas of the Utilities and Roading Committee.

5. **Meeting Frequency**

As required.

6. **Staff Executive**

Manager: Utilities and Roading.
1. SUMMARY

1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval for a submission on the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018/19 to 2027/28. The formal closing date for submissions is Wednesday 2 May.

Attachments:


2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180410038161.

(b) Approves the draft Council submission on the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018/19 to 2027/28 (TRIM No. 180410038725).

(c) Delegates to the Mayor and Chief Executive responsibility for approving any alterations, additions or deletions that may be required before the submission is due to be lodged prior to the closing date of 2 May 2018.

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

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 Council makes submissions periodically on Government policy directional documents especially where there are direct implications for the District. The most recent submissions on land transport Government Policy Statements have been made on the 2015 GPS and 2017 GPS.

3.2 The GPS 2018/19 to 2027/28 was released on 5 April 2018 with the period of formal engagement closing on 2 May 2018. Staff will attend a Ministry of Transport information session on GPS 2018/19 to 2027/28 in Christchurch on 23 April 2014.
4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The Council’s submission on the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport is seen as an important opportunity for the Council to present its views about the new Government’s proposals for the strategic direction, priorities, and investment in land transport.

4.2. The submission supports the step change in approach being taken for the land transport system and welcomes the new strategic priorities and focus on safety, access, environment and value for money.

4.3. The submission acknowledges the document is at this stage a time-constrained, high-level directional statement, and welcomes a second stage GPS which will include detail which cannot at this stage be commented upon including: review of rail, a new road safety strategy and input from the Climate Change Commission.

4.4. Access is supported as a key strategic direction. The submission makes the point that appropriate provision of public transport is vital in order to reduce congestion and meet the needs of this District’s communities, drawing attention to the findings within the District Development Strategy.

4.5. The submission urges retention of the Woodend Bypass noting in particular that the safety and access benefits for Pegasus and Woodend are complementary with the GPS’s strategic direction.

4.6. The submission welcomes work being undertaken on transitional rail investment which would support urban rail services and assist passengers to access major employment and housing areas in Greater Christchurch.

4.7. The submission strongly supports investigation of coastal shipping for shifting freight (and potentially passengers) to reduce regional and localised pressure on the eastern coastal road and rail corridor.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

No views have been specifically sought from groups and organisations when preparing this submission. Community views on the GPS will be sought as part of NZTA’s consultative process beginning in later 2018.

5.2. **Wider Community**

No views have been sought from the wider community when preparing this submission.

6. **IMPLIEDATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

There are no financial implications in preparing and making this submission.

6.2. **Community Implications**

There are no immediate community implications in preparing and making this submission.
6.3. **Risk Management**

There are no organisational risks associated with this submission.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

There are no health and safety risks associated with this submission.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

Sections 67-71 of the *Land Transport Act 2003*

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

This report relates to the following community outcomes:

**Governance**

- Opportunities for collaboration and partnerships are actively pursued.

**Environment**

- Crime, injury and harm from road crashes, gambling, and alcohol abuse are minimised.
- Harm to the environment from the impacts of land use, use of water resources and air emissions is minimised.

**Places and Spaces**

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

**Services**

- 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.
- Opportunities to increase the occupancy of commuter vehicles is actively encouraged.

Mike O’Connell

Senior Policy Analyst

Submission by
Waimakariri District Council

2 May 2018

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

The Waimakariri District Council welcomes the opportunity to submit on the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018/19-2027/28 (the GPS).

Specific comments on the GPS 2018 are offered as follows.

2. Strategic direction

In broad terms, this Council welcomes the step change in approach to the land transport system through the new strategic priorities and focus on safety, access, environment and value for money.

We support Safety and Access being the two key strategic priorities, supported by the priorities of Environment and Value for money (point 11).

We note in particular (p.3) where it is highlighted that this GPS 2018 is a first stage and a second stage GPS is likely to be required. The Council welcomes firmer policy detail a soon as practicable.

The Council welcomes that the second stage GPS is likely to include input from the independent Climate Change Commission to ensure consistency with the overall emissions reductions target and strategy.

We acknowledge the national importance of Auckland (points 63-70), however, it would be appropriate to include sections for Christchurch and Wellington, highlighting greater Christchurch as the country’s second largest city and outlining key transport challenges and proposed initiatives to address those challenges.

The Council also welcomes the mode neutral approach (Section 2.7) being adopted in the GPS and the process transparency associated with considering all modal options.

3. Safety

As noted above, the Council supports Safety as a key strategic priority (Section 2.2). Whilst we support implementation of the Speed Management Guide (point 35), we consider that effective changes in operating speeds will require more than a simple change in speed limit. The Waimakariri District rural road network contains of a large proportion of long, straight roads. The Speed Management Guide suggests that 80km/h is a safe and appropriate speed for most of these roads. We consider that a significant change in road user mind sets is required before 80km/h is accepted as appropriate by many users of those roads.

There is a risk that increased enforcement of speed limits which are not widely accepted could result in negative reactions against the willingness to comply.

We consider that a comprehensive, co-ordinated national and local engagement programme to help change attitudes to speed is a critical early component of the speed management adjustment process.

4. Access

The Council supports Access as a key strategic priority (Section 2.3). Appropriate provision of public transport is vital in order to reduce congestion and meet the needs of this District’s growing communities and aging demographic. This is important not only from a travel point of view, but also from amenity, environmental and economic perspectives and includes the continued protection of the rail corridor to enable commuter rail travel in the future, should regional and national policy approaches, and commuter demand, support this. The Council also has a supporting role in providing park and ride facilities.

Within Section 2.3 (the grey box on p.14), we are interested in exploring further policy direction around future development of greater Christchurch and transport’s role as a place-maker; and on future rapid transit options. It is worth reiterating that the Council continues to work with its Greater Christchurch partners (on regional public transport improvements) and New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) on transport network matters.

The Council brings to the Ministry’s attention the recently released Our District, Our Future - Waimakariri 2048, District Development Strategy, the framework for how the Council responds to anticipated growth over the next three decades. During consultation on the strategy, a recurring theme was current and future transport connections. Improvements in commuting to and from Christchurch and public transport (via a rail link, park and ride and bus
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services) were points consistently raised in the community seeking to improve accessibility, reduce congestion, increase travel time predictability and reduce reliance on cars.

We note that the new Government has committed an additional $100m from the National Land Transport Fund in capital investment to Greater Christchurch multi-modal public transport. It is important that all options for multi-modal public transport are canvassed before committing to any particular solution.

In Section 2.3.1 (p.12), the result (between points 57 and 58) is about better connection and accessibility between metropolitan areas and high growth urban areas. The eastern part of this District is a high growth urban area, presenting itself as a prime development high-growth urban settlement. It is an ideal location for place-making due largely to its geographic layout and a more favourable location to develop park-and-ride facilities than other towns in the Canterbury region.

5. Future development of state highway network

Further discussions will be required with NZTA to identify and confirm issues and options for the future Woodend bypass alignment and the current State Highway 1 (SH1) through Woodend. As the timing and nature of development of the Woodend Bypass and development of the Key Activity Centre at North Woodend becomes clearer, the Council will develop an approach to confirm the future form and function of the existing Woodend town centre, noting the opportunities available in the current SH1 corridor, if and when it ceases to be a state highway.

Regarding the NZTA’s Woodend Corridor Improvements project, the Council expresses concern that this project may now be delayed or suspended with the new strategic direction being adopted in the GPS. We trust this will not be the case for two main reasons: safety and access. Safety and access are identified as the two key strategic priorities.

With NZTA, the Council has been investigating ways to improve SH1 in the Woodend-Pegasus area to allow for future growth in this part of the District. The NZTA notes traffic through Woodend on SH1 is projected to increase to approximately 28,000 vehicles per day, a volume that will exceed the capacity of the existing two-lane road through Woodend.

Access is also a key theme in this Council’s policy and planning framework. For example, the Woodend Pegasus Area Strategy identifies the Short Eastern Bypass Route as a key element for the challenge of connectivity, opening up safer access to nearby Pegasus and the evolving Ravenswood development.

A major concern for Council is that this additional traffic will over time reduce safety and increase community severance, resulting from a reduced ability to safely access facilities in Woodend, including the Woodend School, community centre and shops.

The Woodend bypass will therefore be a transport investment that is consistent with the two key strategic priorities of the draft GPS. It will also be consistent with the third strategic priority in the GPS – Environment. That is, localised environmental impacts such as air pollution will be reduced.

The Woodend bypass will also allow for the development of tailored rapid transit (bus) options and assist Woodend and Pegasus to become place-maker towns.

Having the corridor in place will also aid resilience aspects, providing at least a second egress point from Pegasus to the west. This point is made in part in the document, p.14, point #54: ‘continuing to invest to ensure there are appropriate levels of service […] resilience will help to avoid disruption or minimise it when it occurs.’

6. Transitional rail funding

The Council notes in Section 2.6 reference to ‘transitional rail funding’ and the inclusion of a transitional rail activity class to provide scope for funding key rail projects ‘that cannot wait for the rail review and second stage GPS’ (point 149).

In Table 3. (p.32), transitional rail is defined as 'investment to support urban and interregional rail services that assist passengers to access major employment and housing areas'. These investment moves are supported.

The Council looks forward to future dialogue with NZTA and the Ministry on the findings of the current review of rail (to inform the second stage GPS – point 148).
7. Coastal shipping and network resilience

It is noted (pp. 3, 14 and 17) that as part of a second-stage GPS, the government will investigate enabling funding for coastal shipping, noting further in point 121, that coastal shipping is a lower emissions transport mode and will assist greenhouse gas abatement opportunities.

The Council strongly supports investigation of this mode of shifting freight (and potentially passengers) to reduce regional and localised pressure on the eastern coastal road and rail corridor, thus providing additional resilience within the transport system.

The Council anticipates policy direction will become clearer in a second-stage GPS and support complementary policy work (i.e. objectives and targets for the transport sector) that will emerge as a result of the input from the (independent) Climate Change Commission (pp 3 and 19).

8. Additional funding

It is not immediately apparent about the role of KiwiRail in the GPS, however, we note in Section 3.3 that this section will be updated with details of land transport appropriations once decisions around the 2018 Budget are made.

In the interim, Council welcomes the recent release by the Minister of Transport concerning KiwiRail becoming an approved public organisation under the Land Transport Management Act 2003 (LTMA).

While the Council is supportive of longer term investment in alternative transit modes such as rail and coastal shipping, it is concerned that this may be at the expense of investment in regional roading that addresses the strategic GPS priorities of safety and access.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on GPS 2018.
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Role and context for the GPS 2018
Section 1:  
Role and context for the GPS 2018

Welcome to the draft Government Policy Statement on land transport [GPS]. The GPS helps guide investment in transport by providing a longer term strategic view of how we prioritise things in the transport network, and why. This includes an overall focus of improving our land transport network by prioritising safety, access, environment and value for money.

Read more about the GPS in detail and the policies that will shape the direction of land transport in New Zealand and should you wish to share your thoughts on this DRAFT policy, please go online to www.transport.govt.nz/GPS2018
Section 1.1

Role of the GPS

1. Transport is a critical part of daily life for all New Zealanders. We use transport for access to services, freight, travel for work, education, health, and for visiting family and friends. Transport networks allow businesses, regions, and cities to be well connected and productive.

2. Transport can be a powerful enabler for new housing opportunities, liveable cities, and sustainable economic development in regional New Zealand.

3. The transport network also shapes our towns and cities, and how we get around. Streets are the largest area of, often highly valuable, public spaces in our towns and cities. How that space is allocated and used influences land use, property values, and the life and vibrancy of our towns and cities.

4. Transport investments have long lead times, high costs, and leave long legacies. Good transport investment therefore requires careful planning that allows for uncertainties to ensure today’s transport network will be able to meet our future needs.

5. The GPS outlines the Government’s strategy to guide land transport investment over the next 10 years. It also provides guidance to decision-makers about where the Government will focus resources. The GPS operates under the Land Transport Management Act 2003, which sets out the scope and requirements for the GPS (see Appendices 1, 2 and 3 for details).

6. The GPS influences decisions on how money from the National Land Transport Fund (the Fund) will be invested across activity classes, such as state highways and public transport. It also guides the NZ Transport Agency and local government on the type of activities that should be included in Regional Land Transport Plans and the National Land Transport Programme.

7. The GPS provides guidance on how around $4 billion of New Zealanders’ money is spent through the Fund each year. It also provides signals for spending of a further $1.5 billion each year on land transport through local government investment and a further $0.5 billion a year of Crown investment.

A second stage GPS is likely to be required in order to fully realise Government’s direction for transport investment. Inclusion of some things in this GPS has not been possible given the time constraints. This is because they rely on other work such as the review of rail, and the development of a new road safety strategy.

The second stage GPS may include input from the independent Climate Change Commission once established, to ensure consistency with the overall emissions reductions target and strategy. It will also investigate enabling funding for coastal shipping. Some of the key changes to be made in the second stage GPS have been indicated in text boxes like this in relevant parts of the strategic direction section.
Section 1.2

Government policies relevant to transport

The GPS takes into consideration a range of government policies. Existing key government policy direction documents are listed below, and additional detail is included in Appendix 4.

- **Safer Journeys 2010 – 2020**
  **Focus:** priorities for road safety in New Zealand

- **Regional Economic Development**
  **Focus:** supporting productive, sustainable and inclusive growth in regional New Zealand through the recently established Provincial Growth Fund

- **Housing Infrastructure Fund**
  **Focus:** unlocking housing development in high growth areas

- **National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016**
  **Focus:** directing local authorities to provide sufficient development capacity in their resource management plans, supported by infrastructure to meet demand for housing and business space

- **New Zealand Energy Efficiency and Conservation Strategy 2017-2022**
  **Focus:** unlocking our energy productivity and renewable potential

- **National Infrastructure Plan 2015**
  **Focus:** providing national direction to infrastructure development in New Zealand, and providing confidence to the private sector so they can make long term investment decisions

- **NZ Health Strategy**
  **Focus:** all New Zealanders live well, stay well, get well. A smart, people-powered health system that works as one team to provide services closer to home and is designed for value and high performance

- **Public Transport Operating Model**
  **Focus:** setting the operating environment for the delivery of public transport

- **Tourism Strategy**
  **Focus:** increasing the economic contribution made by tourism at a national and regional level

  **Focus:** sets out government’s role in testing and enabling the deployment of intelligent transport systems technologies that will benefit New Zealand

- **New Zealand Disability Strategy 2016-2026**
  **Focus:** making New Zealand a non-disabling society

In Auckland, the Auckland Transport Alignment Project (ATAP) builds consensus between Government and Auckland Council on a strategic approach to transport investment in Auckland that addresses the region’s challenges. Through ATAP, an indicative investment package is developed to illustrate the strategic approach. An update to the indicative package is currently underway taking into account Auckland’s challenges and the shared Government and Auckland Council objectives. The ATAP work sets a strong direction for Auckland and GPS 2018 supports its direction.
This section describes the overall strategic priorities for GPS 2018, the national objectives for land transport, the themes and the results the Government wishes to achieve through the allocation of funding from the Fund.
Section 2: Strategic direction

10. The strategic direction sets the 10 year view for the GPS to drive improved performance from the land transport system.

11. The four strategic priorities are:
   • safety
   • access
   • environment
   • value for money.

   Safety and access are the key strategic priorities for the Government and reflect the transport system that we are striving for. These key priorities are supported by the priorities of environment and value for money.

12. A one page summary of the strategic direction section can be found on page 8.

13. Each strategic priority has associated objectives, and long term results (for a 10 year period). Appendix 2 includes further information on the GPS framework. Figure 1 on the following page outlines how the strategic priorities and objectives work together.

14. The strategic priorities outline what the Government wants to achieve in land transport, while the objectives provide direction for how these priorities should be achieved. The themes sit alongside the objectives and provide guidance for how objectives should be delivered.

15. A summary of the strategic priorities, objectives, and the long term results are captured in Table 1 (see section 2.7).

16. The Government raises revenue to deliver transport infrastructure and services. It is important that the revenue is used on infrastructure and services that are good value for money – this will automatically advance the strategic priorities. However, there will be some investments with low benefits relative to costs that are necessary to advance Government policies. In these cases there will need to be alignment with the policies expressed in the GPS and transparency about the reason for the decision.
GPS 2018:
Strategic Direction

Figure 1: Strategic direction of the GPS 2018
Section 2.1
Summary of Strategic Direction Section

Safety in GPS 2018:
- reflects a significant increase in the level of ambition for delivering a land transport free of death and serious injury
- outlines a commitment to deliver a new road safety strategy for New Zealand
- signals a greater focus on investing in safety improvements on high risk state highways and local roads across the network, including speed management and primary safe system treatments
- drives improvements in safety outcomes for all road users, including increased investment in footpaths and cycleways to support access to and uptake of active travel modes.

Environment in GPS 2018:
- supports a mode shift to lower emission forms of transport, including walking, cycling, public transport and lower emission vehicles (such as electric vehicles)
- recognises the importance of urban form for creating liveable cities that value public space and improve access
- links to the wider environmental commitments of the Government, such as achieving the Paris Agreement target of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 30 percent below 2005 levels by 2030, and setting a more ambitious reductions target for 2050
- recognises the public health benefits of reducing harmful transport emissions and increasing uptake of walking and cycling.

Value for Money in GPS 2018:
- increases the emphasis on value for money to maximise the impact of money spent to achieve the Government’s outcomes
- indicates that decision makers should take into account the full range of benefits and costs over the whole life of investments, and to be cognisant of possible future changes and uncertainty of the future, so that investment can be made in options that perform best across a wide range of different scenarios
- places greater emphasis on transparent investment decision-making and on enhanced reporting on the outcomes achieved by investment.

Access in GPS 2018:
- has a new focus that prioritises improving New Zealander’s access to opportunities and markets. The increased focus includes:
  - urban centres
  - regional development that supports thriving regions, for example through the Provincial Growth Fund
  - nationally important freight and tourism connections are safe, efficient, resilient and minimise greenhouse gas emissions
  - a continued focus on resilience of the land transport system, but places greater focus on resilience to climate change impacts.
- The increased focus on urban centres is to ensure that transport and land use planning reduces the need to travel by private motor vehicle by:
  - transport and land use planning that improves access by reducing the need to travel long distances to access opportunities like employment, education and recreation
  - supporting a mode shift for trips in urban centres from single occupant private vehicles to more efficient, low cost modes like walking, cycling and public transport.
Section 2.2

Strategic Priority: Safety

17. Significantly reducing the number of deaths and serious injuries that occur on the transport network is a key priority for GPS 2018.

18. People should not be killed or seriously injured while using the transport network for everyday activities such as accessing employment, education, housing, leisure and other social and economic activities. The movement of freight, which is critical for the New Zealand economy, should not result in the loss of life or cause serious injury.

19. The number of deaths and serious injuries on New Zealand's roads has generally followed a downward trend since its peak of 795 deaths in 1987, to a low of 253 deaths in 2013. Since 2013, the rates of serious road trauma have been rising. In 2017, there were 380 road deaths.

20. An increase in motor vehicle trips has resulted in more deaths on the road during this period. However, it is not the only factor that has contributed to a rise in road deaths. The fatality rate per billion kilometres travelled has risen 16 percent from 2013 to 2016. This means that the number of fatalities and serious injuries are increasing at a much faster rate than can be explained by simple traffic growth.

21. New Zealand has continued to perform relatively poorly on road deaths per head of population compared to other developed countries. Our current death rate is 7.9 deaths per 100,000 population, whereas countries with good safety performance have death rates between 2 and 4 deaths per 100,000 population. Australia’s current rate is 5.0 deaths per 100,000 population and Sweden’s death rate is 2.6. If New Zealand had a comparable death rate to Sweden approximately 250 fewer people would have died in 2017.

22. Reversing New Zealand’s current trauma trends requires a transport system that is designed for people, and one that considers their safety as the top priority. This will require strong leadership, significant changes to policy and practice, and increased investment.

23. Mistakes by road users are inevitable, and this must be taken into account in the planning, design and operation of transport systems. It requires a system wide approach to safety in the land transport system.

24. State highways and local roads present road safety challenges for all modes of transport. Around 40 percent of New Zealand’s state highway network has a two-star safety rating – which means they are undivided, have poor alignment, and feature hazards such as narrow or unsealed shoulders, and unforgiving roadside objects such as deep ditches, trees and concrete poles.

25. In the past, the design of both urban and rural roads has often prioritised the faster movement of vehicles over the safety of people, particularly vulnerable road users like people walking and cycling. Urban cycleway networks are significantly underdeveloped so the transport system is comparatively less safe for people on bikes. Further investment in cycleways and footpaths would support safe and healthy travelling options for cyclists and pedestrians.

26. New Zealand roads, speeds, vehicles and user behaviours are a long way from what is required to achieve our aim of a land transport system that is free of death and serious injury. There needs to be increased efforts across the system to reduce road trauma and significantly reduce crash severity and support improved public health and environmental outcomes. This is a key objective for GPS 2018.

Section 2.2.1

安全管理目标：一个安全的交通系统

22. GPS 2018 指示需要增加和持续努力，以实现一个长期的目标，即创建一个没有死亡和严重伤害的交通系统。

警告：如果一个部分的系统失效，将导致死亡和严重伤害。

23. 在过去，城市和农村道路的设计往往优先考虑车辆的快速通行，而不是人们的安全，特别是行人和自行车。因此，需要投资进一步发展自行车道和人行道，以支持安全和健康的交通方式。

24. 在过去的模式下，城市和农村道路的设计往往优先考虑车辆的快速通行，而不是人们的安全，特别是行人和自行车。因此，需要投资进一步发展自行车道和人行道，以支持安全和健康的交通方式。
Developing a new road safety strategy will require consideration of collective and measurable targets, outcomes and performance measures for the land transport system. The strategy will also consider the broader harms to health from the land transport system, for example the impact of transport related air and noise pollution in the environment, as well as the potential for public health gains from increased uptake of active modes. It will also consider personal safety while travelling, including on public transport and in developing shared and potentially driverless modes of travel.

The new strategy will be based on a strong evidence base. This will build on, and potentially expand, agencies current research, data and monitoring programmes. It will also support consideration of research into the broader harms of transport, such as public health concerns from air and noise pollution.

It will include greater monitoring and evaluation of interventions to ensure the impacts of the interventions being made are measured and learned from. This will help to develop a better understanding of changes in fatal and serious injuries, and likely causes. It is important to understand not only why someone crashed, but also why they were harmed.

State highways and local roads are safer for everyone

The GPS supports investment in safety improvements on state highways and local roads. It supports targeting investment at roads and roadsides that will have the greatest impact on reducing deaths and serious injuries.

Investment should improve safety for all users through ensuring safe and appropriate travel speeds, and improving roads, roadsides and intersections. In particular, GPS 2018 supports investment to:

- accelerate the implementation of the new Speed Management Guide, focusing on treating the top 10 percent of the network which will result in the greatest reduction in death and serious injury as quickly as possible (such as reviewing speed limits and/or making engineering improvements to make a road safe for its current speed limit)
- the highest risk parts of the network, increased investment in primary safe system treatments, that reduce the risk of:
  - head-on and run-off road crashes (such as through the installation of median and side barriers)
  - urban and rural intersection crashes (such as through the installation of roundabouts or speed management devices), and
  - harm to vulnerable road users, including pedestrians, cyclists, mobility impaired (such as through segregated facilities, markings or speed management devices, including raised platforms at roundabouts, traffic signals, and pedestrian facilities)
- lower cost safety interventions such as improved skid resistance, signs and markings (including rumble strips), safety targeted seal widening and speed management
- maintenance to ensure these safe system treatments remain fit for purpose
- rail safety, including to partner with KiwiRail to upgrade level crossings.

This includes both state highways and local roads. In regards to local roads it includes reviewing the incentives, processes and funding arrangements for investing in safety initiatives by local government to ensure that safety on local roads is being improved.

GPS 2018 will require improved transparency and reporting of safety investments that support improving safety outcomes across all activity classes [not just maintaining current standards].

Cycling and walking is safer

In line with the GPS objective ‘enabling transport choice and access’, GPS 2018 supports investment towards improving the safety of cyclists and pedestrians. Improving the safety of cycling and walking is a key part of improving accessibility and uptake of cycling and walking as preferred transport modes, and enabling transport choice.

Investment in the provision of appropriately designed and maintained infrastructure [e.g. cycleways] and speed management is particularly important to increase access to and uptake of active forms of travel. Investment in promotional activities to encourage uptake and community engagement is also supported.

Effective enforcement activity to promote safe behaviour by road users

GPS 2018 supports investment in effective enforcement activity to promote safe behaviour by road users. It supports a risk based approach that targets investment and enforcement activity at the behaviours that are likely to create the highest safety risks, alongside highly visible patrols to support and encourage safe driving behaviour.

GPS 2018 also supports continued investment to improve productivity and value for money within the Road Policing Activity Class by:

- supporting Police to deploy to the right activities at the right time. This is to help prevent serious road trauma by continuing to place a particular focus on identified high-risk driver factors, including speed (including low level speeding), impairment, distraction, and not using restraints
- investment in streamlined and more effective technology and processes so that Police can employ a flexible approach to deploying resource to the highest priorities
- investment in the development and implementation of an improved road policing programme operating and funding model.
Safer road use through appropriate education and promotion activities and regulatory changes

42. GPS 2018 supports investment in initiatives to improve road user behaviour and community understanding of road safety, through the Road Safety Promotion Activity Class.

43. GPS 2018 supports policy development in key areas, including:
   - ensuring safer and appropriate speeds, including around schools
   - improving the safety of active transport modes, including rules for what types of vehicles should be allowed on footpaths, cycleways, shared paths and roadways, and under what conditions
   - reviewing regulatory barriers to accelerate the implementation of the speed management guide
   - implementing the new mandatory alcohol interlock regime and associated subsidy scheme for low income offenders
   - improving the vehicle fleet, including through considering the case for mandating new road safety technology standards for vehicles, such as side underrun technology on heavy vehicles, and anti-lock breaking system (ABS) for motorcycles
   - evaluating the effectiveness of interventions (regulatory and non-regulatory) in relation to driver licensing, including for motorcyclists and overseas drivers
   - reviewing vehicle classifications to ensure safe and appropriate road use by different vehicle types.

44. There will also be an increased focus on public engagement and partnerships to deepen community understanding about why infrastructure treatments, speed management and other road safety initiatives are essential to reduce road trauma; and greater community and public conversations about risks on the road and how these should be managed. The aim is to create public demand for, and support of, these road safety interventions.

45. GPS 2018 supports investment in innovative solutions to improve road user behaviour, including the use of technology as appropriate.

The second stage GPS will be informed by the development of the new safety strategy. It will include work on a revised framework for investment across the land transport system to ensure that we are targeting funding to the most effective interventions to achieve a significant reduction in deaths and serious injuries.
Section 2.3

**Strategic Priority: Access**

Access is defined as people’s ability to connect with people, goods, services and opportunities and thereby engage in economic and social activity. Access can be achieved through three systems:

- the transport system which enables physical mobility
- the land-use system which brings people closer to opportunities
- the telecommunications system which allows people to access opportunities virtually.

46. Investment in the transport system increases mobility, and therefore increase access. However, improving mobility is not essential to improve access.

47. People live in and visit cities and towns because they value access – access to ideas, jobs, education, goods, services, cultural facilities and public amenities.

48. Transport investment and land use should therefore prioritise the ability of people and goods to access opportunities and markets. This recognises that greater mobility is a means to achieve better access, but not an end goal in itself.

49. Investing for improved access is guided by considerations of:
   - land use and transport planning that reduces the need for single-occupant vehicle travel in urban centres
   - making the best use of the existing network and services (e.g. through demand management, mode shift and a reduction in single-occupant vehicle travel)
   - providing new infrastructure or services where necessary to support planned growth (including housing developments).

50. The need to travel for single occupant vehicles is minimised by integrating land use and transport planning so that urban forms and transport services reduce the distance or time required to access social and economic opportunities. Improving the availability of real-time information helps people make better decisions about whether, when and/or how to travel. The creation of public places that integrate aspects of the transport network, particularly walking and cycling, can help to make safer and attractive, accessible urban environments that allow land use and transport to work better together.

51. Providing better access means making the best use of the existing transport network before considering investment in new infrastructure or services. Demand management is one option. This includes enabling more people to travel by walking and cycling, public transport or by higher occupancy vehicles.

52. Intelligent transport systems and other technologies also help make the best use of existing networks by actively managing traffic flow, including congestion and incident management.

53. Continuing to invest to ensure there are appropriate levels of service for maintenance and resilience will help to avoid disruption or minimise it when it occurs.

54. Where these interventions are not sufficient to support the demands of planned growth (including housing developments), investment in new infrastructure or services may be required to increase the capacity of the transport network. Such investment will include the appropriate mix of modes and technology to ensure high quality transport connections and easy access to social and economic opportunities.

55. This priority is delivered through the objectives of access, transport choice and resilience.

Section 2.3.1

**Access Objective: A land transport system that provides increased access for economic and social opportunities**

This transport access priority is about improving access to social and economic opportunities so that:

- cities are well connected, safe, accessible and liveable
- regional development supports thriving regions
- nationally important freight and tourism connections are safe, efficient, resilient and minimise greenhouse gas emissions.

**Result:** Metropolitan and high growth urban areas are better connected and accessible

Well-connected and accessible cities are critical to our economic and social prosperity. It is about creating liveable cities that support economic productivity and access to opportunities. People in liveable cities have improved health and personal well being and increased social inclusion as a result of enhancing access and transport choice. The transport system contributes to liveable cities by providing easy and efficient access and effective transport choice.

This requires roads, rail, public transport, walking and cycling networks to work together to increase access to opportunities. The options for access will change as technology and innovation provide new choices.
GPS 2018 is supportive of increasing economic access in high growth areas by encouraging integration between land use and transport planning and the delivery of transport investments, supporting new mixed use housing developments and the implementation of the Auckland Transport Alignment Project.

GPS 2018 is supportive of liveable cities by improving walking, cycling and public transport and by increasing transport choice [see ‘enabling transport choice and access’ objective].

Housing developments

Transport supports urban growth through opening access to new housing developments and existing housing. This access should prioritise modes such as public transport and walking and cycling. GPS 2018 therefore supports:
• increasing the supply of serviced land for housing development in high growth urban areas, which allows for lead and other investments in transport infrastructure to support this growth
• the Housing Infrastructure Fund and Crown Infrastructure Partnerships.

Auckland

There is a special focus on Auckland given its scale and growth, the strongest population growth in New Zealand. Auckland’s population is projected to increase by 45 percent to 2.2 million people over the next 30 years, accompanied by over 243,000 new jobs. Auckland’s success is important not just for Aucklanders but for New Zealand’s long-term growth and productivity.

Auckland is therefore a priority for GPS 2018. Over recent years, there has been joint work between Auckland Council and the government to align their transport investment priorities, through a process called the Auckland Transport Alignment Project [ATAP].

At the end of 2017 ATAP was reconvened and a process is underway to update the ATAP indicative package of investments that takes account of transport challenges identified in previous ATAP work and puts a greater weight on new and broader transport objectives.

Earlier ATAP work identified four key transport challenges for the next decade:
• enabling a faster rate of housing growth, particularly in new greenfield growth areas
• addressing projected declines in access to jobs and education, particularly for people living in the west and the south
• addressing increasing congestion on the motorway and arterial road network, particularly at non-peak times
• increasing public transport use to relieve congested corridors.

Work is underway to account for these challenges, putting a greater weight on the following objectives:
• accelerating the development of Auckland’s rapid transit network, with a particular focus on routes between the city and the airport, to unlock housing and urban development opportunities
• increasing walking and cycling and making these active modes safer for Aucklanders
• delivering improvements in health, safety, the environment and access, including access for people with disabilities
• ensuring the indicative package delivers the best possible value for money, including broader non-monetary costs and benefits.

The ATAP strategic approach also requires an equally strong focus on making better use of Auckland’s existing network and maximising opportunities to influence travel demand.

The ATAP process builds consensus between government and Auckland Council and as such the indicative investment package produced by the work provides a strong direction to investment spending in Auckland.

GPS 2018 is aligned to the ATAP strategic approach and the broader transport objectives that the current ATAP process is working to. GPS 2018 supports investment in projects aligned to the indicative package emerging from the current ATAP work.

Inviting public spaces

Creating spaces within the streetscape that are attractive and safe for people to sit, gather and walk and cycle supports the objectives of creating a safer and more accessible network, as well as key outcomes around improving health and well-being.

Well designed, attractive public spaces provide residents with places to gather, and attract people to frequent local businesses, connect with their neighbours and partake in recreational and cultural activities.

GPS 2018 will support investments that make streets more inviting places for people. This should encourage more housing development in these areas and more city living.

Public transport

Public transport is vital to improve access by moving large numbers of people through the network at peak travelling hours, it is also very important to support communities and provides a mean for increased social inclusion. Public transport availability and frequency, especially in off-peak times, is a significant determinant of access to social and economic opportunities for the physically impaired and elderly, as well as shift workers and the unemployed, among others.

Public transport (especially rapid transit) and walking and cycling can enable opportunities to shape the transport landscape to create more liveable cities.
GPS 2018 supports investment in:

- increases in public transport capacity (availability and frequency) and inter-modal connectivity
- the continuation of off-peak public transport in urban areas
- public transport services to support new housing areas
- consideration of new options provided by technology change and innovation (such as shared vehicles) that can further this objective.

**Result:** Better access to markets, business areas, and supporting tourism

This result primarily has an economic focus on goods reaching their destination efficiently. The focus is on national routes where access constraints at specific points are limiting business productivity or tourism ventures.

Generally, New Zealand’s existing road network is reasonably well developed and provides a high level of access for light and heavy vehicles at a national and local level.

However, moving goods by road may not be the best option. We need to consider providing a higher level of access to markets via rail or coastal shipping. This increased access may reduce other costs such as greenhouse gas emissions and deaths and serious injuries.

Transport connections that are classified as nationally important need to be of the highest safety, quality and resilience. They need to be maintained or improved to:

- respond to changes in freight movements, population growth and tourist numbers by providing extra capacity
- consider the total transport task, taking into account all modes (such as rail, sea, air) and logistics, and how technology and innovation can be used to meet changing demands
- mitigate resilience risk
- enable the transition to low carbon economy.

**Result:** Sustainable economic development of regional New Zealand is supported by safer and better transport connections

For New Zealand to thrive we need our regions to thrive. GPS 2018 supports investment in activities that are complementary to the Provincial Growth Fund (PGF) and to the Government’s goals for tourism. Regional New Zealand is a key driver of the New Zealand economy for example the majority of exports are generated in regional New Zealand and tourists spend most of their time in the regions.

The focus on regions is to build on the strengths and comparative advantages of regions. This aims to lift their potential, resulting in improving the productivity and economic prospects of the region and the living standards and opportunities of those living there. This recognises that some local councils have resource and funding constraints.

The infrastructure focus of the PGF is on investment in projects that enable regions to be well connected (to other regions and within regions) from an economic and social perspective. The Government’s goals for tourism include attracting the right visitor mix, responding to visitor demand and ensuring all regions benefit from tourism. Transport’s contribution to the tourism strategy includes providing robust safe transport infrastructure.

GPS 2018 focuses on assisting regional New Zealand by supporting regional economic development and the Government’s goals for tourism. Resilient and safe transport access within and between regions is vital to a region for economic development and tourism. The focus is on transport investment to improve access and safety for residents and tourists.

GPS 2018 supports investment in an increased focus on regional transport including:

- developing transport connections that are crucial for linking production points with key distribution points (including routes important for exports, and those intra-regional routes critical for getting local goods to market)
- making higher risk roads and intersections safer
- improving transport connections (including local roads, public transport and active modes) that enable tourists to safely reach their destinations
- managing and responding to resilience risk on important regional roads (see resilience objective).

The second-stage GPS will move us further towards transport creating a New Zealand where people and businesses can thrive by:

- reflecting transport’s role in the urban development agenda
- developing local and central government agreements on transport’s role in the future development of metro areas such as Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch including consideration of transport’s role as a place-maker and on future rapid transit options
- considering all modes when providing the best access solution, which will include investigating funding for alternative transport modes, such as rail and coastal shipping.
Section 2.3.2

Access Objective: A land transport system that enables transport choice and access

86. Currently most people require a private motor vehicle to get most places in New Zealand. This high level of dependency on private motor vehicles results in high transport costs for many New Zealanders, higher greenhouse emissions and increased congestion in our larger cities.

87. Having a transport system that promotes equitable access and liveability is vital for creating safer, more attractive and more accessible urban environments. The land transport system needs to enable a range of lower cost and more space efficient transport choices so all people can easily access employment, education, recreational and social opportunities.

88. Walking and cycling and public transport are very important in supporting an efficient, sustainable and affordable transport system. Enabling more people to use active modes and public transport can also contribute to improved health outcomes as people regularly incorporate active travel into their daily life, increasing levels of physical activity.

89. The Government will investigate any regulatory barriers to the uptake and delivery of public transport, walking and cycling in New Zealand.

Result: Increased mode shift from private vehicle trips to walking, cycling and public transport in our towns and cities

90. To make it easier for more people to access employment, education and other opportunities, it is important to shift travel in urban centres from single occupant vehicles travel to walking, cycling and public transport.

91. Central and local government investment in urban areas should incentivise mode shift.

92. GPS 2018 supports:
   - transport and land use planning in urban areas that reduces the need to travel by private vehicle
   - more frequent and highly patronised public transport services
   - extending greater priority on urban routes for walking, cycling and public transport
   - better management of parking to reduce subsidies to for single occupant vehicle travel.

93. GPS 2018 supports investment in:
   - provision of good quality, safe, fit-for-purpose walking and cycling infrastructure
   - education, promotion, and where necessary regulation, to improve the real and perceived safety of cyclists and pedestrians
   - funding for maintenance of walking and cycling infrastructure
   - extending dedicated cycle networks in urban areas that are moving towards being complete, and contiguous
   - delivering critical missing links in the urban cycle network in areas of high demand [for example, between Auckland’s North Shore and City Centre, and Wellington City Centre and Lower Hutt]
   - continued development of the New Zealand Cycle Network, including the premium tourism trails [the Great Rides] and the connecting Heartland Rides
   - extending connections to the Te Araroa trail, which runs the length of New Zealand
   - projects focused on increasing the uptake of children using safe and active travel, especially to and from school.
🚀 Result: More transport choice (including for people with less or limited access to transport)

94. Transport provides access to economic and social opportunities and is key to supporting social engagement and inclusion, as well as access to essential services such as education, healthcare, and employment. Public transport plays an important role, not only in increasing the capacity of the network, but in enabling access for those people whose transport choices are limited.

GPS 2018 supports investment in:
- services that make public transport more affordable for those who are reliant on it to reach social and economic opportunities (for example, people on low-incomes or who do not have access to private transport options)
- the provision of transport that is suitable for people with disabilities in urban centres and inter-regionally
- public transport, which supports the Disability Action Plan’s intentions to increase the accessibility of transport
- continuing investment in specialised services such as ‘Total Mobility’.

GPS 2018 supports:
- continued investment in the SuperGold card transport concession scheme.

The second stage GPS will consider interventions to significantly improve the affordability of public transport, such as investigating a green transport card to reduce public transport fares for people on low incomes.

Access Objective: A land transport system that is resilient

97. When access to the transport system is disrupted, it has flow-on effects both on direct users of the network and those who receive goods and services via the transport system. These access disruptions have both social and economic impacts. A resilient transport system actively manages the risks of and vulnerabilities to disruptive events in an efficient and effective way – whether it is a sudden (usually short term) disruption like a road crash, or a longer term or slow onset disruption brought about by a natural disaster or gradual environmental changes.

Across the New Zealand government, the “4R” approach to resilience and emergency management is used, as set out in the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 (CDEM Act). The four R’s stand for reduction, readiness, response and recovery. The 4R approach reflects that there are a range of potential pre- and post-event options, and investment opportunities, for minimising the impacts of disruption to the transport system. Investment can therefore be focused in different areas, such as strengthening or modifying assets, providing alternative routes or modes or enabling a quicker response or rebuild. Often the best solutions take a whole-of-system approach for a region, for example, mixes of improvements as part of network upgrades, strengthening through maintenance and options that consider non-transport interventions.

98. In all cases, whether it is for a sudden disruption or gradual environmental change, resilience management requires an assessment of the risks compared to the costs of reducing those risks. However, it can be challenging to determine the appropriate level of investment in resilience for all unexpected disruptions, particularly those with low likelihood but high consequence. Often, taking a whole-of-system approach will create the best outcome, for example, improving a road’s ability to cope with flooding as well as fixing a stop bank, improving response times in the event of a disruption, educating the community on preparedness and creating a comprehensive post-event public communications approach. This involves considering all parts of the transport system and non-transport systems relevant to resilience (for example technology solutions to enable people to work from home, increase stores of food to reduce the need to transport food).

100. Climate change and low frequency-high impact events (such as earthquakes) are the key long term issues that have significant implications for the resilience of the land transport system.
101. The government’s response to climate change requires adaptation, through resilience improvements and land use decision making that takes climate impacts into account, as well as mitigation, through reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Actions in GPS 2018 to reduce greenhouse gas emissions are covered in the objective ‘a land transport system that increasingly minimises adverse effects on the climate, local environment and public health’.

102. Low frequency–high impact events are key, due to their potential severity and range of major impacts over a wide range of issues in communities and the economy. There are challenges in capturing and evaluating all impacts to justify investment compounded by the low level of understanding about the probability and nature of the occurrence.

**Result:** Improved network resilience for the most critical connections

103. It is important for sustainable economic development and social wellbeing that the network is resilient, particularly at the most critical points. The most critical points on our network have been determined by considering three factors:

- the route’s importance and the availability of appropriate alternative routes or modes
- the risk (likelihood and consequence) of transport disruption
- the performance of the system at each location in the face of the disruptive event.

104. GPS 2018 prioritises investment to improve resilience on routes where disruptions pose the highest economic and social costs. This also includes investments to improve resilience to gradual change (e.g. erosion and sea level rise) and high impact events of low to medium probability (e.g. earthquakes).

105. GPS 2018 supports developing and implementing regional plans [covering both proactive and reactive responses] to improve targeting of resilience risk and vulnerabilities in an integrated system-wide approach which can also better recognise interdependencies.

106. GPS 2018 supports investment for the best solutions on the most critical transport routes, for example, in regions that have only one viable route in and out. This includes recovery activities for transport routes into and across North Canterbury and for urban areas such as Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch, which are vulnerable to high impact natural events.

107. GPS 2018 will support this result through encouraging regional and local system approaches, including investment in non-transport infrastructure where this has clear transport benefits, are used to improve resilience at the economically and socially most critical points of the network.

**The second-stage GPS** will investigate enabling funding for alternative transport modes, such as rail and coastal shipping, where it would improve resilience of the transport network.
Section 2.4

Strategic Priority: Environment

Transport accounts for 18 percent of New Zealand’s greenhouse gas emissions and has been the fastest growing source of emissions since 1990. Between 1990 and 2015, transport emissions increased by 68 percent compared with 24 percent for total gross emissions across the economy. Within transport, road emissions grew by 78 percent.

Ninety percent of New Zealand’s transport emissions come from road transport, with light vehicles (cars and other vehicles under 3.5 tonnes) alone accounting for 67 percent. Collectively emissions from domestic aviation, rail and coastal shipping are 10 percent.

Compared internationally, New Zealand’s use of transport is emissions intensive. New Zealand has the ninth highest per capita transport emissions of all countries with populations over 1 million. This reflects a number of factors, with the key ones being:

- the transport fuels we use are almost entirely fossil fuels
- the light vehicles entering the fleet have a poorer fuel economy than in most other developed countries
- we are more reliant on road freight than Australia, the European Union and the United States
- public transport accounts for only 3 percent of all trips
- transport and urban planning has contributed to a high level of private car dependency by incentivising urban sprawl, prioritising the movement of vehicles, and requiring urban land for car parking.

Ensuring the land transport system enables better environmental outcomes is a key priority of GPS 2018. When we operate and improve the transport system, we create interactions between the system, people and the environment. These interactions can impose significant impacts on the environment and public health. For example, new highways can bisect communities and, if not properly designed, create noise and water pollution and can have negative impacts on biodiversity. Congestion and delays on existing roads can cause localised air pollution.

The most significant environmental challenges, and opportunities, for transport are to help achieve New Zealand’s goal as part of the Paris Agreement target of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 30 percent below 2005 levels by 2030, and to meet the Government’s commitment of setting a more ambitious emissions reduction target for 2050.

The Government will work to reduce carbon and harmful pollutant emissions from transport and improve public health outcomes by substantially increasing the use of lower emission modes, such as walking and cycling, providing frequent and affordable public transport, promoting integrated land use and transport planning, and supporting rail and sea freight. Increasing walking and cycling not only reduces emissions but also has positive public health benefits through reduced heart disease, obesity and the incidence of diabetes.

The Government will also encourage uptake of lower emission vehicles, including electric cars, buses, trains and bikes, and low-emission fuels like bio-fuel. The Government will also encourage efficient network and speed management, and participate in international negotiations to reduce the impact of international air and maritime emissions.

Environment Objective: A land transport system that reduces the adverse effects on the climate, local environment and public health

Enabling the transport sector to support better environmental outcomes involves minimising adverse effects of transport. Land transport can have significant effects on the environment. These can be immediate local effects (such as effects on the quality of air, water, soil, or the visual and acoustic environment) through to national effects (on public health) and global effects (climate change).

Minimising adverse environmental effects is an important part of land transport investment. There are a range of investment and non-investment initiatives that can be used to address the environmental effects of transport. These include:

- investment in infrastructure and services – for example, road design to mitigate run-off into waterways, measures to reduce motorised traffic volumes on suburban streets, encouragement of the uptake of electric vehicles, increased public transport (including rapid transit) services, and promotion of active modes (such as new cycleways) and shared mobility.
• investment in measures to change people’s behaviour and optimise the system’s efficiency, for example travel demand management initiatives such as road pricing and technologies to provide people with choices about how to access and move easily between modes
• standards or consent conditions set through the Resource Management Act 1991 and other environmental legislation, which direct the amount and type of environmental mitigation and monitoring needed on a project or activity basis
• other regulations, such as vehicle fuel efficiency, fuel type and composition, and emissions standards
• information provision, such as informing consumers about the fuel efficiency and operating costs of different vehicles
• procurement related measures, for example choice of materials for use in infrastructure based on whole-of-life performance.

GPS 2018 seeks an improved and more balanced integration of land uses in relation to transport modes and networks to reduce the adverse environmental effects of transport activities. This means better planning of the land transport system and land uses so that people are appropriately located closer to the places they live, work, study and play. It also means providing people with real alternatives to using cars, including convenient and safe access to public transport and safe, well maintained active transport infrastructure.

**Result: Reduce transport’s negative effects on the global climate**

Reducing the cumulative effects of transport on the environment, such as those caused by greenhouse gas emissions, needs to take a whole-of-system approach, considering all parts of the transport system and non-transport systems relevant to the environment.

Transport has an important role to play in New Zealand’s efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The Government is committed to taking decisive action on climate change and setting a more ambitious emissions reduction target for 2050. This GPS and its successors will align with decisions and recommendations for the transport sector taken by the Government to achieve this transition.

There is a range of potential greenhouse gas abatement opportunities in the transport sector. These can be classified as opportunities to:

• improve the vehicles and fuels we use, such as promoting greater uptake of low-emission and electric vehicles
• avoid inefficient use of transport, such as by encouraging shared mobility, supporting land use and transport system integration (especially in urban areas), and ensuring efficient network management and operation (including optimal travel speeds)
• shift to lower emissions modes of transport, such as public transport and active modes, and moving more freight to rail or coastal shipping.

Initial actions outside of the GPS for reducing greenhouse gas emissions in transport could include regulatory initiatives such as exploring vehicle fuel efficiency standards and the potential for a vehicle purchase feebate scheme.

GPS 2018 will support this result through encouraging:

• a whole-of-system approach to reducing greenhouse gas emissions from transport, including considering the cumulative effects over time
• investment in lower emission modes of transport or transport systems
• ongoing and clear reporting on the investment in environmental harm mitigation across GPS investment activities.

**Result: Reduce transport’s negative effects on the local environment and public health**

While greenhouse gas emissions and climate change have cumulative effects on a global scale, there is also a need to manage local effects of land transport. Some of the areas where transport has an adverse effect on the local environment and public health include:

• air pollution (especially from emissions of particulates and oxides of nitrogen)
• excessive unreasonable noise and vibration
• reduced water and soil quality [particularly from contaminated stormwater run-off and sediment during construction]
• disruption to natural landscapes, vegetation and biodiversity
• reduced physical activity and increased sedentary time.

GPS 2018 will support this result through encouraging:

• increased uptake of active modes such as walking and cycling
• integrated land use and transport planning
• regional and local system approaches that are evidence-based to increasingly mitigate the local effects of land transport on the environment
• reduced effects of transport-related air pollution, stormwater run-off and road-traffic noise on people and the environment where these issues create significant harm
• ongoing and clear reporting on the investment in environmental mitigation across GPS investment activities.

**The second stage GPS** may include input from the independent Climate Change Commission, once established, to ensure consistency with the overall emissions reduction targets and strategy.
126. GPS 2018 increases the emphasis on value for money to maximise the impact of money spent to achieve the Government’s outcomes. Value for money in transport will deliver the right infrastructure and services to the right level at the best cost. Decision makers should consider a range of options, the costs and benefits (both short and long term), and the GPS 2018 strategic direction (i.e. the strategic priorities, objectives and results).

127. They should also consider possible future changes and uncertainties so that investment can be made in options that perform best across a different scenarios.

128. In delivering value for money, investment decisions need to transparently demonstrate the:
   • return on the investment – expected benefits compared with expected cost
   • contribution towards the desired GPS results
   • reason for the decisions, especially where there is a benefit cost ratio lower than would normally be required for inclusion in the National Land Transport Programme (NLTP). Even in these cases, it is expected that the benefit cost ratio will exceed one.

129. Achieving value for money also requires investments to be made at the right time. In some cases this may require investments to be made ahead of demand, to support future developments (lead investments). For example, building a transport corridor ahead of demand while land prices are cheaper will lower the cost and could shape urban form in a way that better integrates transport and land use.

130. It is important that work to support lead investments be completed in a robust and transparent manner, and only when required by specific Government policy. In GPS 2018, lead investment will provide access to serviced land for housing development in high growth urban areas.

Section 2.5.1

Value For Money Objective: A land transport system that delivers the right infrastructure and services to the right level at the best cost

131. There are more potential transport projects than there is available revenue to fund them. To deliver value for money, the focus is on investments that provide the best possible value to New Zealanders. The investment decisions made under the GPS must follow a process that delivers value for money (while considering the Government’s priorities), allowing for changes in demand, technology and innovations.

Result: Better informed investment decision-making

Delivery of the right infrastructure and services to the right level

132. Delivering the right infrastructure and services includes responding to the investment signals in GPS 2018. The NZ Transport Agency and regional authorities need to provide high quality analysis to input into a rigorous, fit-for-purpose investment analysis system. Robust business cases that are supported by evidence and good data gathering systems are vital to support this process. Having data that is easy to find, share and use is important.

133. Delivering the right infrastructure and services requires a wide range of options to be considered. It is expected that options that improve the performance of the current network are considered alongside options for providing new infrastructure where possible.

134. It also requires monitoring and evaluation of GPS objectives and the results of investments over longer periods (10 to 20 years).

135. Monitoring of GPS objectives and results is ongoing. However, initial results indicate that:
   • since GPS 2015, there has been a much better system for determining the appropriate level of maintenance required and for monitoring maintenance investments (e.g. the Road Efficiency Group)
   • public transport use is increasing and providing increased access in the main metropolitan areas
   • the investment in road safety is not obtaining the desired results given that the road deaths is trending up
   • road improvements and improving the operation of the current network have increased the road capacity and throughput on important national routes. However, congestion levels are still worsening in Auckland.
   • demand management is expected to be part of the solution to the problems in high growth areas – particularly in Auckland.

136. The GPS will continue to support delivery of the right infrastructure and services to the right level by requiring:
   • a rigorous investment appraisal system
   • enhanced reporting, monitoring and evaluation on how the GPS 2018 investment strategy has been delivered, and reporting over longer periods of time (10 to 20 years).

1. Investment appraisal system refers to the system that the NZ Transport Agency uses to assess projects.
Investments are at the best cost

137. Investment should represent the best use of resources. This requires the investment appraisal system to include a rigorous cost benefit analysis.

138. Traditional approaches to transport economic evaluation have tended to overstate the benefits of new road capacity and understate the benefits of walking, cycling and public transport investment. An investigation into the appropriateness of current evaluation practices to reflect best evidence will be a priority to ensure they are fit for purpose in giving effect to the strategic direction section of GPS 2018.

139. Cost benefit analysis should take account of the full range of costs and benefits. Evaluation tools therefore need to transparently and robustly capture and evaluate these benefits and costs.

140. GPS 2018 will support this result by requiring transparent:
- use of robust cost benefit analysis
- delivery of projects and programmes on time and on budget
- monitoring and evaluating a wide range of outcomes (both positive and negative) for major investments.

Result: Improved returns

Improved returns from maintenance

141. The GPS increases the emphasis on improving the performance of the existing network through maintenance.

142. Maintenance expenditure supports the provision of nationally consistent levels of service within the network (primarily the road network), and also refers to expenditure for improving the performance of the existing network.

143. Nationally, there has been good progress on improving value for money from road maintenance. The One Network Road Classification has set customer levels of service for each type of road, along with relevant performance standards. The collaborative approach taken through the Road Efficiency Group has improved maintenance procurement and operation practices.

144. While there have been improvements, there is still significant scope for improved returns from road maintenance in areas such as accurately specifying the level of demand for an asset, better informed contracting, and improved whole of life investing. There is also a need to improve the One Network Road Classification in terms of its provision for walking, cycling and public transport in urban areas.

GPS 2018 continues to emphasise the need for ongoing improvements to further improve the returns from maintenance. The GPS will support this result through:
- ongoing investment in network maintenance to ensure it provides the appropriate customer levels of service for all modes of transport
- investment in maintenance that improves the performance of the existing network
- updating the One Network Road Classification to better reflect all modes of transport and liveability, fully embedding the one Network Road Classification, Customer Levels of Service, and performance measures
- continued emphasis on improving returns by focusing on known issues such as improving asset management practices, contracting, and the use of data and analytics.

Innovation and technology are used to increase the net benefits from land transport investment and use

145. Innovation and technology can support value for money by providing alternatives or better choices in the way investments are made and used. This may occur during the design of a new investment or when considering options for better using the infrastructure or service once it is in place.

146. The GPS will support this result by:
- using innovation in systems, standards, procurement and technology to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the transport system.

The second stage GPS will reflect any outcomes of the work that has been undertaken to investigate the appropriateness of current evaluation practices.

2. The GPS acknowledges that in some cases a cost benefit analysis may not be practical, and an appropriate alternative method may be used.
Section 2.6

Transitional rail funding

148. As described in the discussion of the GPS priorities and objectives, GPS 2018 supports an increased focus on public transport and reducing the reliance on single occupant vehicles. Rail has an important role to play in this. The second stage GPS will consider the funding of rail further, and will be informed by the current review of rail.

149. In the meantime, GPS 2018 can enable some beneficial passenger rail projects to progress. GPS 2018 includes a transitional rail activity class to provide scope for funding key rail projects that cannot wait for the rail review and second stage GPS.

150. While GPS 2018 makes provision for rail funding, the scope of this funding is very tight. GPS 2018 supports investment in:

- improving urban rail services for passengers accessing housing, major employment areas and major metropolitan areas, where demand is outstripping capacity, to improve reliability or to reduce conflict between freight and passenger trains
- existing and new interregional commuter rail services, including the implementation of trial interregional rail commuter services to support housing and employment opportunities.
Section 2.7

Themes

Themes have been included to assist understanding of how to effectively deliver on the priorities. The themes influence how the results should be delivered to ensure the best transport solutions for New Zealand are achieved. The themes for GPS 2018 are:

- a mode-neutral approach to transport planning and investment decisions
- incorporating technology and innovation into the design and delivery of land transport investment
- integrating land use and transport planning and delivery.

Theme: A mode neutral approach to transport planning and investment decisions

152. Modal neutrality is a guiding principle that will be applied to investment under the GPS to help deliver the outcomes that Government has set for the transport system.

153. Modal neutrality means considering all modal options, including multi-modal options, when identifying the best transport solutions to deliver transport outcomes. Investment appraisal and evaluation of those options should identify all costs and benefits without any modal bias. To allow appropriate comparison between transport modes, the second stage GPS will investigate enabling funding for alternative transport modes, such as rail and coastal shipping, where it supports the desired outcomes for the transport system.

154. Modal neutrality will also involve giving some modes greater funding priority due to past underinvestment. Mode neutrality may also reduce funding barriers for modes that are delivering outcomes the Government seeks.

155. Over time, other policies will also support mode neutrality, such as smarter road pricing that encourages users to consider more of the costs they impose.

156. A mode neutral approach will have a significant effect on how we plan, fund and use the transport network. It encourages us to look across the whole system and to consider providing a wide range of solutions, whether involving physical infrastructure or, for example, better use of transport data or new technology.

157. Over the next few years, there will be better integration, coordination and collaboration across GPS transport investments, as well as collaboration with other investors to develop the best transport solution.
**Theme: Incorporating technology and innovation into the design and delivery of the land transport investment**

158. Technology is changing many aspects of our lives – and transport is no exception. Transport technologies have the potential to respond to a number of transport challenges by significantly improving, and in some cases transforming, the way people travel, and how freight and services are moved on our network. Technology is also providing alternatives to physical travel.

159. Existing, new and emerging technologies can support the creation of a safer, more efficient and effective transport system. This can be done by having safer and more efficient vehicles, improved access to transport information, and a more connected transport system that provides new ways of managing and optimising how we use what we already have. Transport technologies and new business models have significant potential to make a positive impact on our environment – making it more liveable, sustainable and resilient.

160. We need to plan and invest to take advantage of these opportunities. This will likely involve increasing our ability to use technology to provide the public with better transport services, and provide the infrastructure and services to support electric, connected and autonomous vehicles.

161. How fast and how much transport will change depends on the costs and benefits of any new technology, people’s willingness to use it, and central and local government creating an environment to test, trial and support its deployment.

**Theme: Integrating land use and transport planning and delivery**

162. Integrating land use and transport planning and delivery is an important element in creating a transport network that benefits the wider community. Transport is an enabler, connector and shaper of urban areas.

163. Land use planning (including planning new and increased residential or commercial development, improved health or education infrastructure or regional development) has a significant impact on transport policy, infrastructure and services provision, and vice versa. Once development has happened, its impacts on transport are long term. Changes in land use can affect the demand for travel, creating both pressures and opportunities for investment in transport infrastructure and services, or for demand management. Likewise, changes in transport can affect land use.

164. It is essential that land use and transport planning and delivery are coordinated and integrated. This is largely a role for local and central government, supported by funding under GPS 2018.

165. Central government has a role in improving the visibility of planning and infrastructure intentions, facilitating engagement and enabling joint funding and decision-making.
## Section 2.8

### Mapping the strategic priorities, objectives and results

The relationship between the priorities, objectives and long term results is mapped in Table 1.

**Note:** Short to medium term results and the examples of reporting measures are indicative only and subject to further development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National land transport objectives</th>
<th>Long term results Planning direction 10+ years</th>
<th>Short to medium term results Investment priorities 3-6+ years</th>
<th>Example reporting measures Trends, tracking longer term results and reporting on progress in delivering the long, short and medium term results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Examples of reporting measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| A land transport system that is a safe system, free of death and serious injury | Significant reduction in deaths and serious injuries (1) | • Renewed strategic focus to have the greatest impact on reducing death and serious injury [including developing a new road safety strategy and action plan in the next 12-18 months] (1)  
• State highways and local roads are safer for everyone (1)  
• Cycling and walking is safer (1)  
• Effective enforcement activity to promote safe behaviour by road users (1)  
• Safer road use through appropriate education and promotion activities, and regulatory changes (1) | Examples of reporting areas may include:  
• System Safety: How many people die or are seriously injured on roads |
| Access                             | Metropolitan and high growth urban areas are better connected and accessible (1) Better access to markets, business areas, and supporting tourism (2) Sustainable economic development of regional New Zealand is supported by safer and better transport connections (3) | • A more accessible and better-integrated transport network including public transport, walking and cycling (1)  
• Improved land use and transport planning to create more liveable cities (1)  
• Improved throughput of people and goods in major metropolitan areas (1)  
• Improved transport access to new and existing housing including provision of public transport services (1)  
• Nationally important transport connections are maintained or improved to support areas of growth, changes in population, freight and tourism, and to improve safety (2) Enhanced testing and deployment of intelligent transport systems and other technologies to make the best use of existing networks (1)[2][3] Regional networks (including key regional freight routes) are safer, better connected and more resilient (2)[3]Improved transport connections (including local roads, public transport and active modes) on key regional tourist routes to make these routes safer for all (2)[3] | Examples of reporting areas may include:  
• Network throughput: How much land transport system capacity is being used  
• Network accessibility: How many people can access major areas of activity within a reasonable timeframe |
## National land transport objectives

### Long term results
**Planning direction**
10+ years

### Short to medium term results
**Investment priorities**
3-6+ years

### Example reporting measures
- Trends, tracking longer term results and reporting on progress in delivering the long, short and medium term results

## Access

**A land transport system that enables transport choice and access**
- Increased mode shift from private vehicle trips to walking, cycling and public transport in our towns and cities (1)
- More transport choice (including for people with less or limited access to transport) (2)

**Example reporting areas may include:**
- **Travel Options:** What travel options are available to users that have limited access to a private vehicle
- **Cycling:** How much of cycling infrastructure is utilised; How many children are walking and cycling to school

**A land transport system that is resilient**
- Improved network resilience for the most critical connections (1)

**Example reporting areas may include:**
- **Resilience:** Journeys affected by an unplanned event(s) on high risk routes
- **Availability:** What is the duration of time taken for network performance to resume to pre-incident levels after unplanned disruptions

## Environment

**A land transport system that reduces the adverse effects on the climate, local environment and public health**
- Reduce transport’s negative effects on the global climate (1)
- Reduce transport’s negative effects on the local environment and public health (2)

**Example reporting areas may include:**
- **Environmental Harm:** Levels of harmful air pollution (including greenhouse gas emissions) and noise in affected areas

## Value For Money

**A land transport system that delivers the right infrastructure and services to the right level at the best cost**
- Better informed investment decision-making (1)

**Example reporting areas may include:**
- **Effectiveness and efficiency of investment:** Costs and benefits of investing in the right results

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National land transport objectives</th>
<th>Long term results</th>
<th>Short to medium term results</th>
<th>Example reporting measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning direction</td>
<td>Investment priorities</td>
<td>Tracking longer term results and reporting on progress in delivering the long, short and medium term results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ years</td>
<td>3-6+ years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Access**

**A land transport system that enables transport choice and access**
- Increased mode shift from private vehicle trips to walking, cycling and public transport in our towns and cities (1)
- More transport choice (including for people with less or limited access to transport) (2)

**Example reporting areas may include:**
- **Travel Options:** What travel options are available to users that have limited access to a private vehicle
- **Cycling:** How much of cycling infrastructure is utilised; How many children are walking and cycling to school

**A land transport system that is resilient**
- Improved network resilience for the most critical connections (1)

**Example reporting areas may include:**
- **Resilience:** Journeys affected by an unplanned event(s) on high risk routes
- **Availability:** What is the duration of time taken for network performance to resume to pre-incident levels after unplanned disruptions

**Environment**

**A land transport system that reduces the adverse effects on the climate, local environment and public health**
- Reduce transport’s negative effects on the global climate (1)
- Reduce transport’s negative effects on the local environment and public health (2)

**Example reporting areas may include:**
- **Environmental Harm:** Levels of harmful air pollution (including greenhouse gas emissions) and noise in affected areas

**Value For Money**

**A land transport system that delivers the right infrastructure and services to the right level at the best cost**
- Better informed investment decision-making (1)

**Example reporting areas may include:**
- **Effectiveness and efficiency of investment:** Costs and benefits of investing in the right results
Section 2.9

Reporting

Note: This section is indicative only and subject to further development.

166. The GPS investment strategy involves three reportable components related to how the investment strategy is delivered: results achieved through GPS investment, expenditure under activity classes, and Ministerial expectations [see Section 3.4].

167. Many land transport investments have long lead times and long lives. Some of the effects from earlier land transport investments made under preceding GPSs will be captured in reporting under GPS 2018, particularly in the early periods.

168. The reporting arrangements established in GPS 2018 focus on the investment strategy and on reporting information that tracks progress and will provide GPS investment decision makers with information to help inform future GPS investments. Reporting on the performance of the NZ Transport Agency as a Crown Entity is covered by the Crown Entities Act 2004. GPS reporting may complement these arrangements but is not a substitute for them.

169. The NZ Transport Agency is required to report at least annually on progress being made in achieving the GPS 2018 short and medium term results, and GPS 2018 long term results, using the reporting measures developed with the Ministry of Transport [example reporting measures are included in Table 1].

170. The reporting measures will cover and comment on trends, and track progress. Reporting on results using these measures will form an evidence base of information on changes in land transport delivered by GPS investment.

171. It is noted that the frequency of the reporting measures will vary and some will be reported more or less frequently than annually (for example, quarterly).

172. It is a priority of GPS 2018 for the NZ Transport Agency to establish baselines for reporting. The stability of the reporting process over time will be supported by:
   • the establishment of baselines
   • use of measures that would be reasonably expected to be part of a well-functioning investment management system
   • measures that relate well to the results that are being sought from the investment.

Reporting on expenditure

173. Expenditure under GPS activity classes is reported under the requirements of the Crown Entities Act 2004 and the provisions of the Land Transport Management Act 2003. For GPS 2018, this reporting is presented by activity class reporting line.

Reporting on Ministerial expectations

174. The GPS sets of Ministerial expectations for how the NZ Transport Agency will carry out the GPS investment strategy. The NZ Transport Agency will report annually on how it is meeting these expectations.
Section 3 sets out how funding should be allocated to activity classes, and sets out the Ministerial expectations for how the NZ Transport Agency gives effect to the investment strategy.
Section 3.1

**Total funding for GPS 2018**

Funding from the National Land Transport Fund (the Fund) is allocated through the GPS to help achieve the Government’s priorities for land transport. The revenue for the Fund is projected to increase from around $3.7 billion in 2018/19 to $4.7 billion in 2027/28 based on forecast levels of fuel excise and road user charge rates. The Fund is supplemented by about $1.5 billion a year of local government transport funding in the form of a local share.

Central government revenue predominantly comes from fuel excise duties, road user charges, motor vehicle registration and licensing fees. The Government is currently considering whether an increase to fuel excise duty and road user charges will be necessary in the period covered by the GPS 2018. A charge in the order of 3 to 4 cents per litre (and equivalent for road user charges) per annum for three years is under consideration. The funding ranges in this GPS reflect the potential increase, however all decisions regarding fuel excise duty and road user charges are pending Government decisions.

Contributions from local government to activities included in GPS 2018 will supplement revenue from the Fund. Crown funding may also be made available for specific activities in addition to those directed by the GPS activity classes.

Table 2 reflects the total expenditure target (the expected level of expenditure based on projected revenue) along with the maximum and minimum for the first six years of GPS 2018. Actual expenditure will vary with actual revenue collected in the Fund.

### Table 2: National land transport programme funding ranges 2018/19 to 2027/28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18/19 $m</th>
<th>19/20 $m</th>
<th>20/21 $m</th>
<th>21/22 $m</th>
<th>22/23 $m</th>
<th>23/24 $m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure Target</strong></td>
<td>3,950</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>4,450</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,550</td>
<td>4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>4,050</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>4,650</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>3,850</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>4,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 3.2

Activity class framework

Activity classes provide signals about the balance of investment across the GPS. Funding is divided into activity classes as a means of achieving the results specified in GPS 2018. The new strategic direction will increase investment in safety, public transport, walking and cycling, regional improvements and shift investment away from state highway improvements.

GPS 2018 links results to objectives rather than activity classes. This provides greater flexibility to consider projects that may require investment across activity classes, provided the activities involved fall within the associated activity class definitions. This supports a more mode neutral approach as it enables GPS investments to be funded from more than one activity class to provide the best transport solution.

GPS 2018 allocates funding ranges to 12 activity classes. The activity classes are:

- Public transport*
- Rapid transit*
- Walking and cycling improvements*
- Local road improvements*
- Regional improvements*
- State highway improvements
- Road policing
- Road safety promotion and demand management*
- State highway maintenance
- Local road maintenance*
- Investment management*
- Transitional rail*

*Funding also comes from local government to deliver these activities. Local share is additional to the activity class funding ranges.

For each activity class, a funding range is given with an upper and lower limit for expenditure. The NZ Transport Agency is responsible for allocating funding within these ranges to specific activities, while staying within the overall expenditure target.

Activity class table

Table 3 sets out the activity classes funding ranges for 2018/19 – 2027/28. The activity class funding ranges take into account the forecast expenditure to deliver the Government priorities.

The activity class funding ranges are set to realise the strategic direction in GPS 2018 as stated above. This includes sufficient funding to cover the Government share (based on indicative timing and current financial assistance rates) for the Auckland Transport Alignment Project. Additional funding for land transport that comes from the Crown will be described in the next section once decisions around Budget 18 is decided.
Table 3: Activity classes and proposed funding ranges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Class</th>
<th>Expenditure reporting line</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public transport</td>
<td>Infrastructure operation</td>
<td>Investment in public transport infrastructure operation to maintain levels of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure improvement</td>
<td>Investment in public transport infrastructure to improve levels of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service operation</td>
<td>Investment in the operation of existing public transport system to maintain an appropriate level of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service improvement</td>
<td>Investment in new public transport services to improve levels of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid transit</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Investment in rapid transit improvements. Note: the while funding ranges show a decrease in rapid transit investment in later years the intention is to continue with more investment however the details of what and how it would be funded are not decided yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking and cycling improvements</td>
<td>Walking and cycling</td>
<td>Investment to improve the level of service for walking and cycling including promotional activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local road improvements</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Investment in improving the capacity or level of service on existing local roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Investment to create new local road assets that improve capacity or level of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional improvements</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Investment to the transport levels of service outside of major metropolitan areas, to support regional economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State highway improvements</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Investment in improving the capacity or level of service on existing state highways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Investment to create new state highway assets that improve capacity or level of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road policing</td>
<td>Road policing</td>
<td>Investment in road policing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enforcement of economic compliance [e.g. road user charges]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road safety promotion and demand management</td>
<td>Safer users</td>
<td>Investment to improve safer road user behaviour, the provision of alcohol interlocks and reimbursements related to impounded vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State highway maintenance</td>
<td>Operate</td>
<td>Investment in the operation of existing state highways to deliver an appropriate level of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain</td>
<td>Investment in the maintenance of existing state highways to deliver an appropriate level of service, excluding asset upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renew</td>
<td>Investment in renewal of existing state highways to deliver an appropriate level of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>Urgent response to transport network disruptions to restore an appropriate level of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local road maintenance</td>
<td>Operate</td>
<td>Investment in the operation of existing local roads to deliver an appropriate level of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain</td>
<td>Investment in the maintenance of existing local roads to deliver an appropriate level of service, excluding asset upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renew</td>
<td>Investment in renewal of existing local roads to deliver an appropriate level of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>Urgent response to transport network disruptions to restore an appropriate level of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment management</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Investment in the transport planning research and funding allocation management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sector Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional rail</td>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>Investment to support urban and interregional rail services that assist passengers to access major employment and housing areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**DRAFT GOVERNMENT POLICY STATEMENT ON LAND TRANSPORT: 2018/19 – 2027/28**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPS 2018 funding ranges</th>
<th>2018/19 $m</th>
<th>2019/20 $m</th>
<th>2020/21 $m</th>
<th>2021/22 $m</th>
<th>2022/23 $m</th>
<th>2023/24 $m</th>
<th>2024/25 $m</th>
<th>2025/26 $m</th>
<th>2026/27 $m</th>
<th>2027/28 $m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 3.3
Additional funding for land transport

185. The Land Transport Management Act 2003 requires the GPS, subject to the Public Finance Act 1989, to specify any additional expected funding for land transport, including any money Parliament may appropriate for that purpose.

186. Some of these Crown appropriations affect investment from the Fund, while other appropriations supplement investment. All of these funds are appropriated by Parliament and, in most cases, are spent by the NZ Transport Agency or KiwiRail acting as the Crown’s delivery agent.

187. This section will be updated with details of land transport appropriations once decisions around Budget 18 are made.

**Note:** Ministerial expectations are indicative only and are subject to further development.

The Ministerial expectations included in GPS 2018 relate to how the NZ Transport Agency leads planning, allocates funding, delivers services, and reports on results being achieved. The key elements of this cycle are summarised in the Figure 2.

Under the Land Transport Management Act 2003, Regional Transport Committees and Auckland Transport must develop Regional Land Transport Plans that are consistent with the GPS.

**Expectations**

191. Under GPS 2018, the NZ Transport Agency is expected to continue to:
- take a lead role in securing integrated planning of the transport system
- take a lead role in securing prudent activity management, particularly in road asset management and public transport
- monitor and report on investment efficiency, productivity changes, and results under the GPS
- take a lead role in advancing technology and innovation to deliver the best transport solution
- take a lead role in advancing the Auckland Transport Alignment Project’s strategic approach alongside Auckland Transport.

Figure 2: Land transport investment cycle

* Includes operational policies and processes
**Expectation: The NZ Transport Agency will take a lead role in securing integrated planning of the land transport system**

192. The Minister expects the NZ Transport Agency will:
- coordinate and integrate land transport investment to achieve the best transport solutions including:
  - a whole transport system view of investment options
  - working with planners and investors to identify key issues and any required responses
  - placing importance on consolidated and coordinated approaches; and
  - where feasible, considering non-GPS options
- work collaboratively with the sector to continuously improve models to provide better bases for adjusting levels of service
- employ network classification systems that support the adjustment of service levels (up or down) to reflect changes in current and future demand
- optimise investment in existing and new infrastructure and services to deliver ongoing value for money
- encourage coordinated operations resulting in seamless service delivery to users based on service level standards that are consistent with network use and function
- encourage consistent, good practice planning so that the interaction between transport use and land use is well managed, including contributions from new development to the costs that development imposes on the system
- work collaboratively with local authorities to ensure that transport infrastructure effectively supports urban growth and aligns with wider place making initiatives
- encourage integrated network planning that increases system efficiency and effectiveness.

**Expectation: The NZ Transport Agency will take a lead role in securing prudent activity management and operations**

193. The Minister expects the NZ Transport Agency will:
- support whole of life asset and activity management at standards appropriate to demand at the best whole of life cost
- ensure ongoing value for money including:
  - better aligning the costs of maintaining each part of the network with its use and function, with a focus on improving the productivity of areas that have higher than average costs due to different activity management practices
  - achieving productivity improvements that are at least in line with those gained in the rest of the economy
- ensure that standards and operational policies represent the value for money
- continue improvements in whole of life activity management performance by all providers, focusing particularly on those with the most scope for improvement
- support the sharing of good practice across providers.
**Expectation:** The NZ Transport Agency will monitor and report on investment efficiency, productivity changes and results under the GPS

The Minister expects the NZ Transport Agency will continue to monitor and report on, among other things:
- the GPS as a strategy in accordance with the GPS reporting section and reporting measures
- progress against each GPS expenditure reporting line from the activity classes and proposed funding ranges table in a consistent way over the life of GPS 2018
- productivity improvements made in road maintenance including:
  - an assessment of the state of New Zealand road assets from an asset management quantitative and qualitative basis
  - progress and results arising from the implementation of Road Maintenance Task Force recommendations, including the impact of the One Network Road Classification initiative
  - changes in the scope of maintenance expenditure
  - factors influencing the variance in the costs and returns to road maintenance expenditure per lane kilometre on state highways and local roads
- assessments of any significant changes to strategies, standards and guidelines that impact on expenditure from the Fund, that:
  - ensure all practical options for addressing the problem have been considered
  - ensure the benefits of the preferred option not only exceed the costs, but will also deliver the highest level of net benefit
- the extent to which information and technology are used to increase the net benefits from land transport investment in use
- the decision-making processes it has used, including reporting on:
  - ex-post reviews of major projects and programmes
  - exceptions reporting on projects including where projects proceed with high BCRs and low result alignment or low BCRs and high result alignment, covering the reasons for the exceptions and what decision was taken
  - delays and cost of scope overruns on key projects and programmes, covering the reasons for the delays and overruns, and decisions on actions taken to address these.
- the complete roll-out of the One Network Road Classification across state highways and local roads by 30 June 2021
- improving data reliability for public transport and maintenance
- publishing data and methods used to report on safety, resilience and investment in environmental mitigation.

**Expectation:** The NZ Transport Agency will take a lead role in advancing technology and innovation to deliver the best transport solution

The Minister expects the NZ Transport Agency will:
- identify, test, integrate and implement physical and digital solutions to improve the land transport system by enabling beneficial system and in-vehicle technologies to be adopted and deployed (for example, for safety, accurate positioning, real-time information and operating efficiency)
- make necessary, timely and cost-effective enhancements to information, analytical and modelling systems to manage and gain insight from the large volumes of data generated by transport technologies including vehicles and new business models
- collect, maintain and publish accurate, reliable and relevant, open (land transport) data and ensure appropriate governance of this open data
- lead development of open data protocols for land transport data.
Expectation: The NZ Transport Agency will take a lead role in advancing the Government’s priorities in Auckland

196. Under GPS 2018, the NZ Transport Agency is expected to take a lead role in advancing the Government’s priorities in Auckland, focused on ensuring that transport investment decisions shape urban form and development.

197. Consistent with the key transport challenges the Auckland Transport Alignment Project identified for Auckland for the next decade, GPS 2018 supports targeted investment:
• on major corridors to help maintain and improve access to jobs and education in Auckland, particularly in the west and south, where a lot of housing growth is likely to be concentrated
• that will address congestion on Auckland’s motorways and arterial roads, particularly between peak periods
• that will contribute to a faster rate of housing growth in Auckland, particularly in new greenfield growth areas.

198. The Government and Auckland Council have asked the Auckland Transport Alignment Project agencies to update the indicative package to account for the Government’s intention for its transport investment to shape Auckland’s urban form and development.

199. The Government expects that in time, the NZ Transport Agency will work closely with Auckland Transport to place greater weight on the following:
• accelerating the development of Auckland’s rapid transit network, particularly to unlock housing and urban development opportunities
• encouraging walking and cycling and making these active modes safer for Aucklanders
• delivering improvements in health, safety, the environment and access, including disability access
• ensuring the indicative package delivers the best possible value for money, including broader non-monetary costs and benefits.
Funding sources and management of expenditure

This section includes information about:
- funding land transport
- principles guiding the management of expenditure to revenue
- principles guiding the management of expenditure to funding expectations
- principles guiding the use of alternative funding and financing sources.
Section 4.1

Funding land transport

Primary approach

200. The primary approach to funding land transport under the Land Transport Management Act 2003 is to use hypothecated funds within a ‘modified pay-as-you-go’ approach.

- Hypothecation means that the revenue raised from the land transport system (that is, from fuel excise duties, road user charges, motor vehicle registration and licensing fees, road deaths, and the proceeds from the leasing or disposing of Crown land held for state highway purposes) is put into the Fund to be used for land transport purposes.
- A pure ‘pay-as-you-go’ system is one in which costs (cash outflows) must be met from revenue (cash inflows). The timing of revenue receipts determines the ability to make payments.
- The funding system adopted in New Zealand is best described as ‘modified pay-as-you-go’, where some flexibility has been introduced to deal with cash flow variations when there are very large projects.

201. Together, hypothecation and ‘pay-as-you-go form’ the foundation for land transport planning and funding. They define a relationship between transport network users, the Government, and wider society, which is the starting point for informed discussion about what is needed from the land transport system. The terms of the relationship are that:

- transport revenues will be used to create transport benefits
- transport revenues will be set in proportion to the funding needs of the whole transport task
- today’s funding will generally address today’s priority needs.

Alternative and additional approaches to funding land transport investment

202. In practice, the world is more complicated than this relationship allows. Issues such as who actually benefits from land transport infrastructure and services, who should pay, and over what period of time, are all open to debate. Complexity also makes it hard to accurately predict how much revenue will be available when, or the schedule by which expenditure may be incurred.

203. In addition to the Government’s primary funding sources, local government revenues make a significant contribution to funding the costs of local roads and public transport. Each of these is established through and operated in accordance with relevant legislation. The Government expects that the NZ Transport Agency and local government will explore other funding and financing options to modify cash flows or financing for timing of delivery of investments where this may be appropriate.

204. There are a variety of other funding sources that can be considered that reflect the variety of benefits and beneficiaries arising from transport investments. Other sources of funding include, for example, user charges, value capture mechanisms (such as development contributions and financial contributions from land owners, developers or businesses who receive a particular benefit from an investment), or Crown grants. At some point, it may also prove practical and desirable to introduce more precise value capture mechanisms that will recoup a share of the value that individuals gain from particular transport investments, provided the value gain can be attributed to the particular investment.

205. These may be used to complement the Fund or local government contributions to land transport investment. The Government will work with other participants in the land transport planning and funding system (for example, local government) to further develop a range of alternative funding approaches, and to encourage the use of these alternative approaches where appropriate.
Section 4.2: Principles guiding the management of expenditure to revenue

206. The NZ Transport Agency is required to match its expenditure to the target expenditure set out in GPS 2018. However, it is legally required to limit its spending to the levels of available revenue in the Fund. Because both the timing and levels of revenue and expenditure are subject to uncertainty, the Land Transport Management Act 2003 provides for an allowable variation to be set in a GPS as a way of managing any imbalances that arise. The Minister may vary the expenditure target if forecasted revenues are higher than the maximum or lower than the minimum expenditure ranges in Table 2.

207. A short term borrowing facility for cash flow management provides the specific capacity for allowable variation, where expenditure temporarily exceeds revenue. Although this borrowing facility increases the NZ Transport Agency’s flexibility, the Government expects the NZ Transport Agency to manage expenditure in a way that is fiscally neutral at the end of the 10 year period of this GPS. The specific level and conditions of allowable debt are set by the Ministers of Finance and Transport, in accordance with the principles guiding the use of alternative funding measures.

208. Where revenue exceeds expected expenditure, the GPS allows expenditure to be scaled to meet the upper end of each funding range. Surpluses can be carried forward from one financial year into the next.

209. Where it is likely that actual revenue levels will vary significantly from expenditure targets, the Ministry of Transport and the NZ Transport Agency will advise the Minister of Transport on the options for aligning expenditure and revenue.
Section 4.3: Principles guiding the management of expenditure to funding expectations

210. The NZ Transport Agency is required to manage expenditure for individual activity classes so that it falls within the upper and lower bounds of the funding range. However, situations may arise where expenditure is projected to fall below the lower band for reasons independent of revenue supply and/or otherwise outside the control of the NZ Transport Agency. Opportunity may also arise for expenditure to exceed the upper funding band, consistent with the policy intent and value for money expectations. In these circumstances, the NZ Transport Agency and the Ministry of Transport will advise the Minister of Transport of the risk or opportunity and possible responses.

Section 4.4: Principles guiding the use of alternative financing by the NZ Transport Agency

211. In addition to the primary central government and local government funding sources, it is possible to access alternative government financing through a Crown loan, or from private financing, for example through public private partnerships.

212. It may also be possible to issue infrastructure bonds. These bonds would be repaid through revenue raised from the alternative funding sources referred to above. The Government will investigate the practicality of this approach.

Process principles when considering alternative financing

213. Any alternative financing proposal will require a business case. Because adopting the proposal may foreclose other options, it must represent the best course of action for the land transport system.

214. Whether using debt or revenue measures, alternative financing proposals also have implications for the Government’s broader fiscal strategy and will need to be considered within an all-of-government context. They must be approved by Cabinet in the context of whole-of-government financing and borrowing principles.

215. Business cases for alternative financing proposals should, among other things, demonstrate:

- how the project can realise benefits early
- the willingness and extent to which co-funders commit to funding
- opportunities for value capture and/or to realising the value to communities of land use changes that can be leveraged by land transport investment.

Design principles for alternative financing

216. All proposals involve some form of trade-off between competing principles. Transparency around what is being traded-off in the design and application of alternative financing measures, and why these trade-offs are being made, is important for good decision-making and accountability. Particular tensions that should be explicitly analysed include, but may not be limited to:

- achieving economically efficient investment while preserving the intent behind the ‘modified pay-as-you-go approach’
- optimising financial efficiency in the present management of the Fund while preserving the flexibility to respond to future opportunities and risks
- adopting measures that are proportionate to the task to be performed without unreasonably curtailing the reasonable discretion of decision makers.
Appendices
Appendix 1: The land transport planning environment

Investment in the land transport network is made under the framework set out in the Land Transport Management Act 2003, which requires the following documents to be issued.

**Government Policy Statement on land transport (the GPS)**

The GPS is issued by the Minister of Transport. The GPS sets out what the Government wants land transport to achieve through investment in different types of activity (for example, roads, road policing and public transport). It must also set out how much funding will be provided and how this funding will be raised.

Each GPS is in place for a period of six years, but must set out the results that the Government wishes to achieve over a ten year period from the allocation of funding. The GPS also enables the Government to take a longer-term view of its national land transport objectives, policies and measures.

The Crown land transport investment strategy sits within the GPS and must be reviewed every three years. It must state the overall investment likely to be made in the land transport sector over a period of ten financial years.

Components such as the short to medium term results to be achieved from the allocation of funding, must look forward six years but may look forward up to ten years. In addition, the strategy’s forecast funding ranges must extend out to ten years.

**The National Land Transport Programme**

The NZ Transport Agency must develop a National Land Transport Programme every three years to give effect to the GPS. The programme sets out the specific activities that will be funded to address the transport objectives in the GPS.

**Regional Land Transport Plans**

Regional Land Transport Plans are prepared by Regional Transport Committees and, for Auckland, by Auckland Transport. They list all of the planned transport activities for a region for at least ten years and are used to prioritise applications for government funding through the NZ Transport Agency. Regional Land Transport Plans must be issued every six years and reviewed every three years. Regional Transport Committees and Auckland Transport must ensure consistency with the GPS when preparing Regional Land Transport Plans. The linkages between these different documents are set out in Figure 3.

![Figure 3: Linkages between land transport documents](image-url)
Funding for land transport investment

While the GPS provides a national picture of land transport funding, the specific detail of how funding is invested is the responsibility of the NZ Transport Agency. The NZ Transport Agency’s investment in the land transport system is implemented through the Fund. The Fund is the main central government funding source for the land transport system.

All fuel excise duties and road user charges are allocated directly to the Fund. Additionally, a portion of motor vehicle registration income and other revenue is paid into the Fund, while a small subset of activity, such as funding for the SuperGold Card free off-peak public transport scheme, is supported directly from the Government’s consolidated fund.

Regional, district and city councils, the NZ Transport Agency, the New Zealand Police (NZ Police) and other approved organisations under the Land Transport Management Act 2003, receive funding from the Fund for the land transport activities that they deliver, such as the construction and maintenance of state highways and local roads, road policing, and public transport.

Figure 4: Funding flows
Appendix 2:
GPS 2018 framework

**Purpose of the GPS**
The GPS outlines the Government’s strategy to guide land transport investment over the next ten years. It also provides guidance to decision-makers about where the Government will focus resources, consistent with the purpose of the Land Transport Management Act 2003, which is:

“To contribute to an effective, efficient, and safe land transport system in the public interest”.

Without limiting the legal interpretation of these terms, for the purpose of GPS 2018, a land transport system is:
- effective when it moves people and freight where they need to go in a timely manner
- efficient when it delivers the right infrastructure and services to the right level at the best cost
- safe when it reduces harm from land transport
- in the public interest where it supports economic, social, cultural and environmental wellbeing.

In setting out the Government’s investment strategy for land transport, the GPS identifies the national land transport objectives it wants pursued, allocates funding in ranges to different types of activities and sets out the results it expects from that investment.

---

4. Approved organisations: territorial authorities, regional councils, Auckland Transport, the Department of Conservation and the Waitangi National Trust Board.

---

**Figure 5: GPS 2018 framework**

**Strategic direction**

**Objectives & long term results**
- **National objectives:** What do we want land transport to deliver
- **Long term results:** What the Government wants to achieve from the allocation of funding from the National Land Transport Fund over at least 10 years

**Investment strategy**
- **Long term results:** Results relevant to each activity class
- **Short to medium term results:** What the Government wants to achieve from the allocation of funding over 1-3 and 3-6 years

**Activity classes:** Types of activities to which funding will be allocated
- **Funding ranges:** Funding ranges for Activity Classes and reporting metrics
- **Expectations:** How the NZ Transport Agency gives effect to the GPS

**Funding & financing**
- **Funding:** How revenue and expenditure flows should be managed
- **Financing:** The expectations about use of financing, including borrowing to manage the Fund

**Revenue for land transport**
Requirements of the GPS

The Land Transport Management Act 2003 requires the Minister of Transport to issue a GPS.

A core function of the GPS is to set out the Government’s priorities, objectives and funding available for the land transport sector. GPS 2018 describes:

- the Government’s priorities for expenditure from the Fund from the 2018/19 to the 2027/28 financial years
- how it will achieve these through the allocation of funding ranges in different activity classes (for example, the maintenance of state highways, road policing and walking and cycling)
- how much funding will be provided
- how the funding will be raised.

Under the Land Transport Management Act 2003, the GPS:
- must set out:
  - the results that the Crown wishes to achieve from the allocation of funding from the Fund over a period of at least 10 consecutive financial years (longer-term results)
  - the Crown’s land transport investment strategy
  - the Crown’s policy on borrowing for the purpose of managing the National Land Transport Programme
- may also set out national land transport objectives, policies, and measures for a period of at least 10 financial years
- must specify any additional expected funding for land transport activities, including any appropriations made by Parliament [subject to the Public Finance Act 1989].

The GPS cannot specify particular projects to be funded, or levels of funding for individual interventions. It also does not cover port, airport, maritime or aviation investment, although it may affect land transport links to port and airport facilities.

The Crown’s land transport investment strategy:
- must link the amount of revenue raised with planned levels of expenditure from the Fund
- must, for the first six financial years of the GPS and any subsequent years that the Minister considers relevant, address the following matters:
  - the short term to medium term results that the Crown wishes to achieve through the allocation of funding from the Fund
  - the activity classes to be funded from the Fund
  - likely revenue, including changes to the duties, fees, and charges paid into the Fund
  - the identification of an expenditure target for the National Land Transport Programme for each year
  - a maximum and a minimum level of expenditure for the National Land Transport Programme for each year [subject to the ability to carry forward funds from the closing balance of the Fund from one financial year to a future financial year]
  - an allowable variation between expenses and capital expenditure incurred under the National Land Transport Programme and the inflows received by the Fund
  - funding ranges for each activity class
  - the allowable reasons for varying the expenditure target when making funding allocation decisions
  - a statement of the Minister’s expectations of how the NZ Transport Agency gives effect to the GPS
  - the forecast funding ranges for each activity class for the period of four financial years following the first six financial years of the GPS
  - the overall investment likely to be made in the land transport sector over a period of ten financial years and the likely or proposed funding sources.
Appendix 3:
Scope of GPS 2018

National Land Transport Fund

GPS 2018 sets funding ranges for investment from the Fund in different activity classes. The NZ Transport Agency then allocates funding to activities to give effect to the objectives, results and expectations set out in the GPS. Some of the activity classes relate to land transport activities that are the responsibility of local government, such as local roads and public transport. These activities are jointly funded with local government.

Crown contributions

For the period to 2027/28, a number of land transport projects and activities will be funded through annual Crown appropriations rather than through the Fund.

Where the Crown contributes, it may do so in the form of grants or loans. Grant funding does not need to be repaid, whereas loans to bring forward investments do need to be repaid from future revenues to the Fund.

Any Crown contributions are recorded in the GPS 2018. Details of land transport appropriations will be added to GPS 2018 once decisions around Budget 18 are made.

Rail freight, coastal shipping and freight distribution centres

As signalled in the GPS 2018, the Government is shifting towards a mode neutral approach to transport planning and investment decisions. Over time, this will mean that the scope of the GPS is likely to expand to include aspects of rail freight and coastal shipping.

GPS 2018 includes a transitional rail activity class to provide scope for funding key passenger rail projects that cannot wait for the rail review and second stage GPS.

While GPS 2018 makes provision for rail funding, the scope of this funding is very tight. GPS 2018 supports investment in:

- improving urban rail services for passengers accessing housing, major employment areas and major metropolitan areas, where demand is outstripping capacity, to improve reliability or to reduce conflict between freight and passenger trains
- existing and new interregional commuter rail services, including the implementation of trial interregional rail commuter services to support housing and employment opportunities.

Investment in rail freight services and infrastructure is managed by KiwiRail under the State-Owned Enterprises Act 1986. Investment in urban passenger rail services that is contracted by local government, and uses revenue from the Fund and local rates, is covered under GPS 2018.

Coastal shipping services, ports and airports are considered when planning for land transport services that link to these facilities, but operate on a commercial basis without funding from the Fund. The GPS does not authorise the use of Fund revenue for these activities.

Nevertheless, we expect the NZ Transport Agency, KiwiRail and local authorities involved in land transport investment, to coordinate their activities where possible. GPS 2018 recognises the importance of the coordinated approach needed by KiwiRail and the NZ Transport Agency to achieve the Government’s objectives.

Land use planning

The relationship between land use planning and transport planning is established by the Resource Management Act 1991 and the Land Transport Management Act 2003 respectively. Transport planning determines what investment will be undertaken and is dealt with under the Land Transport Management Act 2003 (for example, whether a bypass is proposed and whether it is built). Land use planning regulates how investment can be undertaken, and is dealt with by the Resource Management Act 1991 (for example, whether the alignment of a future bypass is safeguarded from other development and how the local effects of the bypass are mitigated when the bypass is built).

The GPS directs transport planning and informs land use planning processes. For instance, transport planning can identify network hierarchy that maximises the productivity of a transport system in line with the GPS, but is reliant on land use planning to secure development controls on adjacent land in a way that is consistent with that network hierarchy. The statement of priorities, objectives and results in the GPS enables well informed decision making in each area, while respecting the difference between regulatory and investment planning processes.

Regulation

The development and design of land transport regulation is outside the scope of the GPS. Transport regulation includes Acts of Parliament (for example, the Transport Act 1998), transport regulations (for example, Heavy Motor Vehicle Regulations 1974), and transport rules (for example, bridge weight limits). Land transport regulation is undertaken by a range of public bodies, including the NZ Transport Agency, local authorities and the NZ Police.

GPS 2018 includes a focus on the better understanding of the funding implications of regulatory policy, particularly in the fields of safety and environmental regulation.

A future GPS could include transport regulation within the scope of its objectives, policies and measures. Decisions to further investigate these issues lie outside this GPS and may require legislative change.
Technology and innovation

Over the coming decade, technology will play an increasing part in managing network access and capacity. So far, relatively small scale initiatives, such as improved traffic light phasing and ramp metering, have led to measurable improvements in traffic flows in the Auckland network. Other initiatives, such as integrated ticketing, the greater use of satellite positioning systems and smart phones are improving the availability of real time travel information.

This greatly supports new travel demand management initiatives. Securing these and other productivity improvements that can be achieved through cost effective investment in existing technologies is within the scope of the current GPS. This includes a wide spectrum of systems, from the more extensive use of electronic payment methods and asset management practices that increase the productivity of existing networks, through to technologies such as LED lighting that can reduce operating costs.

The regulation of potential in-vehicle technologies that interact with fixed infrastructure is currently outside the scope of the GPS. However investment in infrastructure (physical and digital) to support in-vehicle and connected vehicle technologies is within the scope of the GPS. There are promising developments in the fields of collision avoidance technology, autonomous vehicles and in-vehicle telematics, which will affect the efficient management of vehicles and networks. For example, lane control technology and automatic braking systems are increasingly common in new vehicles and could enable significantly reduced separation distances between vehicles, thereby improving traffic flows and increasing network productivity.

Improved communication between vehicles and between vehicles and infrastructure (variously known as connected vehicles or cooperative intelligent transport systems) also has significant potential to improve traffic flow and safety.

GPS 2018 provides for trials of innovation and technology investment across the GPS and the associated net benefits, but does not endorse any specific form of technology in view of the speed of evolution.
Appendix 4: Summary of key policy direction documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport Alignment Project (ATAP)</td>
<td>In Auckland, the ATAP process builds consensus between Government and Auckland Council on a strategic approach to transport investment in Auckland that addresses the region’s challenges. Through ATAP, an indicative investment package is developed to illustrate the strategic approach. An update to the indicative package is currently underway taking into account Auckland’s challenges and the shared Government and Auckland Council objectives. The ATAP work sets a strong direction for Auckland and GPS 2018 supports its direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Economic Development (RED)</td>
<td>Regional development and resilience are critical to the success of New Zealand as a whole. That is why the Government is committed to supporting productive, sustainable and inclusive growth in regional New Zealand through the recently established Provincial Growth Fund. This Fund seeks to support regions through investment in infrastructure, employment opportunities, and other proposals that lift capability and productivity potential of the regions. Although all regions will be eligible, key regions that will experience concentrated effort in the first instance are Tai Tokerau/Northland, Bay of Plenty, East Coast, Hawke’s Bay, Manawatū-Whanganui, and the West Coast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF)</td>
<td>The HIF is intended to bring forward in time local authority three-waters [water, wastewater and stormwater] and transport infrastructure necessary to increase the supply of housing in high-growth areas including Auckland, Hamilton/Waikato, Tauranga, and Queenstown. Transport infrastructure provided through the NZ Transport Agency is also eligible for funding, provided that such infrastructure is required to unlock new housing areas and the relevant local authorities have specifically identified the NZ Transport Agency projects to be included in their applications to the fund. The fund allocates approximately $1 billion of funding, with financial contingency, for capital works. The HIF is a one-off fund (one round of applications only) and applications to it are now closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016 (NPS-UDC)</td>
<td>National policy statements are issued by the government to provide direction to local government about matters of national significance which contribute to meeting the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991. The NPS-UDC 2016 recognises the national significance of: • urban environments and the need to enable such environments to develop and change • providing sufficient development capacity to meet the needs of people and communities and future generations in urban environments. The NPS-UDC directs local authorities to provide sufficient development capacity in their resource management plans, supported by infrastructure [including transport infrastructure], to meet demand for housing and business space. Development capacity refers to the amount of development allowed by zoning and regulations in plans that is supported by infrastructure. This development can be ‘outwards’ [on greenfield sites] and/or ‘upwards’ [by intensifying existing urban environments]. Sufficient development capacity is necessary for urban land and development markets to function efficiently to meet community needs. In well-functioning markets the supply of land, housing and business space matches demand at efficient [more affordable] prices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Energy Efficiency and Conservation Strategy (NZEECS) 2017–2022</td>
<td>NZEECS contributes to the delivery of the Government’s energy priorities set out in the New Zealand Energy Strategy. The NZEECS sets five year targets and objectives to provide consistency and certainty for investment. In terms of transport, the priority area is for “efficient and low emissions transport.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 National Infrastructure Plan</td>
<td>The 2015 National Infrastructure Plan sets the vision that by 2045 New Zealand’s infrastructure is resilient and coordinated, and contributes to economic growth and increased quality of life. The plan provides the framework for infrastructure development over the next 30 years and is focused on ensuring better use of existing infrastructure and allocating new investment to meet long term needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Health Strategy: Future Direction 2018 and New Zealand Health Strategy: Roadmap of actions 2016</td>
<td>The New Zealand Health Strategy has two parts. Both parts of the Strategy together comprise the ‘New Zealand Health Strategy’. • Future Direction – this sets high level direction for New Zealand’s health system from 2016 – 2026, “All New Zealanders live well, stay well, get well, in a system that is people-powered, provides services closer to home, is designed for value and high performance, and works as one team in a smart system.” • Roadmap of Actions 2016 – the New Zealand Public Health and Disability Act 2000 Section 8(1) requires the Minister of Health to ‘determine a strategy for health services, called the New Zealand Health Strategy, to provide the framework for the Government’s overall direction of the health sector in improving the health of people and communities.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Transport Operating Model</strong></td>
<td>The Public Transport Operating Model sets the operating environment for the delivery of public transport. It is a fully contracted model with features designed to incentivise commercial behaviour, create efficient networks, encourage a partnership approach to growing use, and reduce the level of public subsidy. Under this model, public transport contracts will be awarded through a mix of direct negotiations and tendering. The legislative elements of the model are set out in Part 5 of the Land Transport Management Act 2003. The operational elements are in the NZ Transport Agency’s Procurement Manual and Guidelines for preparing Regional Public Transport Plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong><a href="http://www.transport.govt.nz">www.transport.govt.nz</a></strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tourism Strategy</strong></td>
<td>The Tourism Strategy supports the tourism sector to reap the benefits of growth in visitor numbers while managing the pressures this places on businesses, communities and infrastructure. It is designed to help the sector attract high value visitors and investment, not only to tourist hotspots during peak seasons, but also to a range of regions and throughout the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong><a href="http://www.mbie.govt.nz">www.mbie.govt.nz</a></strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong><a href="http://www.transport.govt.nz">www.transport.govt.nz</a></strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Zealand Disability Strategy</strong></td>
<td>The New Zealand Disability Strategy guides the work of government agencies on disability issues from 2016 to 2026. The Strategy’s vision is New Zealand is a non-disabling society. It sets out eight outcome areas with goals and aspirations including Outcome 5: accessibility – we access all places, services and information with ease and dignity. Universal design is an approach used to implement the strategy, where accessibility for everyone is designed for at the beginning, rather than retrofitting for accessibility later. The Strategy is carried out through the existing Disability Action Plan which will be updated in 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong><a href="http://www.odi.govt.nz">www.odi.govt.nz</a></strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Glossary

**Activity**
Defined in the Land Transport Management Act 2003 as a land transport output or capital project, or both.

**Activity Class**
Refers to a grouping of similar activities.

**Active modes**
Transport by walking, cycling or other methods, which involve the direct application of kinetic energy by the person travelling.

**Approved organisations**
Organisations eligible to receive funding from the NZ Transport Agency for land transport activities. Approved organisations as defined in the Land Transport Management Act 2003.

**Capacity of network**
The amount of movement of people and/or goods that the network can support at a given time.

**Demand management**
Demand management refers to interventions which change the demand for transport. These interventions may seek to influence, how, when and where people travel and freight is transported. The purpose of demand management is to ensure the transport system is utilised efficiently and effectively, and to reduce the negative impacts of travel and freight movement.

**Fuel Excise Duty (FED)**
Fuel Excise Duty is a tax imposed by the Government on fuel and is used to fund land transport activities.

**Hypothecation**
The direct allocation of all income from a tax or charge (e.g. fuel excise duty or road user charges) to a particular type of activity, e.g. the National Land Transport Fund.

**Land Transport Management Act 2003**
The main Act governing the land transport planning and funding system.

**Land transport revenue**
Revenue paid into the Fund under the Land Transport Management Act 2003.

**Local road**
Defined in the Land Transport Management Act 2003 as a road (other than a state highway) in a district that is under the control of a territorial authority.

**Maintenance**
Maintaining a road so that it can deliver a defined level of service, while leaving the fundamental structure of the existing road intact.

**Major metropolitan areas**
The following urban areas, as defined by Statistics New Zealand in Classification-Urban Area 2013 v2.0, which have significant areas with employment densities greater than 100 jobs per square kilometre:
- Northern Auckland Zone
- Southern Auckland Zone
- Porirua Zone
- Wellington Zone
- Western Auckland Zone
- Hamilton Zone
- Upper Hutt Zone
- Christchurch
- Central Auckland Zone
- Tauranga
- Lower Hutt Zone
- Dunedin

**Rapid transit**
Public transport capable of moving a large number of people. Common characteristics of rapid transit include frequent services, fast loading and unloading capability and largely dedicated or exclusive right-of-way routes.

**Mode neutral**
Considering all modal options, appraising them in a neutral way, increasing funding for some modes to reflect past imbalances, and making costs more transparent to users to influence their decision making.

**Motor vehicle registration and licensing fees**
The Register established under the Transport (Vehicle and Driver Registration and Licensing) Act 1986, which is continued under Part 17 of the Land Transport Act 1998. It records the details of vehicles that are registered to operate on the road. Motor vehicle registration and licensing fees are defined as land transport revenue.

**Ministry of Transport**
The Government’s principal transport policy adviser that leads and generates policy, and helps to set the vision and strategic direction for the future of transport in New Zealand.

**National Land Transport Fund (the Fund)**
The set of resources, including land transport revenue, that are available for land transport activities under the National Land Transport Programme.

**National Land Transport Programme**
A programme, prepared by the NZ Transport Agency, that sets out the land transport activities which are likely to receive funding from the Fund. The National Land Transport Programme is a three-yearly programme of investment in land transport infrastructure and services from the National Land Transport Fund.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>New Zealand Transport Agency (the NZ Transport Agency)</strong></th>
<th>The Government agency with statutory functions to manage the funding of the land transport system and manage the state highway system.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public transport</strong></td>
<td>Passenger transport infrastructure and services contracted by local and central government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Land Transport Plans</strong></td>
<td>Plans prepared by Regional Transport Committees, that set out each region’s transport objectives and policies for a period of at least 10 years. This includes bids for funding from the National Land Transport Programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Transport Committee</strong></td>
<td>A transport committee, which must be established by every regional council or unitary authority for its region. The main function of a regional transport committee is to prepare a Regional Land Transport Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Road controlling authorities</strong></td>
<td>Authorities and agencies that have control of the roads, including the NZ Transport Agency, territorial authorities, Auckland Transport, the Waitangi Trust and the Department of Conservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Road user charges (RUC)</strong></td>
<td>Charges on diesel and heavy vehicles paid to the Government and used to fund land transport activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State highways</strong></td>
<td>A road operated by the NZ Transport Agency, as defined under the Land Transport Management Act 2003.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Mobility Scheme</strong></td>
<td>Subsidised taxi services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6:
Relevant sections of the Land Transport Management Act 2003

Please note that:
- these sections are excerpts rather than complete replications of the Act
- amendments may be made to the Land Transport Management Act 2003 during the course of the GPS 2018 that may affect these sections

Relevant sections
Section 3. Purpose
The purpose of this Act is to contribute to an effective, efficient, and safe land transport system in the public interest.

Section 66. Minister must issue GPS on land transport
1. The Minister must issue a GPS on land transport —
   a. before the start of the first financial year to which it applies; and
   b. that covers a period of six financial years.
2. The Minister must issue a replacement GPS on land transport under subsection [1] before the current GPS on land transport expires.
3. If a GPS on land transport that is issued under subsection [1] is replaced, the GPS on land transport that is replaced expires on the date that it is replaced.

Section 67. Preparation or review of GPS on land transport
1. When preparing or reviewing a GPS on land transport, the Minister must —
   a. be satisfied that the GPS on land transport contributes to the purpose of this Act; and
   b. take into account —
      i. any national energy efficiency and conservation strategy; and
      ii. any relevant national policy statement that is in force under the Resource Management Act 1991; and
   c. have regard to the views of Local Government New Zealand and representative groups of land transport users and providers.
2. For the purposes of subsection [1], the Minister must, at least once in every period of three financial years, review the Crown’s land transport investment strategy required under section 68(1) [b].
4. Before issuing a GPS on land transport, the Minister must consult the NZ Transport Agency about the proposed GPS on land transport.
Section 68. Content of GPS on land transport

1. The GPS on land transport must include —
   a. the results that the Crown wishes to achieve from the allocation of funding from the Fund over a period of at least 10 consecutive financial years; and
   b. the Crown’s land transport investment strategy; and
   c. the Crown’s policy on borrowing for the purpose of managing the National Land Transport Programme.

2. The Crown’s land transport investment strategy—
   a. must link the amount of revenue raised from road users with the planned levels of expenditure from the Fund; and
   b. must, for the first six financial years of the GPS on land transport and any subsequent years that the Minister considers relevant, address the following matters:
      i. the short-term to medium-term results that the Crown wishes to achieve through the allocation of funding from the Fund:
      ii. the activity classes to be funded from the Fund:
      iii. likely revenue, including changes to the duties, fees, and charges paid into the Fund:
      iv. the identification of an expenditure target for the National Land Transport Programme for each year:
      v. a maximum and a minimum level of expenditure for the National Land Transport Programme for each year (subject to the ability to carry forward funds from the closing balance of the Fund for a financial year to a future financial year):
      vi. an allowable variation between expenses and capital expenditure incurred under the National Land Transport Programme and the inflows received by the national land transport fund:
      vii. funding ranges for each activity class:
      viii. the allowable reasons for varying the expenditure target identified under subparagraph (ii) when making funding allocation decisions:
      ix. a statement of the Minister’s expectations of how the NZ Transport Agency gives effect to the GPS on land transport; and
   c. must specify the forecast funding ranges for each activity class for the period of four financial years following the first six financial years of the GPS on land transport; and
   d. must state the overall investment likely to be made in the land transport sector over a period of 10 financial years and the likely or proposed funding sources.

3. The GPS on land transport -
   a. may set out national land transport objectives, policies, and measures for a period of at least 10 financial years beginning on the date that the GPS on land transport is issued; and
   b. must, subject to the Public Finance Act 1989, specify any additional expected funding for land transport activities, including [but not limited to] any money that Parliament may appropriate for the purpose.
Section 69. Status of GPS on land transport

To avoid doubt, a GPS on land transport is not—

a. a direction for the purposes of Part 3 of the Crown Entities Act 2004; or
b. a legislative instrument for the purposes of the Legislation Act 2012; or
c. a disallowable instrument for the purposes of the Legislation Act 2012.

Section 70. Agency to give effect to GPS on land transport in respect of funding of land transport system

1. The NZ Transport Agency must give effect to the GPS on land transport when performing its functions under subpart 1 of Part 2 in respect of land transport planning and funding.

2. To avoid doubt, the GPS on land transport may not impose an obligation on the NZ Transport Agency to approve or decline funding for a particular activity or any combination of activities under section 20.

Section 71. Availability of GPS on land transport

As soon as practicable after issuing a GPS on land transport, the Minister must—

a. present a copy of the GPS on land transport to the House of Representatives; and
b. arrange for a copy of the GPS on land transport to be given to each of the following:
   i. the Secretary
   ii. the Agency
   iii. the Commissioner
   iv. every approved organisation
   v. the Auckland Council; and

c. make a copy of the GPS on land transport publicly available in accordance with section 108.
**Other relevant sections**

**Section 11. Annual report on National Land Transport Fund**

1. After the end of each financial year, the NZ Transport Agency must prepare an annual report on the Fund.

2. The annual report required under subsection [1] must be prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting practice, and must include:
   
   - an explanation of how the funding of activities or combinations of activities under the National Land Transport Programme has contributed to the achievement of any outcomes, objectives or impacts set out in the relevant GPS on land transport.

3. The provisions of the Crown Entities Act 2004 in respect of the preparation, audit, presentation, and publication of a Crown entity’s annual report (including its financial statements) apply, with all necessary modifications, to the annual report required under subsection [1].

**Section 14. Core requirements of regional land transport plans**

4. Before a regional transport committee submits a regional land transport plan to a regional council or Auckland Transport (as the case may be) for approval, the regional transport committee must:
   
   - be satisfied that the regional land transport plan -
     - is consistent with the GPS on land transport;

**Section 19E. Variation of national land transport programme.**

3. If the GPS on land transport is amended under section 90(1), the NZ Transport Agency must vary the National Land Transport Programme as soon as practicable if necessary to give effect to the amendment.

**Section 20. Approval of activities and combinations of activities**

2. In approving a proposed activity or combination of activities, the Agency must be satisfied that:
   
   - the activity or combination of activities is -
     - consistent with the GPS on land transport;

5. When approving an activity or combination of activities as qualifying for payments from the Fund, the NZ Transport Agency must be satisfied that the expenditure on the National Land Transport Programme and any expenses associated with any borrowing undertaken in accordance with section 10(1)(b) in the relevant financial year will not exceed the lesser of:
   
   - the maximum level of expenditure for the National Land Transport Programme outlined in the GPS on land transport for that financial year and the actual or anticipated amount of the closing balance of the Fund at the end of the previous financial year; or
   
   - the sum of:
     - the anticipated inflows to the Fund in that financial year; and
     - the actual or anticipated amount of the closing balance of the Fund at the end of the previous financial year; and
     - the allowable variation for that financial year specified in the GPS on land transport.
Please use this page to jot down your thoughts.
Then go online and submit your comments to www.transport.govt.nz/GPS2018.
Disclaimer: all reasonable endeavours are made to ensure the accuracy of the information in this document. However, the information is provided without warranties of any kind including accuracy, completeness, timeliness or fitness for any particular purpose.

The Ministry of Transport excludes liability for any loss, damage or expense, direct or indirect, and however caused, whether through negligence or otherwise, resulting from any person’s or organisation’s use of, or reliance on, the information provided in this document.

Under the terms of the New Zealand Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 [BY] licence, this document, and the information contained within it, can be copied, distributed, adapted and otherwise used provided that –

• the Ministry of Transport is attributed as the source of the material
• the material is not misrepresented or distorted through selective use of the material
• images contained in the material are not copied.

The terms of the Ministry’s Copyright and disclaimer apply, available at: www.transport.govt.nz
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 This report seeks approval and adoption of a Register of Interests Policy relating to the elected members to complement the Register of Interests for Elected Members of the Council.

1.2 This Policy currently relates directly to Councillors. It is proposed that disclose is voluntary for Community Board members until the end of the current term when full implementation is proposed for all elected members from October 2019.

**Attachments:**

i. Report to Council June 2017 – Register of Interests for Elected Members (Trim 170423039527).

ii. Extract of Minutes of Council June 2017 (Trim 180419043079)

iii. Extract examples of various Register of Members Interests (Trim 170530054726).

iv. Proposed style of Register (Trim 180419043077).

v. Draft Policy (Trim 180419043038).

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180419042965.

(b) **Adopts** the Register of Interests Policy 2018 (Trim 180419043038).

(c) **Notes** a Register of Interests will be listed in the Council agenda of June 2018, and on the Council website. The Register will be re-published in subsequent agendas and web page when an amendment has been notified and recorded. The Register can be subsequently reviewed each December as a matter of best practice.

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

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

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 Elected members of the Council are required to operate in a transparent and unbiased manner, and it is important to be seen to be operating in this manner by the community. The Auditor-General states elected member decision-making should be guided by the
principles of integrity, honesty, transparency, openness, independence, good faith and service to the public.

3.2. The Council, Standing Committees and Community Boards, at the beginning of each meeting, ask for any conflicts of interest to be declared and this is duly recorded in the meeting minutes. However with issues around conflicts of interest, it is believed to be prudent to have a more formal disclosure of members’ interests where pecuniary (financial) interest may arise. The register is not designed to be a ‘register of wealth’ but only record fact of a personal financial interest in matters that intersect with the Council business.

3.3. The Code of Conduct describes conflicts of interests in general terms using the Office of the Auditor General’s Good Practice Guide. Local Government NZ, the Auditor General and Deloitte’s recommended that the Council should establish a Register of Members’ Interests. The Council subsequently adopted a Register in June 2017, however the accompanying Policy was required to activate the process. Staff now present that policy for consideration.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1. A conflict of interest, in any matter before the Council, must be declared to the meeting, recorded in the minutes and members refrain from discussing or voting on the matter, as is this Council’s present practice. The Local Authorities (Members’ Interests Act 1968) applies to the pecuniary interests of members of local authorities, and the Auditor-General recommends that the same procedure be followed for non-pecuniary interests.

4.2. It is recommended by the Auditor-General that the Council have a Register of Members Interests to help ensure that any conflicts of interest (both pecuniary and non-pecuniary) that arise are identified and managed before they cause issues. Such a disclosure signals openness, transparency and reduces the potential for false allegations of improper behaviour.

4.3. In the Auditor-General’s Best Practice Guide a conflict of interest is defined as “where a member’s or official’s duties or responsibilities to a public entity could be affected by some other interest or duty that the member or official may have”.

4.4. A pecuniary interest is not defined in the Act but the recommended test to use is: Whether, if the matter were dealt with in a particular way, discussing or voting on that matter could reasonably give rise to an expectation or a gain or loss of money for the member concerned. Would a reasonable, informed observer think that your impartiality might have been affected?

4.5. The Interests Register would also apply to any business activities/contracts with the Council undertaken by the spouses or partners or immediate family (including children/siblings), of any elected or externally appointed members.

4.6. While the Council has adopted to establish a register of interests, whether a member wishes to make a declaration, and the extent of such a declaration, is a matter for each member. The Council cannot require a member to make a disclosure.

4.7. It should be noted that declarations associated with an election fall outside the intention of the Interests’ Register and are subject to the Local Electoral Act 2001.

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

Groups and Organisations

5.1. No groups or organisations have been consulted.

Wider Community

5.2. The wider community has not been consulted.

6. **IMPLIEDATIONS AND RISKS**

Financial Implications

6.1. Under section 3 (Disqualifying contracts between local authorities and their members) of ‘the Act’, no person shall be capable of being elected as or appointed to be or of being a member of a local authority or of any committee of a local authority, if the total of all payments made or to be made by or on behalf of the local authority in respect of all contracts made by it in which that person is concerned or interested exceeds $25,000 in any financial year. This is applicable unless approval from the Auditor-General is obtained (section 3,(3)).

6.2. Any elected member that commits an offence under ‘the Act’ is liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding $200.

6.3. No cost is associated with maintaining a Register of Members Interests, which would be maintained by the Governance Manager.

Community Implications

6.4. Perceived conflict of interest of undemocratic and appropriate best practices being upheld and loss of confidence from the community if a breach occurs.

Risk Management

6.5. By having a Register of Interests, and reviewing at least annually, elected members are aware of their responsibilities and minimal risk to the organisation due to best practices and appropriate declarations. All Council, Committee and Community Board agendas will continue to list “conflicts of interest” for recording at each decision meeting.

Health and Safety

6.6. Not applicable.

7. **CONTEXT**

Policy

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

Legislation

7.2. Local Authorities (Members’ Interests Act 1968)

7.2.1. ensuring that members are not affected by personal motives when they participate in decisions of their local authority, and
7.2.2. preventing members, in contracting situations, from using their position to obtain preferential treatment from the authority.

7.2.3. controls the making of contracts worth more than $25,000 in a financial year between members and their authority, and

7.2.4. prohibits members from participating in matters before the authority in which they have a pecuniary interest, other than an interest in common with the public.

7.3. Local Government Act 2002


Community Outcomes

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

• The Council makes information about its plans and activities readily available.
• The Council takes account of the views across the community including mana whenua.
• The Council makes known its views on significant proposals by others affecting the District’s wellbeing.
• Opportunities for collaboration and partnerships are actively pursued.

Delegations

7.6. The Council has the authority to approve or amend any Policy at any time.

Sarah Nichols
Governance Manager
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to consider the adoption of a Register of Members’ Interests where the Mayor and Councillors declare a personal involvement or interest in properties, businesses, organisations and appointments, which may be seen to affect their ability to perform their role as an Elected Member.

1.2. The register would also extend to spouse/partner and close family member.

1.3. The Code of Conduct describes conflicts of interests in general terms using the Office of the Auditor General’s Good Practice Guide. The Auditor General has recommended that the Council should establish a Register of Members’ Interests. A business practice review undertaken by Deloitte in June 2016 also identified the need for an Interests Register for elected members.

Attachments:

i. Extract examples of various Register of Members Interests (Trim 170530054726).

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 170423039527.
(b) Adopts a Register of Elected Members’ Conflicts and Interests for the balance of 2016-19 electoral term.
(c) Notes the Register of Members’ Interests will be formally reviewed each June and will be published on the Council’s website, being updated regularly as changes are notified.
(d) Notes senior staff (Level 2 up), will be asked to declare any pecuniary and non-pecuniary or perceived conflicts of interests which will be maintained by the Council’s Privacy Officer in a separate Senior Staff Register.
(e) Notes a policy will be formalised to accompany the Register, and be presented to the Council in July.
(f) Recommends Community Board elected members be included in the Register of Members Interests for consistency and community transparency.
(g) Circulates a copy of this report to the Community Boards.
3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. Elected members of the Council are required to operate in a transparent and unbiased manner, and it is important to be seen to be operating in this manner by the community. The Auditor-General states elected member decision-making should be guided by the principles of integrity, honesty, transparency, openness, independence, good faith and service to the public.

3.2. The Council, Standing Committees and Community Boards, at the beginning of each meeting, ask for any conflicts of interest to be declared and this is duly recorded in the meeting minutes. However with issues around conflicts of interest, it is believed it may be prudent to have a more formal disclosure of members’ interests where pecuniary (financial) interest may arise. The register is not designed to be a ‘register of wealth’ but only record fact of a personal financial interest in matters that intersect with the Council business.

3.3. A conflict of interest, in any matter before the Council, must be declared to the meeting, recorded in the minutes and members refrain from discussing or voting on the matter, as is this Council’s present practice. The Local Authorities (Members' Interests Act 1968) applies to the pecuniary interests of members of local authorities, and the Auditor-General recommends that the same procedure be followed for non-pecuniary interests.

3.4. It is recommended by the Auditor-General that the Council have a Register of Members Interests to help ensure that any conflicts of interest (both pecuniary and non-pecuniary) that arise are identified and managed before they cause issues. Such a disclosure minimizes any temptation for a member to use their office for personal pecuniary benefit and also reduces the potential for false allegations of improper behavior.

3.5. In the Auditor-General’s Best Practice Guide a conflict of interest is defined as “where a member’s or official’s duties or responsibilities to a public entity could be affected by some other interest or duty that the member or official may have”.

3.6. A pecuniary interest is not defined in the Act but the recommended test to use is: Whether, if the matter were dealt with in a particular way, discussing or voting on that matter could reasonably give rise to an expectation or a gain or loss of money for the member concerned. **Would a reasonable, informed observer think that your impartiality might have been affected?**

3.7. Members of Parliament are required to submit a return each year since August 2005. Prior to this time it was a requirement only for Ministers of the Crown. Both the Officer of the Auditor General and Local Government best practice recommends the Council hold such a register for all its elected members.

3.8. The Interests Register would also apply to any business activities/contracts with the Council undertaken by the spouses or partners or immediate family (including children/siblings), of any elected or externally appointed members.

3.9. There is a current Disclosure of Interest Policy for staff and a similar associated policy would be drafted for the Council’s consideration in July, which would define what interests members would declare.

3.10. Some of the interests which members could declare include:

3.10.1. Interests in land (address or legal description)
3.10.2. Investments in partnerships, joint ventures or other business
3.10.3. Shares in companies
3.10.4. Occupation, Employers name, Employment status
3.10.5. Appointments held
3.10.6. Memberships
3.11. A number of New Zealand Councils handle their Members Interests Register in different ways. Some publish this listing at the front of the main Council agenda each month, others publish the register in the agenda of the Audit and Risk Committee or review each financial year, while some Councils publish it on the website and update regularly as changes are notified. (refer to attachments).

3.12. Should the Council adopt a Register, it could be formally reviewed at the end of each financial year at a Council meeting. Amendments to a declaration can be notified throughout the year. The Register would be maintained by the Governance Manager.

3.13. While the Council may adopt to establish a register of interests, whether a member wishes to make a declaration, and the extent of such a declaration, is a matter for each member. The Council cannot require a member to make a disclosure.

3.14. The register would be a public document therefore be listed on the Council website.

3.15. It should be noted that declarations associated with an election fall outside the intention of the Interests’ Register and are subject to the Local Electoral Act 2001.

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

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Not sought.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. No cost is associated with maintaining a Register of Members Interests, and it is recommended by the Office of the Auditor General that such a register exists. The Register would be maintained by the Governance Manager.

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

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Local Authorities (Members’ Interests Act 1968)

6.1.1. ensuring that members are not affected by personal motives when they participate in decisions of their local authority, and

6.1.2. preventing members, in contracting situations, from using their position to obtain preferential treatment from the authority.

6.1.3. controls the making of contracts worth more than $25,000 in a financial year between members and their authority, and

6.1.4. prohibits members from participating in matters before the authority in which they have a pecuniary interest, other than an interest in common with the public.

6.2. Local Government Act 2002


Sarah Nichols
Governance Manager
Mayor Richard Kempthorne (last updated February 2017)
- Family Trust owns 11 Hillplough Heights, Richmond
- Forestry block, Aniseed Valley Road, Richmond
- Estate property Eves Valley, RD 1, Brightwater
- Chairman, Tasman Regional Sports Trust
- Local Government representative, Land and Water Forum
- Co-Chair, Nelson Tasman Youth Strategies Forum
- Ex-officio Trustee, Cawthron Institute Trust Board
- Chair, Zone 5 LGNZ
- Chair, South Island Strategic Alliance
- Member, LGNZ National Council

Deputy Mayor Tim King (last updated February 2017)
- Partner, T B & J G King Farm Partnership
- Trustee, Pinegrove Trust
- Lessee with Council, for land at Eves Valley around the Council landfill
- Member, Wanderers Sports Club Management Committee
- Board member, Kaiteriteri Recreation Reserve Board
- Property in Eves Valley
- Director, Port Nelson Ltd
- Independent Director, Waimea Rural Fire Authority
- Member, Rural Fire Committee of the Fire Services Commission

Gail King (Spouse)
- Partner, T B & J G King Farm Partnership

Councillor Sue Brown (updated February 2017)
- Director and Shareholder (40%), Neilers Ferntown (2001) Ltd
- Trustee, Inc Society, Collingwood Health Centre
- Board Member (until 30 June 2017), Nelson / Marlborough Conservation
- Elected Member (Tasman / Marlborough Ward), Fonterra Shareholders Councillor

John Nalder (Spouse)
## Nelson City Council Members’ Interests Register 2016-2019
### at 29 March 2017

### Elected Members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Most recent update by Member</th>
<th>Member Declared Interest</th>
<th>Spouse/Partner Declared Interest</th>
<th>OAG approval status 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Her Worship the Mayor Rachel Reese | 19 October 2016               | • Property co-owner 4A Allan Street  
• Shareholder/Director - Rachel Reese Consulting Ltd  
• Shareholder - Wharehuga Forestry 2004 Ltd  
• Beneficiary - TuJaes Trust  
• Minor Shareholder - AMP Ltd  
• Minor Shareholder - Manus Resources Ltd  
• Local government representative - Environmental Legal Assistance Advisory Panel  
• Council-related appointments  
  • Patron - Civic Trust  
  • Trustee - Nelson Municipal Band  
  • Trustee - Cawthron Trust Board  
  • Trustee - Hilda and Auty Harley Trust  
  • Committee Member - Whakatu Marae Komiti |  
• Property co-owner 4A Allan Street  
• Director/Shareholder - RH Investments Ltd | N/A |
| Councillor Ian Barker            | 14 October 2016               | • Tahuna Beach Holiday Park  
• Guardians Nightingale Library  
• Network Tasman Trust          | • Nil  
• Nil  
• Nil | N/A |
| Councillor Mel Courtney          | 14 October 2016               | • Property – 26/269 Wakefield Quay, Stepneyville, Nelson 7010.  
• Trustee – Rutherford Rotary  |                                         | N/A |

1 Where the combined total of pecuniary interests in dealings with Council is over $25,000 including GST, Members are asked to note whether OAG approval is being sought or has been granted. For non-pecuniary interests, or interests that are not dealings with Council, or pecuniary interests in dealings with Council totalling less than $25,000 including GST, members are asked to state "n/a".
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# Mayor Greg Gent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mayor or Partner declared business interests</th>
<th>Mayor or Partner declared Clubs and Society roles</th>
<th>Declared interactions and transactions with Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Southern Cross Health Care Group, Chair</td>
<td>• Ruawai Boating Club</td>
<td>• Ratepayer in the Raupo Drainage District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FMG Director</td>
<td>• Most equestrian organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plant &amp; Food Research, Deputy Chair</td>
<td>• Friends of the Kauri Museum (Ann Flood my wife).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dairy Holdings (a group of 70 companies), Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Six O Farms Limited, Director/Shareholder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Delann Limited, Director/Shareholder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Double Two Dairies Limited, Director/Shareholder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gent &amp; Flood Family Trust, Trustee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mayor Celia Wade-Brown (last updated: February 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor Declared Business Interest</th>
<th>Spouse/Partner Declared Business Interest</th>
<th>Council Appointments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• House 42 High Street Island Bay (Owner)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Forest and Bird (Life Member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Living Streets Aotearoa Honorory Life Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nikau Foundation (Trustee)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Alzheimer’s Society (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Capital Vision Research Trust (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Central Allbreeds Dog Training School (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Duke of Edinburgh Hillary Award (Local Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evans Bay Yacht and Motor Boat Club (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Friends of Tawa Bush Reserves (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Great Harbour Way (Co Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Island Bay &amp; Berhampore Orchard (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• International Arts Festival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Joe Aspell Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kelburn Municipal Croquet Club (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Council of Women (Wellington Branch) (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• NBR New Zealand Opera (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Netball Wellington Region (2010) (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Onslow Historical Society (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Orphues Choir (Vice Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pan Pacific and South East Asian Women Association (Wellington Group) (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parent Help (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pelorous Trust Wellington Brass Band (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rainbow Wellington (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Royal Humane Society of New Zealand, Inc (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Royal Port Nicholson Yacht Club (Honorary Member)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Table Tennis Wellington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extract of Minutes of Council 6 June 2017

Register of Interests of Elected Members – S Nichols (Governance Manager)

S Nichols took the report as read.


Councillor Blackie sought clarity on non-pecuniary interests. J Palmer responded.

Mayor Ayers reflected on examples of declaration such as the Museum Trust Board.

Moved: Councillor Brine Seconded: Mayor Ayers

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 170423039527.

Adopts a Register of Elected Members’ Conflicts and Interests for the balance of 2016-19 electoral term.

Notes the Register of Members’ Interests will be formally reviewed each December and will be published on the Council’s website, being updated regularly as changes are notified.

Notes senior staff (Level 2 up), will be asked to declare any pecuniary and non-pecuniary or perceived conflicts of interests which will be maintained by the Council’s Privacy Officer in a separate Senior Staff Register.

Notes a policy will be formalised to accompany the Register, and be presented to the Council in July.

Recommends Community Board elected members be included in the Register of Members Interests for consistency and community transparency.

Circulates a copy of this report to the Community Boards.

CARRIED

Against Councillors Doody and Blackie

Councillor Brine reflected on the past with previous conflict of interest matters, commenting members can go to the Chief Executive for clarification of what to declare and to the Auditor General.

Mayor Ayers reflected on situations with other Boards. The best approach was that if a matter arises declare at the time. There were options available to members and the process provides transparency to the public, with the list being amended at any time.

Councillor Blackie stated he had concerns, reflecting on the oath he took at the being of office, daily conflicts, and believed the current status quo worked well. Councillor Blackie stated he felt the process was intrusive.

Councillor Brine reflected on the report with definitions of declarations.
Mayor Richard Kempthorne (last updated February 2017)

- Family Trust owns 11 Hillplough Heights, Richmond
- Forestry block, Aniseed Valley Road, Richmond
- Estate property Eves Valley, RD 1, Brightwater
- Chairman, Tasman Regional Sports Trust
- Local Government representative, Land and Water Forum
- Co-Chair, Nelson Tasman Youth Strategies Forum
- Ex-officio Trustee, Cawthron Institute Trust Board
- Chair, Zone 5 LGNZ
- Chair, South Island Strategic Alliance
- Member, LGNZ National Council

Deputy Mayor Tim King (last updated February 2017)

- Partner, T B & J G King Farm Partnership
- Trustee, Pinegrove Trust
- Lessee with Council, for land at Eves Valley around the Council landfill
- Member, Wanderers Sports Club Management Committee
- Board member, Kaliteriti Recreation Reserve Board
- Property in Eves Valley
- Director, Port Nelson Ltd
- Independent Director, Waimea Rural Fire Authority
- Member, Rural Fire Committee of the Fire Services Commission

Gail King (Spouse)

- Partner, T B & J G King Farm Partnership

Councillor Sue Brown (updated February 2017)

- Director and Shareholder (40%), Nalders Ferntown (2001) Ltd
- Trustee, Inc Society, Collingwood Health Centre
- Board Member (until 30 June 2017), Nelson / Marlborough Conservation
- Elected Member (Tasman / Marlborough Ward), Fonterra Shareholders Councillor

John Nalder (Spouse)
### Elected Members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Most recent update by Member</th>
<th>Member Declared Interest</th>
<th>Spouse/Partner Declared Interest</th>
<th>OAG approval status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Her Worship the Mayor Rachel Reese</td>
<td>19 October 2016</td>
<td>• Property co-owner 4A Allan Street&lt;br&gt;• Shareholder/Director - Rachel Reese Consulting Ltd&lt;br&gt;• Shareholder - Wharehunga Forestry 2004 Ltd&lt;br&gt;• Beneficiary - TuJaes Trust&lt;br&gt;• Minor Shareholder - AMP Ltd&lt;br&gt;• Minor Shareholder - Manus Resources Ltd&lt;br&gt;• Local government representative - Environmental Legal Assistance Advisory Panel</td>
<td>• Property co-owner 4A Allan Street&lt;br&gt;• Director/Shareholder - RH Investments Ltd</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Ian Barker</td>
<td>14 October 2016</td>
<td>• Tahuna Beach Holiday Park&lt;br&gt;• Guardians Nightingale Library&lt;br&gt;• Network Tasman Trust</td>
<td>• Nil</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Mel Courtney</td>
<td>14 October 2016</td>
<td>• Property – 26/269 Wakefield Quay, Stepneyville, Nelson 7010&lt;br&gt;• Trustee – Rutherford Rotary</td>
<td>• Nil</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Where the combined total of pecuniary interests in dealings with Council is over $25,000 including GST, Members are asked to note whether OAG approval is being sought or has been granted. For non-pecuniary interests, or interests that are not dealings with Council, or pecuniary interests in dealings with Council totalling less than $25,000 including GST, members are asked to state "n/a".

A1645289
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mayor or Partner declared business interests</th>
<th>Mayor or Partner declared Clubs and Society roles</th>
<th>Declared Interactions and transactions with Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Southern Cross Health Care Group, Chair</td>
<td>• Ruawai Boating Club</td>
<td>• Ratepayer in the Raupo Drainage District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FMG Director</td>
<td>• Most equestrian organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plant &amp; Food Research, Deputy Chair</td>
<td>• Friends of the Kauri Museum (Ann Flood my wife).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dairy Holdings (a group of 70 companies), Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Six O Farms Limited, Director/Shareholder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Delann Limited, Director/Shareholder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Double Two Dairies Limited, Director/Shareholder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gent &amp; Flood Family Trust, Trustee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mayor Celia Wade-Brown (last updated: February 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor Declared Business Interest</th>
<th>Spouse/Partner Declared Business Interest</th>
<th>Council Appointments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House 42 High Street Island Bay (Owner)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Forest and Bird (Life Member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Streets Aotearoa Honorary Life Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikau Foundation (Trustee)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alzheimer’s Society (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Vision Research Trust (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Allbreeds Dog Training School (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke of Edinburgh Hillary Award (Local Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans Bay Yacht and Motor Boat Club (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Tawa Bush Reserves (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Harbour Way (Co Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Bay &amp; Berhampore Orchard (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Arts Festival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Aspell Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelburn Municipal Croquet Club (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council of Women (Wellington Branch) (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBR New Zealand Opera (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netball Wellington Region (2016) (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onslow Historical Society (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orpheus Choir (Vice Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan Pacific and South East Asian Women Association (Wellington Group) (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Help (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelorus Trust Wellington Brass Band (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow Wellington (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Humane Society of New Zealand, Inc (Patron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Port Nicholson Yacht Club (Honorary Member)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Tennis Wellington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Introduction

Elected members of the Council have a number of professional and personal interests and roles. Conflicts of interest sometimes cannot be avoided but they need not cause problems when promptly disclosed and well managed. Disclosure by an elected member is voluntary.

This policy is intended to reflect best practice, and will generally be applied by the Council (i.e. Councillors).

Examples of conflicts include paid outside employment, company directors or commercial relationships that interface with the Council or a Community Board.

2 Policy Context

This policy applies to all elected members, including committees and hearing panels. A disclosure of interest policy is already in place for Council employees.

A conflict of interest occurs when:

• the activities of an elected member leads, or could lead, to material benefit for that elected member concerned or to an external entity, either directly or indirectly, to the detriment, or potential detriment, of the Council.

• the activities of an elected member interfere, or could interfere, with that elected member’s fulfilment of their obligations.

If elected members are unclear about the application of this policy to specific circumstances or situations they should seek clarification from the Governance Manager or Chief Executive.

3 Policy Objective

The objective of this policy is to:

• provide best practice guidance to Council members so that such decisions are seen to be transparent and unbiased and without giving rise to any perception of conflict of interest;

• set rules around disclosing actual, potential and perceived conflicts and accepting gifts and other benefits; and

• set out Council’s expectations for its members to ensure compliance with the provisions of the legislation and good practice guides listed below;

• preserve public trust in Council by avoiding actual, perceived or potential bias.

4 Policy Statement

Elected members must carry out their duties in an efficient and competent manner and avoid any behaviour which might impair their effectiveness, or damage the integrity or standing of the Council. Thus it is fundamental to the protection of the reputation of Waimakariri District Council that no elected members have, or are perceived to have, a conflict between their official responsibilities and their personal interests.

A conflict of interest can arise where two different interests overlap, i.e. in any situation where an elected member has a financial interest, a private or personal interest or business interest
sufficient to influence or appear to influence the impartial exercise of their official duties or professional judgment.

Members must at all times avoid situations where their integrity might be questioned or where they may appear to favour one party, supplier or customer over another. In addition, members must act honestly and impartially and in no circumstances reveal or make private use of personal, confidential or other non-public information obtained as a result of their employment by the Council.

The existence of a conflict of interest may not necessarily mean that the elected member concerned has done anything wrong or that the interests of Council or the public have been compromised. For an elected member a conflict of interest that creates risks may be where their duties or responsibilities to Council could be affected by some other interest or duty that they may have. For example, other interests or duties might exist for an elected member because of their own financial affairs; a relationship (private or personal interest) or other role (business interest) that the elected member has; or something the elected member has said or done.

Disclosure provides transparency and protects those concerned from allegations of duplicity and enables the avoidance of being unwittingly placed in situations that may lead to a conflict of interest.

5 Policy Actions

Council members are to conduct themselves at all times under the above principles, ensuring that:

• self-interest or personal factors are not permitted to influence their decision making;
• financial, family, personal or business relationships or interests do not in fact, nor appear to, unfairly advantage or disadvantage the Council, elected members or other individuals or organisations;
• they are not involved in the appointment process of people with whom they have a close personal or family relationship;
• they do not take part in discussions, deliberations, decision-making or voting on a matter in which he/she (or a member of his/her immediate family or a dependent) has a material interest;
• they observe the highest standards of behaviour in accepting gifts or rewards. Any gift that might attract the suspicion of improper motive, or which obligates the individual should not be accepted. In any event all gifts offered (received or not) are to be declared (refer to WDC Gifts & Hospitality Policy and Elected Members’ Code of Conduct);
• Council’s name, resources, information and time are not used for private or personal benefit without prior written consent of an authorised person;
• any conflict of interest identified is declared as soon as possible;

As part of the induction process, new Council members will receive advice on how to identify, report, and manage conflicts of interest.

Council members must monitor any business interactions between the Council and any company or organisation in which the member has a material interest and ensure that such business does not exceed $NZ25,000 (including GST) in value without the prior approval of the Auditor-General.
Elected Members shall:

- declare any interests in contracts in the Council’s Interest Register;
- discuss any proposed interest in contracts (of whatever value) in advance with the Chief Executive and/or the OAG and follow the advice that they are given;
- not participate in decision-making relating to any contract in which they have an interest;
- not accept any gifts (including hospitality, entertainment) from tendering parties where the Council or community board/committee will be part of the decision-making process.

6 Interests Register

The Governance Manager will maintain an elected member Interests Registers which is to be updated at least annually (1st December) and as required when an elected member declares a conflict of interest at any time during the year.

The Elected Members Interests Register will be published on the Council website and in the Council agenda each December and following any amendment.

7 Links to legislation, other policies and community outcomes

- Local Authorities (Members Interests) Act 1968
- Managing Conflicts of Interest: Guidance for Public Entities (Office of the Auditor-General)
- Guidance for Members of Local Authorities about the Local Authorities (Members’ Interests) Act 1968
- Purchasing Policy (including Tendering) 2017
- Elected Members Code of Conduct.

8 Guidance Notes relating to the making of returns:

The following explanatory notes are intended to assist members in preparing their returns for the register but a final judgment on interpreting the requirements in the responsibility of the members themselves.

- You may have financial interests that are not covered by the requirements for the register but do need to be declared orally to a committee before you participate in debate relating to that interest. This might include an interest you have acquired but is not due for registration until several months later, or it may relate to an interest of a family member. If in any doubt, you should consider making an oral declaration to the committee before participating in consideration of a related item of business, regardless of any written registration.
- There is no formal requirement to register any change in your interests 1st December each year (or any other date required for an initial return) until the next return is required. However the requirements for an oral declaration will apply to any interests that have not been registered.
- At no stage are you required to state the actual value or extent of any interest. You simply need to register its existence.
- If any interest is held jointly with another person or persons, you should indicate the interest. You can list it as jointly owned but do not need to name the other owner(s).
POLICY

REGISTER OF INTERESTS POLICY

9 Definitions

Business entity means anybody or organisation, whether incorporated or unincorporated, that carries on any profession, trade, manufacture, or undertaking for pecuniary profit, and includes a business activity carried on by a sole proprietor.

Company means:

a) A company registered under Part 2 of the Companies Act 1993, or
b) A body corporate that is incorporated outside New Zealand

Relevant Interest is when an elected member has a business, financial or personal interest in a company, trust, or community organisation that is likely to do business with council at any time.

Conflict of Interest means any situation when a person has a financial, personal or business interest sufficient to influence or appear to influence the impartial exercise of their official Council duties or professional judgement.

Matter means the Council’s performance of its functions or the exercise of its powers, or an arrangement, agreement or contract the Council has entered into or proposes to enter.

Member means elected members of Waimakariri District Council and Community Boards.

Business Interest An elected member will have a business interest in an enterprise seeking to do business with the Council if they:

• are a director of the enterprise;
• are an owner of or partner in the enterprise;
• have a shareholding in the enterprise;
• have a close personal or familial relationship with a person who is an owner or partner or significant shareholder in the enterprise.
• Holds a significant managerial role that trades with Waimakariri District Council.

Declarations of a Conflict: is a reference to a real, perceived or potential conflict and is valid for Council, Committees and Community Boards.

Financial Interest means anything of monetary value, including but not limited to:

• Salary or payments for service, e.g. consulting fees and honoraria;
• Equity interests, e.g. stocks, stock options and other ownership interests;
• Gifts;
• Allowances, forgiveness of debts, interests in real estate or personal property, dividends, rents, capital gains; and
• Intellectual property rights, e.g. patents, copyrights and royalties from these rights.
• The term does not include salary or other remuneration received from or approved by Council.

Pecuniary Interest: An interest that involves money.

Personal Interest An elected member has a personal interest in a matter if their spouse or partner, or other person in their family with whom there is a close friendship or relationship, could be advantaged or disadvantaged by any decision that the
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staff or elected member either can make, or does make, or is in a position to influence.

Relevant Interest is when an elected member has a business, financial or personal interest in a company, trust, or community organisation that is likely to do business with council at any time.

Spouse/Partner/Family: Under the various Acts pertaining to Conflict or Pecuniary Interests it is also relevant to the elected member if the conflict of interest pertains to their spouse, partner or close family member (ie brother/sister, son/daughter, parent).

10 Adopted by and date

This Policy was considered and adopted by the Council at its meeting of 1 May 2018.

11 Review

First Review October 2019, then review every six years thereafter, or sooner on request.
1. SUMMARY

1.1. This report is to update the Woodend-Sefton Community Board with investigations into the feasibility of connecting the Bramleys Road well to the Woodend-Pegasus water supply scheme. Note that a similar update report will be presented to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting on the 16 April 2018.

1.2. A number of potential benefits were originally identified with the Bramleys Road well. These are listed below, as well as a summary of other developments and investigation outcomes that have occurred since the project conception.

1.3. It was originally assumed that the well could achieve a yield in the order of 20 – 30 L/s based on the previous testing in order to provide additional capacity for the Woodend-Pegasus scheme in the future.

1.4. It has been since identified that there would be a significant number of affected bore owners that would make it very challenging to gain a consent to take the required volume of water from this well.

1.5. It was previously thought that the well could be used without any treatment based on its location and depth.

1.6. Further analysis on the well, in addition to the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry Stage 2 Report recommendations, indicate that the well would likely require treatment for bacteria, protozoa, and some form of treatment to reduce biofilm growth (either chlorination, filtration or both).

1.7. Based on the findings of the report, the Bramleys Road well is no longer considered a viable additional source for the Woodend Pegasus water supply scheme.
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

    THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board recommends:

    THAT the Council:

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

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

        (c) **Notes** that the Bramleys Road well is no longer considered to be a viable future source for the scheme, as the water source would likely require significant treatment and gaining consent to abstract water from the well would be very difficult.

        (d) **Notes** that some Tuahiwi residents opposed the joining of the scheme with Pegasus for cultural reasons, and that the future connection of the Bramleys Road well would have potentially mitigated these concerns.

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

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

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1. In October 2016, the Council resolved to join the Woodend and Pegasus water supplies (refer to report 160927099778).

3.2. The Woodend, Tuahiwi and Pegasus communities were consulted on this, and the proposal to join the schemes was supported by 73% of those that submitted feedback.

3.3. There were some concerns raised by Tuahiwi residents that they did not want their water to pass through the Pegasus water treatment plant for cultural reasons (four submissions noted this as a concern).

3.4. A potential mitigation, to these concerns raised, was the potential connection of the Bramleys Road well, which is situated south-west of Tuahiwi. If this well was connected to the greater scheme, while this well was running, all of Tuahiwi’s water would be sourced from this well and would not pass through the Pegasus water treatment plant.
Other benefits that were noted regarding the Bramleys Road well were:

- It would likely improve the water quality, as it was expected that this water would not require any additional treatment, and would not result in potential biofilm growth.

- It would potentially reduce treatment costs (as it was assumed that this water would not require treatment)

- It would offset potential future reservoir upgrades (as this water would not pass through a reservoir).

- It would offset potential future surface pump upgrades (as this water would not need to be pumped other than at the well site).

It was noted in the report to Council that while there were significant potential benefits associated with the Bramleys Road well, there would be a significant cost in forming the connection. It was noted that it was likely that the Bramleys Road well would be connected if the yield achievable from the well was sufficient to justify the cost.

Based on the above, a budget to bring that Bramleys Road well online was included in the 2017/18 Annual Plan in the year 2021/22 to the value of $1,600,000.

Upon re-assessing this budget as part of the 2018-28 draft Long Term Plan, it was increased to $2,200,000 based on the assumption that UV treatment would be needed at this source (following the Havelock North Stage 2 Inquiry Report). Although this was included in the draft Long Term Plan for a future year, it was intended that the viability of this source be investigated further prior to committing to the expenditure. The timing of the project was also changed to the 2022/23 and 2023/24 year at this point.
3.9. This subsequent re-evaluation of the viability of this source is covered within the Issues and Options section of this report.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The key items evaluated as part of this report to determine the viability of this source are:

- The quantity of water that could be abstracted from the well (taking into account potential consenting issues)
- The quality of water from the source both in terms of microbiological treatment and also aesthetic values (associated with potential biofilm growth).

**Assessment of Amount that could be Abstracted from Bramleys Road Bore**

4.2. The amount that could be abstracted from the well was assessed by Pattle Delamore Partners (PDP) from the pump test results. The key output from this assessment was to determine what flowrate could be abstracted from the well without causing unacceptable drawdown effects on existing private wells.

4.3. The results from PDP’s analysis are summarised below in terms of the number of potentially affected bores at a range of flowrates. It is noted that affected bores is defined by Environment Canterbury (Ecan) as those where the proposed pumping rates contributes to the drawdown in the well to give a cumulative total drawdown of more than 20% of the total available drawdown (this makes them an affected party as part of a consent application). This way that this is assessed is summarised on Figure 2.

![Figure 2: Diagrammatic Summary of how Drawdown is Assessed by Ecan](image)

4.4. Table 1 summarises the number of affected bores at a range of flow rates.
Table 1: Summary of potentially affected bores due to pumping of Bramleys Road bore

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pumping rate (L/s)</th>
<th>Number of potentially affected bores</th>
<th>Additional Drawdown Caused by Council Bore (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.5 – 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.0 – 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.1 – 5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5. The conclusion from the above is that it would be very challenging to gain a consent to take water from the well at the desired flow rate of 20 L/s, or even at a substantially reduced flow rate such as 5 L/s.

4.6. One of the key reasons for the large number of affected bore owners is that it was found that pumping of the Bramleys Road bore induced drawdown in shallow bores (as shallow as 26m deep), as well as deeper bores. If the effects had been limited to just deeper bores, the number of bores affected would be significantly less.

Assessment of Microbiological Compliance of Bore

4.7. Consideration was given to whether the Bramleys Road bore would comply with the Drinking-water Standards for New Zealand in terms of protozoal and bacterial compliance. It was originally assumed that under the current standards the bore water would be able to be deemed as a secure groundwater source, meaning that it would be able to be distributed with no treatment for bacteria or protozoa.

4.8. The findings from PDP indicate that it would be questionable whether the bore could be certified as secure under the current standards, given that it induced drawdown in bores as shallow as 26m below ground level. This indicates that the bore is hydraulically connected to the shallow aquifers, and potentially not free from risk of contamination from surface contaminants.

4.9. If the source was not able to be deemed to be secure, it would require treatment for bacteria and protozoa (such as UV disinfection).

4.10. Further to the above, the Havelock North Stage 2 Inquiry Report, that was released in December 2017, has recommended that the secure section of the current Drinking-water Standards be abolished. The interpretation therefore is that all drinking water would need to be treated for bacteria and protozoa.

4.11. Therefore, based on both the fact that the well is hydraulically linked to shallow aquifers, and the Havelock North Stage 2 Inquiry Report, the initial assumption that the bore water would be able to be distributed without treatment is unlikely to be accurate. It is considered far more likely that the water would have to be treated by UV disinfection as a minimum.

4.12. In addition to providing treatment for protozoa with UV disinfection, there is a reasonable likelihood that chlorination would be required to be added in the future as well. This is based on a further recommendation of the Havelock North Stage 2 Inquiry Report recommending that there be a residual disinfectant in all drinking water.

Assessment of Aesthetic Water Quality (and potential for biofilm growth)

4.13. Initial assessments of the chemical water quality data for the bore indicated it would be unlikely to result in biofilm growth within the Tuahiwi and Woodend reticulation if it were connected. This is because it was previously thought that the water was more similar to the water delivered to Rangiora and Kaiapoi compared to the water sources for Woodend and Pegasus which are treated to minimise biofilm growth.
A test was carried out in which the water from the Bramleys Road bore was passed through a clear canister to monitor biofilm growth over time. This data was compared to growth rates from treated Woodend water and Pegasus water.

The results from the test are shown on Figure 2 below. This showed a very high rate of growth of biofilm from this bore. The rate of biofilm growth was approximately 20 times greater than the rate of growth in the filtered Woodend water for example.

This high rate of biofilm growth would likely be reduced by UV treatment, but would still become a significant risk if this source was to be used. The only way in which this risk could be adequately managed would be through the implementation of chlorination of the water (in addition to UV treatment), and filtration such as at the Woodend and Pegasus treatment plants, or both.

![Figure 3: Biofilm growth test on Bramleys Road well after growth of biofilm](image)

![Figure 4: Example of biofilm growth canister with no biofilm](image)

**Conclusion of Assessments**

Based on the assessments carried out in terms of the flow that could be abstracted from the bore, the microbiological compliance of the bore water both with current standards and possible future standards, and also the potential for biofilm growth, it is no longer recommended that this bore be used.

A preferential option in order to provide future capacity to the Woodend-Pegasus water supply scheme would be to connect the Equestrian 4 (EQ4) well. This is a well that is drilled within the Pegasus well field, but was never completed as the developer for Pegasus achieved the yield they required from the existing three Equestrian wells that had already been drilled. The connection of the EQ4 well would have the advantages over the Bramleys Road well that:

4.18.1. This well is close to existing infrastructure and could easily be connected into the delivery main from the well field to the Pegasus water treatment plant.
4.18.2. By this well being easily able to be connected into the central treatment plant, it would not require a separate treatment system which would be required for the Bramleys Road bore.

4.18.3. There are unlikely to be significant issues gaining consent to take water from this well given that Council already holds consents to take water from a number of other wells in this area. It is likely that the consent that Council already holds could be modified to include this bore as well, rather than requiring a new consent.

4.19. The recommended option to provide additional capacity for the Woodend-Pegasus scheme is to provide allowance for the future connection of the EQ4 well as opposed to the Bramleys Road well. This will reduce the amount allowed for in the Long Term Plan from $2.2M to approximately $0.5M.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

5.2. It is noted that a similar update report will be presented to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting on the 16 April 2018.

5.3. This issue will be of particular interest to the local Runanga. There were cultural concerns expressed with water that passes through Pegasus being distributed to Tuahiwi, and the potential future connection of the Bramleys Road well was seen as mitigating this issue.

5.4. A letter will be written to the Chairperson of Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga to advise them of the findings of the Bramleys Road well assessment and to provide a copy of this report. This also will be discussed with Runanga at their next meeting with Council staff on the 17 May 2018.

5.5. Residents with adjacent wells close to the Council’s well on Bramleys Road have expressed their concerns that the Council well may have an adverse effect on their private wells.

5.6. Wider Community

5.7. The wider community was consulted on the project to join the Woodend and Pegasus water supplies in October 2016. The outcomes from this consultation are summarised on the Background section of this report. Of particular relevance is that four parties submitted that they had concerns about their water passing through the Pegasus water treatment plant, for which the Bramleys Road well connection was identified as a potential mitigation.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.2. It has been identified that by utilising the EQ4 well as opposed to the Bramleys Road well, the capital cost for the project to bring another source online could be reduced from $2.2M to $0.5M. This project is currently programmed for the 2022/23 and 2023/24 financial year. It is proposed that staff make a submission to the Long Term Plan to change this budget.

6.3. The reduction in budget above is calculated as reducing rates by approximately $30 per connection per year.
6.4. There is a future reservoir budget of $3.0M recommended in 2040 and a surface pump upgrade budget of $50,000 in 2038. These projects may be required to occur earlier based on the Bramleys Road project not going ahead. The reason being that by having a source that pumps directly into reticulation (such as what was proposed for Bramleys Road), the need for storage and surface pumping reduces.

6.5. How the timing of these future projects changes due to the Bramleys Road project not progressing will be modelled by the Network Planning Team prior to the next Annual Plan, however the changes are not expected to be significant.

6.6. Community Implications

6.7. There is a risk that the residents that opposed the joining of the schemes on grounds that they did not want the water supplied to Tuahiwi passing through Pegasus may be disappointed with the findings presented in this report. It is proposed that this be mitigated by conveying the reasons for the recommendations to the local Runanga.

6.8. Risk Management

6.9. The analysis that fed into this report identified a number of risks associated with the connection of the Bramleys Road source in terms of microbiological compliance with the Drinking-water Standards, as well as a risk of biofilm growth. The proposal to manage this risk is not to proceed with the connection of this well, and to instead connect the EQ4 well which could be treated centrally with the other sources for the scheme.

6.10. Health and Safety

6.11. There are no significant health and safety issues associated with this assessment.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

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

7.2. Legislation

7.3. Section 69 of the Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act 2007 is relevant in this matter.

7.4. Community Outcomes

7.5. The following community outcomes are relevant in this matter:

- There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that effects our District
- There is a safe environment for all
- Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner
- People have wide-ranging opportunities for learning and being informed

7.6. Delegations

7.7. The Community Board, under deregulation 1041, has been kept informed on these matters so that they can be responsible for;
1. Representing, and acting as an advocate for, the interests of its community.

2. Maintaining an overview of services provided by the Council such as road works, water supply, sewerage, stormwater drainage, parks, recreational facilities, community activities, and traffic management projects within the community.

3. Communication with community organisations and special interest groups within the community.
Extract of Community Board recommendations in relation to Bramleys Road Well Viability Assessment Report.  (Considered 9 April and 16 April 2018)

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board recommends:

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180323031876.

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

(c) Notes that the Bramleys Road well is no longer considered to be a viable future source for the scheme, as the water source would likely require significant treatment and gaining consent to abstract water from the well would be very difficult.

(d) Notes that some Tuahiwi residents opposed the joining of the scheme with Pegasus for cultural reasons, and that the future connection of the Bramleys Road well would have potentially mitigated these concerns.

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

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

CARRIED

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board recommends:

(g) Receives report No. 180323031876.

THAT the Council:

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

(i) Notes that the Bramleys Road well is no longer considered to be a viable future source for the scheme, as the water source would likely require significant treatment and gaining consent to abstract water from the well would be very difficult.

(j) Notes that some Tuahiwi residents opposed the joining of the scheme with Pegasus for cultural reasons, and that the future connection of the Bramleys Road well would have potentially mitigated these concerns.

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

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

CARRIED
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL
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1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report is to update on design progress on the proposed floating pontoons in the Kaiapoi Wharf and Marine Precinct, and to seek approval of the Level of Service for the Riverview and Boat ramp pontoons and approval of the proposed procurement method.

1.2 Separate reports will be prepared at a later date to cover the dredging works and proposed procurement of dredging contractors associated with the marine precinct development.

Attachments:

i. Draft Pontoon General Arrangement Plan (Trim: 180327032542)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group recommends:

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180321030331

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

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

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

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

3.1 The master-planned redevelopment of the Kaiapoi River Wharf and Marine Precinct has been a multi-year project. The current phase of works includes the following key projects and developments:

- Further stopbank repairs and reconstruction (by ECan)
- River wall (North bank) Upgrades
- Riverview terraces and boardwalk
- Floating pontoons and dredging

3.2 Allied to this; PLC developments are also privately developing the Riverview development on the former Bridge Tavern and Hansens Mall site. This facility is planned by the developer to open to the public in November 2018.

3.3 The two floating pontoons proposed are referred to respectively as:

- the ‘Riverview pontoon’, (located between the wharf and Williams St Bridge), and
- the ‘Boat-ramp pontoon’, (located adjacent to the Coastguard slipway).

3.4 An outline configuration and conceptual level of service for the pontoons was agreed at previous meetings of the Regeneration Steering Group, and this has informed the subsequent concept and detailed design stages. This was included in previous reports to Riverbanks Steering Group in February 2017 (Trim: 161209127292) and Regeneration Steering Group in July 2017 (Trim: 170705069411), and intervening workshops with the Regeneration Steering Group.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1 The outline level of service for the pontoons is shown in figure 1, replicated from the previous pontoon reports. This also shows the other current mooring/berthing options in the wharf and marine precinct area for completeness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Existing wharf</th>
<th>Fore/aft moorings (existing)</th>
<th>Pontoon 1 – ‘Riverview’ area</th>
<th>Pontoon 2 – ‘Boat Ramp’ area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Berthing Length</td>
<td>28m Rafting of vessels is also possible</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>Up to 110m approx. (for preferred option)</td>
<td>20m approx.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessel type/size</td>
<td>No change. Same as existing, up to 6’9” (approx. 2m) draught</td>
<td>No change. Same as existing, up to 6’6” (approx. 2m) draught</td>
<td>Less than 15m length; up to 1.8m draught depending on position and duration (^{(4)})</td>
<td>Less than 6m length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical vessel proposed</td>
<td>Larger vessels / commercial</td>
<td>Varies (typically privately owned moorings)</td>
<td>Pleasure boats, motor cruisers / yachts, shallow draft houseboats, tourism operators</td>
<td>Pleasure boats, coastguard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical purpose</td>
<td>Berthing, load in/out, servicing</td>
<td>Long term mooring</td>
<td>Access to town centre, recreation</td>
<td>Temporary for Launching/retrieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical duration</td>
<td>Medium/long duration</td>
<td>Long term</td>
<td>Medium duration</td>
<td>Very short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other uses</td>
<td>Public fishing</td>
<td>Mooring</td>
<td>Public fishing, walking</td>
<td>Coastguard lifeboat short term berthing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Structure Width

| Width | 4.0m approx. | n/a | 2.0m | 1.8m (could possibly be reduced to 1.2m nominal if lower level of service required) |

### Means of Access

| Access | Level access from wharf side carpark | Tender/dinghy | Gangway each end | Single gangway |

### Trafficable (can it be driven on?)

| Trafficable | No | n/a | No | No |

### Approx. minimum water depth (at MLWS in berth pocket)

| Depth | 1.1m (existing – note this varies along the river) | 1.2 to 1.6m (existing – varies) | Varies 1.5m to 2.3m (proposed – subject to dredging) | 1.5m proposed |

### Services provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Shore Power</th>
<th>Nil</th>
<th>Shore Power</th>
<th>General area lighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>Potable water (Wastewater dumpstation adjacent)</td>
<td>(no other services provided)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wastewater pump-out</td>
<td></td>
<td>On-pontoon low-level lighting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General area lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appurtenances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appurtenance</th>
<th>Access ladders</th>
<th>Nil</th>
<th>Cleats, rings, fender strip, kick-rail, lifebuoy(s)</th>
<th>Cleats, fender strip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lifebuoy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fender piles/bollards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Accessibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Pedestrian access</th>
<th>No accessibility</th>
<th>Pedestrian access</th>
<th>Pedestrian access (non-accessible route – i.e. not disabled access)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1**

4.2. The general masterplan diagram for the wharf and marine precinct area is shown in figure 2.

![Figure 2. Marine Precinct Masterplan diagram](image)
4.3. An image of the Riverview Terraces and Boardwalk and pontoons to show context is shown in figure 3.

Progress to Date

4.4. OCEL Consultants were engaged to undertake the detailed design for the pontoons and associated dredging. This is based on general arrangement concepts developed by staff for the pontoons layouts.

4.5. In parallel to this, the design focus was on completing the design and procurement phases for the associated river wall upgrades, and Riverview terraces and boardwalk. Detailed design for both of these projects is now complete, and construction of the river wall commenced in late March 2018, with the Terraces and Boardwalk construction commencing in May 2018 (including off-site fabrication of some elements).

4.6. The critical path item is the obtaining of resource consents for the pontoons and dredging.

Pontoons General Arrangement

4.7. The general arrangement of the Riverview pontoon and cross-sections are shown in Attachment I (TRIM 180327032542)

4.8. Debris deflectors are proposed to be included in the scheme, to limit the chances for debris washed down the river (particularly during flood events) from snagging on the pontoons or accumulating behind them. It will not be possible to completely eliminate the risk of debris accumulation however and this will be an ongoing routine maintenance requirement, along with other regular maintenance items.

4.9. The pontoons guide pile heights are proposed to be set above the spring high tide level and at a sufficient level to accommodate the local flooding scenario of water level RL 2.6m (this water level is approximately 800mm above the existing river wall near the bridge), with the pontoons able to float up to this design flood level without de-coupling. In this localised flood scenario the pontoons would be unusable due to the gangways and other safety risks. In the 1 in 450 year scenario, the pontoons would float off the top of the guide piles and then be restrained by anchor chains attached to the pile bases, to prevent the pontoons from being taken away by the flood current. In this scenario the gangways would become de-coupled and would be damaged. This approach reduces the piling costs (due to length, and also to structural loading and geotechnical considerations) and avoids
having the guide piles protruding a long way out of the water and above the adjacent banks and terraces.

4.10. The pontoons specification sets out details such as:
   - Design criteria
   - Performance requirements – freeboard, durability, relevant standards, stability, slip resistance, safety features, loading and deflection requirements.
   - Finishes and quality
   - Contract scope and contractor responsibilities
   - Contractor design elements
   - Servicing provisions – e.g. the service pillars, ancillaries etc.
   - Gangways, bank-seats and jetties
   - Flood capacity.

4.11. Spare service connections and capacity was provided in the recently installed services to the fixed wharf area, to allow for ease of connecting potable water and electrical power to the new Riverview pontoon. The Riverview pontoon will have a service umbilical attached to the downstream gangway (attached to the wharf end). Ducts were pre-installed for this purpose at this location during the wharf upgrade.

4.12. The pontoon design will be future-proofed to allow for a possible servicing pad adjacent to the existing fixed wharf. This servicing pad could include a wastewater dump station point (the recently installed pumping station has a capped spare connection specifically for this) to serve vessel wastewater portable tanks/cassettes, as well as serving as a possible refuelling point for either tote tanks or small trailerable tanks for refuelling vessels. Suitable bunding and interceptor traps would need to be included in the serving pad. This has not been included in the current pontoon design scheme, but could be added subject to budget being available.

Riverview Pontoon Configuration

4.13. The pontoon position is set off the wall, with the berthing face approximately 4 metres off the new river wall face. This is done so:
   i. Pontoon length is maximised; this allows for the gangways to articulate up and down with the expected tidal and flood height range without clashing with the floating pontoon.
   ii. Optimal placement of the gangway access in the centre of the Riverview terraces structure where the main stairs terminate and the deck is at its widest, providing the most direct, convenient access to the pontoon. It also minimises pedestrian movement in front of the terraced seating areas and on the lower deck.
   iii. Maintenance dredging frequency may be reduced, as more silt may be allowed to accumulate over time against the new river wall before maintenance dredging is required.
   iv. Safety from falling is improved, since the river wall length is an unprotected edge, the 2m water gap reduces the risk of persons falling onto the rigid pontoon structure when the pontoon is at lowest tide (a fall height of up to 3 metres).
   v. A gap is maintained between the pontoon and the wall to reduce the risk of persons attempting to jump from the wall across to the pontoon at high tides (especially important if ever in future there is a decision to change to controlled access to any part of the pontoon).
vi. The gap is wide enough to prevent entrapment, and is intended to reduce likelihood and removal difficulty of debris accumulating in a small gap (albeit somewhat mitigated by debris deflector).

vii. This configuration does allow a relatively easy means of providing additional floatation support to aid in carrying the weight of the gangway where it reaches the pontoon, aiding in stability and strength.

4.14. This pontoon set-out allows an internal fairway/channel clearance between the existing swing moorings and boats moored at the pontoon of approximately 8 metres. This is based on two vessels of 5m beam (width) berthed adjacent to each other, and includes allowance for vessels at the fore and aft mooring in the river centre to displace (drift) at mid to high tide levels (based on previous modelling done by OPUS). In previous feasibility reports it was estimated that this equivalent distance would be 8 metres, so the agreed criteria have been met. The river cross section is shown in figure 4.

Figure 4. River cross-section

4.15. The alternative layout would have the pontoons closer to the new river wall. This would result in a shorter pontoon length being achieved, and would not achieve the other outcomes noted in section 4.13. This is not the proposed design option.

4.16. In the proposed configuration – vessels would need to turn around in the short reach upstream of the existing moorings in the centre of the river. The gap between the mooring buoy and the bridge pier is approximately 24 metres.

4.17. The pontoon will be accessed via gangways at each end, with the upstream access from the lower deck of the Riverview terraces, and the downstream access from the existing wharf. Both access locations will require a small fixed jetty type construction. The gangway access provided will not meet the requirements of ‘accessible ramps’ as defined in the building code, due mainly to the steeper ramp angle. However the gangways will be wide enough to allow for assisted access for wheelchairs & pushchairs, as well as trolleys for loading equipment onto vessels.

4.18. The pontoon and associated dredging allows for berthed vessels of up to 1.8 metres draught to avoid touching the bottom of the dredged basin, for the majority of the pontoon berthing length. The section closest to the bridge, upstream of the terraces gangway lower landing, will have a shallower berth pocket due to dredging depth constraints near the Williams Street Bridge.

Boat-ramp Pontoon Configuration

4.19. The boat ramp pontoon has a number of options for configuration. The three main options considered were:

A. Pontoon accessed from a gangway from the footpath near the top of the ramp. This is the preferred option.

B. Pontoon accessed from a gangway and fixed jetty immediately adjacent to the ramp.
C. Pontoon located close to (and partially over) the ramp, based on a proprietary plastic articulating model.

4.20. These options are shown in concept in figure 5.
4.21. Option A has the advantage of providing less of a debris trap, as there is no obstruction to the river flow in each direction. Option A also utilises a similar gangway to the gangways on the Riverview pontoon – so there will be economies of scale in construction/procurement.

4.22. Options A & B have the advantage of moving the pontoon further away from the launching ramp, which allows for a deeper berth pocket to be achieved, and avoids the risk of undermining the ramp (noting that scour is already occurring in this area since the ramp was installed). This will allow for use at greater range of tides, and reduces risk to adjacent structures. This also makes use of the existing deeper pocket at the old MV Tuhoe berth location (now removed).

4.23. Option C has the advantage of being able to launch single-handedly and potentially hand-tow small boats alongside the pontoon to tie up. This is not feasible with option A, and would still be difficult to achieve with Option B. Option A and B effectively require boats to be driven between the launching/retrieval ramp and the pontoon. Option C would likely have ongoing debris accumulation issues however due to the shape and nature of the floating units. Option C would not achieve the desired berth pocket depths without significant additional engineering works required near the edge of the boat ramp.

4.24. The proposed Boat-ramp pontoon configuration is based on option A. This is due to the feedback from the previous steering group workshops whereby it was noted that boats would be driven from the launching ramp to the pontoon (rather than hand-towed). This is also the configuration that was presented to the Coastguard during early concept meetings in November 2016.

4.25. Timing of construction of the Boat-ramp pontoon has been deferred to allow for concurrent construction with other pontoon. If the Riverview pontoon encounters delays due to the required dredging and the associated resource consenting risk, then consideration could be given to advancing the Boat ramp pontoon construction independently; although this is not the preferred option at present.

Design details and criteria

4.26. The design basis for the pontoons and associated dredging is based on the outline level of service (figure 1), and the guidelines from the applicable normative design standard which is AS 3962 – 2001: Guidelines for design of marinas, and other relevant standards. It was noted in previous reports that the pontoon configuration in the Kalapoi River Marine Precinct will not achieve all of the recommended design criteria in the design standard, due to existing spatial constraints, and the design directives made at feasibility stage. Key examples of exceptions to the design guidelines from the standard are items such as limited clearance achieved, pontoon deck widths, and the internal navigable channel width (constrained by the existing river walls and central moorings).

4.27. The pontoon guide piles design is based on the known geotechnical information from the recent testing of the banks and the river bed, river hydrology information from ECAN reports, and river bed bathymetry (depth profiles and cross-sections). The piles design includes for flood flows and allowance for wind and wake effects, the design vessel sizes, and factor-of-safety allowance for debris accumulation.

4.28. The Riverview pontoon is nominal 110 metres long and provides short to long term berthing. This pontoon has a nominal 2m wide deck, with jetty bank-seat and ramped gangway access each end, with kick rails and service pillars for moored vessels, along with low level deck lighting for wayfinding. The berthing basin/pocket depth varies long
the upstream length of the pontoon, due to proximity to the Williams Street Bridge, as agreed in the feasibility stage definition. This is to avoid deep dredging from undermining the bridge piers and abutments, both of which have relatively shallow foundations. The design team have consulted with Stantec, who provide professional services under contract to WDC for our bridge assets.

4.29. The Boat-ramp pontoon provides short-term parking only, for launching and retrieval of boats up to 6 metres, and is un-serviced. Area lighting is provided only via spill-lighting from the adjacent wharf area lighting.

4.30. Both pontoons accommodate mooring cleats, fender rails, and safety devices and signage. Both pontoons are permanently open to the public, with no gated access. Other details are included in the level of service table 1. Safety access ladders will be included at the Riverview pontoon – on both sides of the pontoon.

4.31. Both pontoons are proposed to have timber decks. Examples of similar structures are shown in figures 6-9. The timber deck for the Riverview pontoon is intended to tie-in and complement the timber decking and features on the adjacent Riverview Terraces and Boardwalk. This implies a pontoon construction with a timber deck structure and supporting structure on top of the floating modules. Options for floating modules vary and include many types of proprietary plastic pontoon modules, plastic pipe and mussel buoy options, concrete modules, steel and aluminium to name a few. Most pontoon suppliers offer floating pontoons with alternative (if not their own ‘standard’) deck options to timber, including bare plastic, concrete, or other materials. The request for tender documents will allow for submission of alternatives to the timber decking, as long as the alternative is submitted along with a conforming (i.e. timber decking) tender option for comparison.

4.32. Kick-rails will be included on each side of the Riverview pontoon. This will stop objects rolling off the deck, help to delineate the edge, prevent wheelchairs or other wheeled items from rolling off, and avoids trip hazards by accommodating deck hardware like mooring cleats etc. The kick rail also helps strengthen the edge of the deck.
Figure 6. Timber decking (treated pine)

Figure 7. Timber decking (untreated hardwood decking)

Figure 8. Typical gangway

Figure 9. Typical kick-rail
Dredging Considerations

4.33. Three elements/phasing of dredging are proposed:
   - Berthing basin dredging
   - River channel dredging – navigability and river rehabilitation
   - Maintenance dredging – both elements

4.34. The dredging operations have a number of constraints and considerations which will be the subject of a further report to the Regeneration Steering Group.

Procurement for Pontoons

4.35. The pontoons and dredging design will be broken into a number of works packages for procurement, being:
   - Pontoon guide piles works
   - Pontoon manufacture/supply and installation works
   - Berthing basin Dredging works

4.36. The pontoon guide piles are proposed to be procured as an addition to the current river wall upgrade contract by way of variation, to make use of the piling rig while it is on site. This allows the piles to be installed from the river bank rather than necessitating a later deployment of piling rig on a barge within the river. This approach is however dependent upon the adoption of the design for the pontoons outlined in this report. OCEL are producing the pile details and specifications package.

4.37. OCEL are producing developed design drawings and performance specifications for the pontoons work package, to sufficient level of detail for suitably qualified contractors and pontoons suppliers to submit tenders. The pontoons construction will be sourced as a design and build, with the contractor to provide final design details to suit their own proposed pontoons systems where they have a proprietary pontoon system to offer.

4.38. This pontoon package procurement is proposed to be undertaken via open tender, to allow for local manufacture opportunities. Tenderers will however be required to show relevant experience and track record, which will be weighted heavily and will have a pass/fail component to the assessment. Assessment will be via a Price-Quality method. Alternative tenders will be allowed, as long as they are submitted along with a fully conforming tender as well. This will allow for innovation and for pontoon suppliers to offer proprietary systems that may still meet the overarching performance specifications.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

The Coastguard supports the need for more members of the public using the boat ramp.

5.2. Wider Community

The pontoons will be a public space with permanent public access (although will not comply to an ‘accessible’ standard).

Previous public consultation included the pontoons as part of the Marine Precinct Masterplan.
6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

The current budget for Riverview pontoons includes provisions of $450,000 for the pontoon (and piling) and dredging of $250,000. The Boat Ramp pontoon is funded from the CEAT funded ledger, with an assigned budget of $250,000.

The cost estimate for the piling component for both the Riverview and the Boat-ramp pontoon is in the order of $200,000 total. The piling costs would be funded from the above budgets.

There will be a separate report on the proposed dredging.

The Kaiapoi Wharf berthing policy/bylaw will need revision, with a new schedule of berthing options, and associated new fees and charges. This will be actioned prior to the completion of the pontoon.

6.2. **Community Implications**

Depending on timing of dredging (and ultimately the pontoons installation), there may be some disruption to the use of the Riverview Terraces during the construction of the upstream jetty and gangway for Riverview pontoon. There will be some restricted access periods to the existing wharf during the construction of the downstream jetty and gangway, and the connection of services to the pontoons.

Vessels currently tied up at wharf may be required to temporarily shift. Vessels at the central moorings may be required to temporarily shift during the dredging and pontoon installation phase.

6.3. **Risk Management: Dredging and programme risk**

Risk around dredging due to multiple constraints. Noted knock-on effect that the Riverview pontoon cannot be installed until the dredging is complete, due to the existing shallow nature of the channel. The pontoon would not be able to float at low tides and would ground on the muds.

Design confirmation and procurement strategy approval required as soon as possible in order to undertake procurement.

Pontoons installation proposed for late spring 2018; to ideally coincide with Riverview and terraces opening, but will be subject to the timing of dredging.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

The proposed works will be within the Kaiapoi River and will require specific and appropriate construction materials, equipment and methods to ensure person safety and minimise potential risk to the environment.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

7.2.1. **Maritime Transport Act 1994 S33I (i):**
Territorial Authorities erect and maintain quays, docks, piers, wharves, jetties and launching ramps

7.2.2. Resource Management Act 1991
Requires resource consent from Canterbury Regional Council to erect structures within a riverbed.

7.2.3. Building Act 2004
All building work must comply with the Building Code

7.3. Community Outcomes

There is a wide variety of public places and spaces to meet people's needs.

There are wide-ranging opportunities for people to enjoy the outdoors.

7.4. Delegations

The Council has the delegation to approve these works.
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1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Woodend-Sefton Community Board’s endorsement of the recommended alignment of the new supply pipe from Gladstone Road to the Pegasus water treatment plant, particularly the section of pipe by Gladstone Park.

1.2. The new supply pipe is part of the project to join the Woodend and Pegasus water supplies and will deliver raw water from the wells on Gladstone Road to the Pegasus water treatment plant.

1.3. Following an options assessment there are two viable options for the Gladstone Park section of the project, these are as follows;

- Option 1 – alignment through the trees (within the road reserve)
- Option 2 – alignment through Gladstone Park (within greenspace reserve)

1.4. Key points to note for these options are as follows;

- Option 1 - constructing the pipe within the road reserve is generally the preferred long term option. However, for this option all of the large pine trees along the western side of Gladstone Park would need to be removed. This option is estimated to cost $61,000 more than Option 2.
- Option 2 - would run along the western side of the park through an easement, and work could be undertaken without affecting the playing surface of the rugby fields.

1.5. The Council’s Greenspace team has taken these two options to the Gladstone Park Advisory Group. The Advisory Group’s preferred option is Option 1, constructing the pipe through the trees (within the road reserve).

1.6. Council Staff support the Gladstone Park Advisory Group views, as in the medium to long term (10 – 15 years) this section of land will most likely be converted into a connector road
once the planned Woodend Bypass is constructed and for maintenance reasons it is preferred that any new 3 Waters infrastructure is constructed within a road reserve.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

   **THAT** the Woodend-Sefton Community Board recommends:

   **THAT** the Utilities and Roading Committee:

   (a) **Receives** report No. 180322031093.

   (b) **Notes** that this project to install a new raw water pipe is part of the wider project to join the Woodend and Pegasus water schemes.

   (c) **Notes** that design work is scheduled to be undertaken this financial year, 2017/18, and construction is scheduled to be completed next financial year, 2018/19.

   (d) **Endorses** that the section of pipe immediately north of Gladstone Road be installed in the road reserve land, rather than through Gladstone Park.

   (e) **Approves** the removal of the trees along the preferred route, in road reserve land.

   (f) **Notes** that the recommended route is supported by the Gladstone Park Advisory Group.

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

3. **BACKGROUND**

   3.1. In 2016, following public consultation, the Council resolved to join the Woodend and Pegasus water supplies both physically and financially (TRIM reference No. 160927099778).

   3.2. The planned joining of the Woodend and Pegasus water supplies generally involved the following.

       1. Conversion of the existing chemical filter at Pegasus to a biological filter for the removal of manganese and iron (complete January 2018).

       2. Divert all Woodend source wells to the new biological filter at Pegasus, via a new water supply pipeline (in progress - this report is part of this project)

       3. Cease chlorination of the Pegasus water supply (to be assessed following Government decision on Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry Stage 2 report).

       4. Abandon the existing biological manganese removal filter at Chinnerys Road, Woodend (future project, 2018/19 financial year).

       5. Pump treated water from the new central treatment plant at Pegasus to the Chinnerys Rd headworks by way of the existing Gladstone Road raw water main (future project, 2018/19 financial year).

       6. Join the Woodend and Pegasus networks by way of a link main between Infinity Drive and the Ravenswood Development (future project, 2018/19 financial year).

   "New water supply pipeline"
3.3. The next phase of the work is to construct a new raw water supply pipeline from Gladstone Road to the Pegasus WTP. The purpose of this new pipeline is to take both the Woodend (Gladstone Park wells) and Pegasus (Equestrian Park wells) raw water to the Pegasus water treatment plant for treatment.

3.1. This project has a budget of $80,000 for design and $500,000 to construct the new raw water pipeline. The construction budget is split $398,850 for level of service and $181,150 for growth.

3.2. Design work is scheduled to be undertaken this financial year, 2017/18, and construction is scheduled to be completed next financial year, 2018/19.

3.3. The existing Pegasus supply pipeline would be utilised to deliver water back to the existing Gladstone Road supply main (Woodend water supply's supply main), which would deliver treated water to the Woodend headworks.

3.4. The following figure presents the concept plan for this work.

![Figure 1: concept plan for joining the treatment of the Pegasus and Woodend water sources](image)

3.4. Note that the existing Woodend filter is reaching the end of its useful life and will be decommissioned when this connection is made. The Pegasus water treatment plant will treat all Woodend and Pegasus water.
4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The new pipeline has been designed to be a 400mm diameter PN12.5 polyethylene (PE) main. This will connect into the existing (Gladstone Park and Equestrian Park) supply mains, from the wells, at Gladstone Road and take the supply water to the Pegasus water treatment plant for treatment.

4.2. Note that as part of this construction, connections will be made to utilise the existing 315mm diameter Pegasus supply pipeline to carry treated water from the Pegasus water treatment plant to the Gladstone Road Woodend supply pipeline.

4.3. This report discusses the findings from the conceptual design options assessment, refer to Appendix A for a summary of this assessment.

4.4. Several conceptual design options have been considered, and the majority of them have been dismissed for practicality and financial reasons. The concept design was split into two sections, the northern section and southern section. See Figure 2 for extents.

4.5. The northern section of the work, from the north side of Gladstone Park to the Pegasus water treatment plant, had one sensible pipe alignment. There are several options however for the southern section through Gladstone Park. Council staff are seeking the Woodend-Sefton Community Board’s endorsement of the recommended route for this section.

4.6. The reason for the Board’s involvement is that both options may be of some interest to the community that utilises the park. One option would involve excavation within the park, and the other would involve removal of the large pine tree wind break adjacent to the park.

4.7. The following figure shows the preferred pipe alignment options for the new pipeline from Gladstone Road to the Pegasus Water Treatment Plant.
4.8. Following an options assessment, the preferred alignment was selected for the northern section of the work. It follows the alignment of the existing supply main. The pipe will be trenched along the berm on the western side of the existing water supply pipe along infinity drive. It will then take an alignment to the north of the existing water supply pipe and then cross into the Pegasus water treatment plant. Refer to Appendix A for the full options assessment on the northern section.

4.9. This northern alignment is the most sensible alignment as it has lower reinstatement costs and is the only practical alignment available along most of the northern section of the works. It does however require obtaining an easement from Te Kohaka O Tuhaitara Trust.
4.10. The northern section of the works is estimated to cost approximately $350,000 including contingency and professional fees.

Southern Gladstone Park Section

4.11. The Gladstone Park section had several matters to consider for the options assessment:

4.11.1. There are live (in service) power, water and sewer mains running north-south along the western side of the trees. Due to the where these services are located there are no alignment options available west of the trees within the road reserve.

4.11.2. Drilling the new pipeline under the trees was considered but as it is a large diameter pipe it would mean the construction cost would be approximately double the cost of open trenching.

4.11.3. An alignment was considered west of the road reserve, however the land owner at 160 Gladstone Road does not want to sell land to the Council. Therefore an alignment along the west side of the road reserve is not viable.

4.11.4. In Gladstone Park, there is 8 metres between the newly planted trees and the rugby field. Therefore there would be enough space to install the new water pipe without damaging the rugby field. It is noted however there is still a risk the contractor may damage the field during construction.

4.11.5. The Council’s Greenspace team were consulted on the matter of removing the trees. They commissioned Treetech to undertake an assessment to see if it would be possible to remove only some of the large pine trees (TRIM reference 180314027354, Appendix B). Treetech recommended that all of the large pine trees be removed, as the inner trees are weaker than the outer trees and may collapse in high winds if just the outer trees were removed. Therefore the cost estimates have allowed for all of the trees to be removed.

4.11.6. Removing all of these trees would mean that the park would no longer have a wind break from the western side. It is noted however that the Greenspace team have planted some smaller trees within Gladstone Park which will act as a windbreak in the future.

4.11.7. Through the trees the pipe would be installed with a cover of approximately 1m. It is noted that both a water and sewer main have been installed along this utilities reserve in the past, these needed to have both scour points and air vales installed to account for the uneven ground.

4.11.8. If the trees are removed the stumps would be ground down to ground level so that a mower could pass over them. The exception to this would be stumps near the pipe alignment, these would be removed entirely. This area would be reinstated with grass.

4.11.9. The large trees may also have some aesthetic and recreational values to the community.

4.11.10. Gladstone Park has a Fee Simple title, meaning an easement should be sought if the pipe were to be constructed through the Park. This would restrict future development of this area of the land (e.g. no building or planting over the pipe alignment).

4.11.11. Constructing the pipe within the road reserve is generally the preferred option over installing the pipe within a park. This is so that maintenance and repairs can be carried out without involving external stakeholders. Undertaking maintenance of the pipeline in the park in the future could lead to conflicts between recreation users of the field and could lead to the field becoming unusable for short periods.
4.11.12 Construction would need to be undertaken in summer if the pipe is installed on the park land, when rugby is not being played. This timing would impact the joining Woodend and Pegasus water supplies project’s schedule.

Refer to Appendix A for the full options assessment.

4.12. Following the options assessment two viable options remain, these are as follows;

1. Option 1 – alignment through the trees (within the road reserve)
2. Option 2 – alignment through Gladstone Park (within Greenspace reserve)

4.13. The following figure shows a more detailed drawing of the Gladstone Park section pipe alignment options.
Figure 3: Detailed drawing of the Gladstone Park section pipe alignment options for the Southern Section.
4.14. The engineer’s estimate for the options are as follows:

Option 1 (alignment though the trees) - $461,000

Option 2 (alignment though Gladstone park) - $400,000

4.15. The costs above include a construction contingency and professional fees. Note that the cost to remove the trees has been sought by getting quotes from arborists/forestry companies known to Council staff.

4.16. It is noted that the alignment through the trees does not include the costs to level out the undulations, rather an allowance has been made to install air valves and scour points. When the connector road is constructed, this area would be releveled.

4.17. The Greenspace team took these two options to the Gladstone Park Advisory Group. The Group would prefer that Council proceed with Option 1, constructing the pipe through the trees. The following information, from the WDC greenspace team, explains the reasons for the Group’s decision.

“We showed the Gladstone Park Advisory Group the two proposed options along with the attached tree report and asked what their preferred option would be. The response from those present was that they would prefer option 1 with the removal of all of the large mature pines and the pipe within the road reserve. Option 2 was only favourable if there was insufficient funds to remove the mature pines. They did want to ensure that the juvenile pines and cypress were protected though as a wind break for the fields. I then emailed the rest of the group who were not at the meeting for additional comment and received a verbal response from the rugby club that they agree with the above preference of the group.”

4.18. Council Staff support the Gladstone Park Advisory Group views, as in the medium to long term this section of land will most likely be converted into a connector road once the planned Woodend Bypass is constructed and for maintenance reasons it is preferred that any new 3 Waters infrastructure is constructed within a road reserve (as opposed to greenspace reserve).

4.19. Although there is some additional cost to the recommended option, this is seen as preferential over the disruption that would be caused to the park in the long term, as well as due to the long term benefits of having the pipe installed within road reserve land.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.1.1. The Gladstone Park Advisory Group would prefer that Council proceed with Option 1, constructing the pipe through the trees. See section 4.16 for more detail on the Group’s decision.

5.2. **Wider Community**

5.2.1. The wider community has not been consulted specifically on the new water pipe alignment options assessment. The Gladstone Park Advisory Group however are seen as representing the views of the community who use this park.
6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.1.1. A shortfall in budget to complete this work has been identified. There is a budget of $580,000 allocated to this project and the engineers estimate is $811,000. The shortfall is $231,000.

6.1.2. The reason for this shortfall is mainly due to there being an alignment available at the time of creating the budget, however the Ravenswood rising main wastewater alignment was prioritised over this pipeline. This has meant that a new alignment needed to be sought for this supply pipeline.

6.1.3. Additional costs have come from gaining legal easements, removing trees and more complicated connection details.

6.1.4. It has been calculated that the additional budget of $231,000 will increase rates on the Woodend-Pegasus water supply scheme by approximately $6.40 per connection per year due to additional capital repayments.

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

6.2. **Community Implications**

6.2.1. Removing all of the large pine trees would mean that the Park would no longer have a wind break from the west side. It is noted however that greenspace have planted some smaller trees within Gladstone Park which will act as a windbreak in the future. Additionally it is noted that the large trees may have aesthetic and recreational values to the community.

6.2.2. Constructing the pipeline along the park would mean the formation of an easement (as this is a Fee Simple Title), which may restrict building in this area of the park in the future.

6.3. **Risk Management**

6.3.1. If the construction was to occur within Gladstone Park, the contractor would need to put measures in place to reduce the risk of the field getting damaged during construction.

6.3.2. A risk worth noting is that Te Kohaka O Tuhaitara Trust may not agree to us obtaining an easement from them for the northern section. If this easement cannot be obtained the pipe would need to be placed around the road reserve on Infinity Drive and Atkinsons Lane, which would be significantly more expensive. The Trust will be contacted in the next stage of the design work after a survey of the utilities in the area has been carried out.

6.3.3. There is another risk is that population growth may be more than Council staff have projected. This pipe has been designed to take all of the existing Equestrian Park and Gladstone Park supply water, and the future Equestrian Park 4 well water to the Pegasus water treatment plant. Council staff have undertaken future growth (50 year) water supply modelling which projected that another well would need to be constructed in approximately 35 years. It is uncertain where this well would be located, however this pipeline has capacity to take the additional flow if the well were to be constructed in this area.

6.3.4. The road reserve has several undulations though it, which will be releveled when the connector road is constructed. This releveling would mean that the water pipe
may be deeper than necessary in places. This will be considered as part of the detailed design. However it is noted that it is unnecessary for the ground to be releveled as part of this work and the pipeline would be constructed by welding polyethylene (PE) pipe, which is a very resilient construction method (so it would not need to be dug up often).

6.4. **Health and Safety**

6.4.1. Contractors would need to provide the a health and safety plan for constructing the pipeline and the removal the trees. This would need to include elements of protecting the public and workers from the hazards of the construction site.

6.4.2. Safety in design would be considered during the design phase, where considerations will be made for the public’s health, to ensure redundancy and resilience with the pipework layout (valves, connections and pipe material).

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 following acts are relevant in this matter:

- The Local Government Act.
- The Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

This report relates to the following community outcomes:

- There is a safe environment for all.
- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable, and affordable manner.

7.4. **Delegations**

The Community Board, under deregulation 1041, has been kept informed on these matters so that they can be responsible for;

1. Representing, and acting as an advocate for, the interests of its community.

2. Maintaining an overview of services provided by the Council such as road works, water supply, sewerage, stormwater drainage, parks, recreational facilities, community activities, and traffic management projects within the community.

3. Approving, on behalf of the Council as landowner, proposed developments or activities on parks, reserves and waterways and within existing budgets; Approving consultation plans for new developments on parks, reserves or waterways which may include planting plans and play equipment.

4. Where referred to the Board, the authority to approve the removal of street and recreation reserve trees; unless deemed an urgent Health and Safety matter.
## Southern Gladstone Park Section Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option Number</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option Title</strong></td>
<td>Trench East of Sewer and Water Pipes</td>
<td>Trench in Gladstone Park, between the rugby field and tree line</td>
<td>Trench between the Sewer and Water Pipes</td>
<td>Drill East of Sewer and Water Pipes</td>
<td>Drill between the Sewer and Water Pipes</td>
<td>Trench West of Sewer and Water Pipes - Farmers Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>- Clearance between the existing sewer and existing water pipes is 1.4m (1.7m to the pipe centres) - Trees within 2.5m of trench noted to be removed.</td>
<td>- Approximately 8m between the tree line and the rugby field - Clearing to the rugby field is required to be 3m. And no driving on the field during construction</td>
<td>- Clearance between the existing sewer and existing water pipes is 1.4m (1.7m to the pipe centres)</td>
<td>- Tree root depth is approximately 0.6m deep. - Can drill 90-100m, 4 pits would be needed therefore some trees would need to be removed.</td>
<td>- Tree root depth is approximately 0.6m deep. - Drill pit width generally is 2m wide, there is only 1.4m therefore this would need to be discussed with a drilling company. - Can drill 90-100m, 4 pits would be needed.</td>
<td>- Clearance between the existing sewer and new water line would be 1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Technique</strong></td>
<td>Trenching</td>
<td>Trenching</td>
<td>Trenching</td>
<td>Directional Drilling</td>
<td>Directional Drilling</td>
<td>Trenching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Engineers Estimate</strong></td>
<td>$383,000.00</td>
<td>$327,000.00</td>
<td>$351,000.00</td>
<td>$899,000.00</td>
<td>$846,000.00</td>
<td>$360,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Contingency 10%</strong></td>
<td>$38,300.00</td>
<td>$32,700.00</td>
<td>$35,100.00</td>
<td>$89,900.00</td>
<td>$84,600.00</td>
<td>$36,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Total</strong></td>
<td>$421,300.00</td>
<td>$359,700.00</td>
<td>$386,100.00</td>
<td>$988,900.00</td>
<td>$930,600.00</td>
<td>$396,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Fees (half of budget)</strong></td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Cost (including professional fees and contingency)</strong></td>
<td>$461,300.00</td>
<td>$399,700.00</td>
<td>$426,100.00</td>
<td>$1,028,900.00</td>
<td>$970,600.00</td>
<td>$436,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational Cost ($/annum)</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assumptions
- All trees would need to be removed as recommended by Greenspace and Tree Tech - Approximately 8m between the tree line and the rugby field - This option is dependent on Greenspaces sign off, however Greg Barnard seem to think that green spaces would be more interested in this option than removing the trees - Clearance between the existing sewer and existing water pipes is 1.4m (1.7m to the pipe centres). Install of the new pipe would be tight. - Tree root depth is approximately 0.6m deep. - Can drill 90-100m, 4 pits would be needed therefore some trees would need to be removed. - Tree root depth is approximately 0.6m deep. - Drill pit width generally is 2m wide, there is only 1.4m therefore this would need to be discussed with a drilling company. - Can drill 90-100m, 4 pits would be needed. - Assumed 2.5m of land would be purchased, cost for land has been estimated and is dependent on negotiation - Could purchase more land so that the new road could be installed to and the trees remain.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Quality Considerations</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>There will be a connection at to take water from the wells to the Woodend WFP if needed. The Pegasus WFP has PWL well for backup supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backup Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pipe material is PE, which is best in liquefaction prone soil. The pipe alignment would comply with the ECOP 1m clearance from sewer - therefore lower risk of contamination from the sewer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pipe material is PE, which is best in liquefaction prone soil. The pipe alignment would comply with the ECOP 1m clearance from sewer. The pipe would not be in a utilities reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pipe material is PE, which is best in liquefaction prone soil. However it would be within the recommended clearance of the engineering code of practice (1m from sewer).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pipe material is PE, which is best in liquefaction prone soil. Trees would mostly remain which would mean that if a tree was to fall over it may compromise the water pipe. The pipe alignment would comply with the ECOP 1m clearance from sewer - therefore lower risk of contamination from the sewer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pipe material is PE, which is best in liquefaction prone soil. The pipe alignment would comply with the ECOP 1m clearance from sewer - therefore lower risk of contamination from the sewer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pipe material is PE, which is best in liquefaction prone soil. The pipe alignment would comply with the ECOP 1m clearance from sewer. The pipe would be in a utilities reserve (once land is purchased).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There could be some resistance from the community, greenspaces and the rugby club</td>
<td></td>
<td>- May not get agreement from greenspaces and the rugby club due to the removal of some trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Soil moisture content is low (according to ECAN soil moisture) and soil is Deep Sandy Loam therefore shielding will likely be required to stop the other pipes from moving</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Routine maintenance (ECOP) would be required to keep pipes in the road reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Possible conflict if repairs are needed</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Water Supply alignment would be within 1m of a live sewer line. Non-compliant with the ECOP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Potential restriction on future development of field - e.g. no building</td>
<td></td>
<td>- May be feasible. GS and MA seem to think it may not be a feasible option with shields etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Would need to be very careful during construction and maintenance to not have vehicles on the field</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Soil moisture content is low (according to ECAN soil moisture) and soil is Deep Sandy Loam therefore shielding will likely be required to stop the other pipes from moving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Soil moisture content is low (according to ECAN soil moisture) and soil is Deep Sandy Loam therefore shielding would likely be required to stop the other pipes from moving</td>
<td></td>
<td>- * May be feasible. GS and MA seem to think it may not be a feasible option with shields etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pipe would not be in the road reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Water Supply alignment would be within 1m of a live sewer line. Non-compliant with the ECOP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- May not get agreement from greenspaces and the rugby club</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Water Supply alignment would be within 1m of a live sewer line. Non-compliant with the ECOP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Potential restriction on future development of field - e.g. no building</td>
<td></td>
<td>- May be feasible. GS and MA seem to think it may not be a feasible option with shields etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Would need to be very careful during construction and maintenance to not have vehicles on the field</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Soil moisture content is low (according to ECAN soil moisture) and soil is Deep Sandy Loam therefore shielding will likely be required to stop the other pipes from moving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Soil moisture content is low (according to ECAN soil moisture) and soil is Deep Sandy Loam therefore shielding would likely be required to stop the other pipes from moving</td>
<td></td>
<td>- * May be feasible. GS and MA seem to think it may not be a feasible option with shields etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pipe would not be in the road reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Water Supply alignment would be within 1m of a live sewer line. Non-compliant with the ECOP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- May not get agreement from greenspaces and the rugby club</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Water Supply alignment would be within 1m of a live sewer line. Non-compliant with the ECOP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Potential restriction on future development of field - e.g. no building</td>
<td></td>
<td>- May be feasible. GS and MA seem to think it may not be a feasible option with shields etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Would need to be very careful during construction and maintenance to not have vehicles on the field</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Soil moisture content is low (according to ECAN soil moisture) and soil is Deep Sandy Loam therefore shielding will likely be required to stop the other pipes from moving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Soil moisture content is low (according to ECAN soil moisture) and soil is Deep Sandy Loam therefore shielding would likely be required to stop the other pipes from moving</td>
<td></td>
<td>- * May be feasible. GS and MA seem to think it may not be a feasible option with shields etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(additional to those stated above)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Easier to construct after the trees are removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Within Road Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Achieve ECOP clearances from sewer rising main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Lowest total capital cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Easy to construct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Achieve ECOP clearances from services, good separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Do not need to remove trees, therefore maintain the wind protection for the rugby club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Within Road Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Do not need to remove trees, therefore maintain the wind protection for the rugby club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reduced reinstatement cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Within Road Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Do not need to remove trees, therefore maintain the wind protection for the rugby club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Achieve ECOP clearances from sewer rising main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reduced reinstatement cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Within Road Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Do not need to remove trees, therefore maintain the wind protection for the rugby club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Achieve ECOP clearances from sewer rising main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Easier to construct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Within Road Reserve (once land is purchased)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Achieve ECOP clearances from services, good separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Do not need to remove trees, therefore maintain the wind protection for the rugby club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(additional to those stated above)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction would be best in Summer when rugby is not being played - schedule change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- If maintenance such as flushing was required the water would need to be managed so it would not scour the field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- High Total Capital Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Maintenance access to the water pipe once constructed could be an issue, as trees would need to be removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- High Total Capital Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for dismissing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The pipes either side of this pipe are critical trunk mains and the clearance is less than optimal, the risk of damaging these pipe is too high. Therefore this option was dismissed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This option is double the price of the other options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The pipes either side of this pipe are critical trunk mains and the clearance is less than optimal, the risk of damaging these pipe is too high. Therefore this option was dismissed. Additionally, this option is double the price of the other options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The landowner was contacted by council staff and offered generous compensation for their land. They did not want to sell their land to the WDC, as they were concerned that their property would be left in a messy state.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Northern Section Options Assessment
The northern section had several matters to consider:

- The existing Pegasus water supply pipe runs through easements on Te Kohaka O Tuhaitara Trust and Pegasus Golf Limited land. Unfortunately some of these easements are full with services and easement extensions would be required to get the new pipe to the WTP.
- The land owner at 160 Gladstone Road does not want to sell land to the council. Therefore the alignment along the west side of the Te Kohaka O Tuhaitara Trust reserve (135 Infinity Drive) is not attainable.
- WDC owns the section of land at 7 Atkinsons Lane (two properties north of the WTP). As it is not possible to acquire land from 160 Gladstone Road and the easement through Pegasus Gold Course land is full, the pipe would need to be constructed though the WDC land to the north (7 Atkinsons Lane).
- The reinstatement cost to construct the pipeline in the road is more than constructing the pipe in the berm. Additionally there appears to be an alignment available in the Te Kohaka O Tuhaitara Trust reserve which the new pipe could be constructed in.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option Number</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option Title</td>
<td>Road Reserve and WDC land</td>
<td>Berm Easement and WDC land</td>
<td>Berm Easement and Farmers land</td>
<td>Farmers land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>- Alignment along the Road Reserve, extend easement in Todds Properties land to the North of the existing easement, get an easement in WDC reserve land to the North of the existing easement, use easement across 11 Atkinsons Drive into the WTP</td>
<td>- Alignment along the Berm Easement parallel to Infinity Drive, extend easement in Todds Properties land to the North of the existing easement, get an easement in WDC reserve land to the north, use easement across 11 Atkinsons Drive into the WTP</td>
<td>- Alignment along the Berm Easement parallel to Infinity Drive, extend easement in Todds Properties land to the south of the existing easement, buy a strip of 160 Gladstone Roads land, use easement across 11 Atkinsons Drive into the WTP</td>
<td>- Alignment along the farmers land (160 Gladstone Road) and use easement across 11 Atkinsons Drive into the WTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction technique</td>
<td>Trenching</td>
<td>Trenching</td>
<td>Trenching</td>
<td>Trenching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Engineers Estimate</td>
<td>$297,940.00</td>
<td>$284,724.00</td>
<td>$269,170.00</td>
<td>$285,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contingency 10%</td>
<td>$29,794.00</td>
<td>$28,472.40</td>
<td>$26,917.00</td>
<td>$28,550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Total</td>
<td>$327,734.00</td>
<td>$313,196.40</td>
<td>$296,087.00</td>
<td>$314,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Fees (half of budget)</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital Cost (including professional fees and contingency)</td>
<td>$368,000.00</td>
<td>$353,000.00</td>
<td>$336,000.00</td>
<td>$354,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Cost ($/annum)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions</td>
<td>- The existing tee connection and stacker pipe at the WTP could be reused for this design.</td>
<td>- We could get easements</td>
<td>- We could get an easement and buy some land from the farmer</td>
<td>- We could buy some land from the farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality Considerations</td>
<td>- We could get easements</td>
<td>- Clean out the raw line with a pig before commissioning, also flush and sterilise.</td>
<td>- We could get easements</td>
<td>- Clean out the raw line with a pig before commissioning, also flush and sterilise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backup Capacity</td>
<td>Yes - There will be a connection at to take water from the wells to the Woodend WTP if needed. The Pegasus WTP has PW1 well for backup supply</td>
<td>Yes - There will be a connection at to take water from the wells to the Woodend WTP if needed. The Pegasus WTP has PW1 well for backup supply</td>
<td>Yes - There will be a connection at to take water from the wells to the Woodend WTP if needed. The Pegasus WTP has PW1 well for backup supply</td>
<td>Yes - There will be a connection at to take water from the wells to the Woodend WTP if needed. The Pegasus WTP has PW1 well for backup supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>Good - Pipe material is PE, which is best in liquefaction prone soil. Pipe would be within an easement or in WDC Utilities land.</td>
<td>Good - Pipe material is PE, which is best in liquefaction prone soil. Pipe would be within an existing easement or in WDC Utilities land (once purchased from farmer).</td>
<td>Good - Pipe material is PE, which is best in liquefaction prone soil. Pipe would be within an existing easement or in WDC Utilities land (once purchased from farmer).</td>
<td>Best - Pipe material is PE, which is best in liquefaction prone soil. Pipe would be within WDC utilities land (once purchased from farmer).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Risks

- Three service crossings (Gas, HV, LV, Sewer and Chorus)
  - Need to apply for two easements which need to be agreed by WDC and Todds Property Group
  - Soil moisture content is low (according to ECAN soil moisture) and soil is Deep Sandy Loam therefore shielding will likely be required
- Need to apply for an easement which need to be agreed by Todds Property Group
  - Farmer may not want to sell the land for a reasonable price
  - Could take a long time to negotiate, which would mean a delay in the works
  - Soil moisture content is low (according to ECAN soil moisture) and soil is Deep Sandy Loam therefore shielding will likely be required
- Farmer may not want to sell the land for a reasonable price
  - Could take a long time to negotiate, which would mean a delay in the works
  - Soil moisture content is low (according to ECAN soil moisture) and soil is Deep Sandy Loam therefore shielding will likely be required

Advantages
(additional to those stated above)

- Within Road Reserve
- Trenching in Berm
- Trenching in Berm
- No Services would need to be crossed
- Lowest Total Capital Cost
- Trenching in Berm
- No Services would need to be crossed
- Within a utilities reserve (once the land is purchased)

Disadvantages
(additional to those stated above)

- Trench along the road, reinstatement of road surface and increased Traffic Management Costs
  - Pipe Construction in an easement which would need liaision for Maintenance and Construction
  - Acquiring an easement may impact the time of construction
- Pipe Construction in an easement which would need liaision for Maintenance and Construction
  - Acquiring an easement may impact the time of construction

Reason for dismissing Option

The reinstatement cost would be slightly more in this option as the reinstatement is along the road, rather than the berm.

The landowner was contacted by council staff and offered generous compensation for their land. They did not want to sell their land to the WDC, as they were concerned that their property would be left in a messy state.

The landowner was contacted by council staff and offered generous compensation for their land. They did not want to sell their land to the WDC, as they were concerned that their property would be left in a messy state.
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1.0  SCOPE OF REPORT

1.1  Survey Brief

To carry out a survey of trees located at the western aspect of Gladstone Park in context with the proposed Woodend – Pegasus Raw Water Main installation, see Appendix 1, details as provided by WDC.

The survey has identified the condition of tree assets within the Park boundary, in order to provide the client with details of tree condition and potential impacts of the proposed Raw Water installation.

1.2  Background

Mr Grant Stephens commissioned TreeTech Specialist Treecare Ltd™ to undertake a tree survey in accordance with the guiding principles of a Level 2 Basic Assessment upon the linear group of Pines (Pinus radiata) and Macrocarpa (Cupressus macrocarpa), located along the western aspect of Gladstone Park.

1.3  Report References

As a progressive company, we keep abreast of research data relating to Arboriculture. All observations, recommendations and works are based on current industry standard reference material and extensive FA Bartlett research findings, derived from the company’s facilities at the University of Reading in England as well as in Charlotte, North Carolina, in the USA.

Specific tree survey methodologies and references applied by TreeTech Specialist Treecare Ltd for this project include:


1.0 SCOPE OF REPORT (Continued)

1.4 Report Methodology and Limitations

This report is restricted to those trees shown on Appendix 1: Tree Location Plan attached to this report. The statements, findings and recommendations made within the report do not take into account any effects of extreme climate and weather incidences, vandalism, changes in the natural and built environment around the trees after the date of this report nor any damage whether physical, chemical or otherwise.

TreeTech Specialist Treecare Ltd cannot accept any liability in connection with the above factors nor where recommended tree management is not carried out in accordance with modern tree health care techniques, within the timelines proposed.

The trees were not climbed at the time of the tree survey.

All tree information and dimensions are accurate as captured on the day.

* Levels of Tree Assessment

Level 1 Limited Visual Assessment:
A visual assessment of an individual tree or a population of trees near a specified target, conducted from a specific perspective, in order to identify obvious defects or specified conditions. Observations are made from ground level and the tree is not climbed.

Level 2 Basic Assessment:
A detailed visual inspection and assessment of a tree and the surrounding site, found to possess a hazard. The basic assessment requires the tree risk assessor to walk completely around the tree. Tree dimensions are recorded using hand tools such as a diameter tape, laser range finder and a measuring tape.

Level 3 Advanced Assessment:
An advanced assessment is performed to provide detailed information about specific tree parts, defects, targets or site conditions. Methods of advanced assessment can include climbing inspections, decay detection, root excavations, lean monitoring and pull tests.

It is important to understand that as trees are living and dynamic organisms, it is not possible to maintain them totally tree of risk. Some level of risk must be accepted in order to experience the full range of benefits that trees provide. As such, we reference the recently published document by the National Tree Safety Group (NTSG): Common Sense Risk Management of trees (Forestry Commission 2011). This document provides guidance on trees and public safety in the UK for owners, managers and advisors.
2.0 TREE PROTECTION STATUS

The Resource Management Act (RMA) 1991 promotes the sustainable management of natural and physical resources such as land, air and water in New Zealand. The RMA – in particular the purpose and principles in Part 2, which emphasise the requirement to sustainably manage the use, development and protection of the natural and physical resources for current and future generations, taking into account the 'four well beings' (social, economic, cultural and environmental).

The Local Government Act 2002 - in particular section 14, Principles relating to local authorities. Sub-sections 14(c), (g) and (h) emphasise a strong intergenerational approach, considering not only current environments, communities and residents but also those of the future. They demand a future focussed policy approach, balanced with considering current needs and interests. Like the RMA, the provisions also emphasise the need to take into account social, economic and cultural matters in addition to environmental ones.

2.1 Protected Trees

No information has been provided relevant to Tree Protection for the subject assets, apart from ownership of the reserve area by WDC.
3.0 GENERAL SITE DETAILS

3.1 Weather Conditions at Time of Survey

At the time of the tree inspection, the weather was fine and dry, with a gusty north-westerly wind, providing optimal surveying conditions.

3.2 Site Location

Gladstone Park is located north-east of Woodend, bordering Pegasus, within Waimakariri District Council. The subject site is rugby sports fields, with private property to the north and west, Gladstone Road along the southern boundary and reserve area to the east.

3.3 Local Landscape Evaluation

The site features a predominance of Pine and Macrocarpa trees and maintained hedge. Adjacent properties contain a diverse mix of trees including deciduous and evergreen species.

3.4 Slopes and Boundaries

The site is predominantly level, with the southern sports field elevated approximately 1.5 metres above the northern sports field.

Pine and Macrocarpa planting along the western aspect is on a raised mound which descends to the western property boundary.
3.5 Underlying Soils

(Ref: S-map Soil Report, Landcare Research New Zealand Limited 2011-2015, Manaaki Whenua, dated: 14th August 2017). Using the S-mapOnline, ‘soil map viewer’ (http://smap.landcareresearch.co.nz) it has been determined that the underlying soils are:

- Kairaki – deep, well drained, sandy loam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Name (Soil code)</th>
<th>Area %</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kairaki (So 1)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>deep, well drained, sandy loam</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Easting/Northing: 1524953 5209100
4.0 TREE DETAILS, Photographic overview

Figure 1:
Root plate failure, tree supported by neighbours.

Figure 2:
Apical stem failure, upward growth maintained by secondary lateral branch, with decay at point of attachment.
Figure 3:
Entire tree failure, only stump remaining.

Figure 4: (above left) shows new Macrocarpa planting, eastern aspect of line of trees, middle of northern field.
Above right shows Macrocarpa-Pine-Macrocarpa, eastern aspect of line of trees, middle of southern field.
4.0 TREE DETAILS (Continued)

The tree line, oriented north-south along the western edge of the park is predominantly mature Pine, height up to 32.0 metres, DBH up to 700mm, — canopy spread is difficult to quantify as the group of trees has a unified canopy, with individual trees suppressed by those adjacent.

Along the eastern edge of the group Macrocarpa have been planted, (see figure 4). Considering their size, I can only assume that this planting may have been an attempt at establishing replacement shelter, as currently afforded by the larger Pines.

The Pines vary considerably in:

- Height and DBH, considerable variation in individual trees due to the close proximity planting which has suppressed many of the inner trees.
- Health, generally consistently fair health throughout the group, exception being smaller trees that have failed to establish and are now dead, standing.
- Structure, considerable variation in structure from well-established single leader trees, to root plate failure, (see figure 1), failed leader above ground level (see figure 2) and total tree failure (see figure 3) The failures to date provide an indication of the potential failures from hereon.

The Macrocarpa are generally in good health and structure, with the onset of phototropic suppression along the western aspect due to the close proximity of the Pines. The size of the Macrocarpa varies between 1.0 – 6.0 metres in height, and it is possible that the planting has taken place on separate occasions, with several years between planting.
5.0 DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

The proposed Raw Water installation per WDC information provides 2 options, see Appendix 1:

- Option 1 – this will require the removal of many of the western Pines from the group – a consequence to this will be that the remaining trees will be susceptible to wind throw, as the wind dynamics within the group will have been altered by removal of some of the trees.

- Option 2 – Trenching at 2.0 metres east of the Macrocarpa trees will not affect the root plate of the group, and is the preferable option from a tree perspective.

- Option 3 – This option would include removal of the Pines, with the Raw Water installation per Option 1. The benefit of this option is that the Pines, which are close to becoming over-mature, with increased failure potential, would no longer be an issue, allowing the newly planted Macrocarpa to spread and become the primary wind break. The Macrocarpa have established well generally, and the removal of the Pines would stimulate both calliper (secondary trunk thickening) and root spread into the hospitable soil type, to provide a line of trees that could be managed as a hedge, in the future. Pine removal would also allow for the planting of a second line of suitable species, west of the existing Macrocarpa, to provide a long-term rotation with screening.

The above options have considered only the arboricultural factors for this site, and have not included any comment or preference from a costing aspect.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report Status:</td>
<td>Final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report completed by:</td>
<td>Alan Parker, Cert Arb. Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Consultant Arborist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TreeTech Specialist Treecare Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Monday 19\textsuperscript{th} February, 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1 – Installation options provided by WDC
1. SUMMARY

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

Attachment
1. Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties
2. April 2018 Health and Safety Dashboard Report

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 180420043230

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

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

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

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS
   4.1. Not applicable.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS
   5.1 Not applicable

6. CONTEXT
   6.1. Policy
       Not applicable

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICER DUTIES</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF ACTIVITIES TO SUPPORT DISCHARGE OF DUTIES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **KNOW**
(To acquire, and keep up to date, knowledge of work health and safety matters) | • Updates on new activities/major contracts  
• Council reports to include Health and Safety advice as relevant  
• Audit Committee to receive minutes of Health and Safety Committee meetings  
• Update on legislation and best practice changes to Audit Committee | Various Committee reports  
Monthly, as required  
Two-monthly  
As required |
| **UNDERSTAND**
(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) | • Induction of new Council through tour of District and ongoing site visits.  
• H&S Risk register to Audit Committee  
• Training on H&S legislation and best practices updates  
• CCO activities reported to the Audit Committee | Start of each new term and as required  
Six monthly, or where major change  
At least annually  
At least annually |
| **RESOURCES**
(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) | • LTP or Annual Plan to have a specific report on H&S resources  
• Reports to Committees will outline H&S issues and resourcing, as appropriate | Annually  
As required |
| **MONITOR**
(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) | • Report to every Council meeting – standing agenda item to include Dashboard Update and any major developments  
• Risk register review by Audit Committee | Monthly  
Six monthly |
| **COMPLY**
(To ensure that the PCBU has, and implements, processes for complying with any duty or obligation of the PCBU under this Act) | • Programme of H&S internal work received by Audit Committee  
• Internal Audit reports to Audit Committee  
• Incident Investigations reported Audit Committee  
• Worksafe review of incidents/ accidents reported to Audit Committee | Annually  
As completed  
As required  
As required |
| **VERIFY**
(To verify the provision and use of the resources and processes) | • Receive ACC WSMP audit results and remedial actions (if any) reported to Audit Committee  
• Worksafe audits, if undertaken  
• Self-assessment against Canterbury Safety Charter reported to the Audit Committee | Two yearly  
As completed  
Annually |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Projects</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1: Improve Health and Safety data management, and encourage all staff to report incidents and hazards.</td>
<td>No change to prior month</td>
<td>Action 6: Contractor management process improvement project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 2: Implementation of Tech1/Mobile Hazard, Incident and Take-5 systems (carry-over project).</td>
<td>COMPLETE</td>
<td>Project is now in implementation phase. Stage 1: Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 3: Ensure that all contractors are managed according to health and safety procedural requirements, and improve staff knowledge of those requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stage 2 Steps:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 4: Improvement of Due Diligence Health and Safety reporting.</td>
<td>No change to prior month</td>
<td>1. Creation of interim contract register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 5: Review and re-develop internal health and safety auditing system, aligned with best practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Process mapping of Contract Management processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 6: Contractor management process improvement project.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Implementation of a Contract Management software system (e.g. TechnologyOne Contract Management module).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 7: Wellbeing strategy development and implementation project.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Roll-out of Take-5 form has been completed with field staff from Property, Redzone Regeneration, Greenspace, and Utilities and Roading during April.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 8: Lone working equipment procurement project.</td>
<td>Slightly behind schedule (less than one month)</td>
<td>A 'walkthrough' of the TechnologyOne Contract Management module was completed on 19 February, where Project Control Group plus other key staff had the opportunity to review the system. Report was submitted to Management Team to recommend that TechnologyOne Contract Management should be the software system of choice, however to delay implementation until after other key projects (Asset Management module in particular) are complete, complete. Report approved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGEND**

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

- **Accident**
- **Incident**
- **Notifiable Injury/Illness/Incident**
- **Near Miss**
- **Property Damage**
- **Fatality**
- **2003**
- **Total**

The chart shows the trend of incidents and accidents from April 2017 to the current date, with a peak in June and a significant decline in April.
### Incidents/Accidents - April 2018 (**as at Monday 16th April 2018**)

#### April 2017 to Current: Worker - Cause of Incident

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause of Incident</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fall, trip or slip</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being hit by moving objects</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hitting objects with part of body incl. cuts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body stressing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biological factors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mental stress</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sound or pressure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heat, radiation or energy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chemicals or other substances</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### April 2017 to Current: Worker Incident Reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accident</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Miss</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Damage</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notifiable Injury/Illness/Incident</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Incidents/Accidents:** 283
## Actions Relating To Highest H&S Risk Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Description</th>
<th>Rating (out of 25)</th>
<th>Current actions</th>
<th>Action Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Health and Safety Management</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>*Train all contract managers in H&amp;S processes/requirements at time of induction.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Develop comprehensive contract administration/contract management training package to deliver to all staff managing contractors.</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Identify volunteer groups and leaseholders that engage contractors on behalf of WDC and train in contract H&amp;S management processes.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Complete development of Safety in Design procedures and embed in design processes.</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Use &amp; Driver Safety</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>*Deliver driver training as per training strategy (Driver Safety / 4WD)</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Identify any drivers that require further progressive driver training on an as-needs basis and provide relevant training.</td>
<td>Managers &amp; Team Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Provide information and training regarding use of safety equipment such as fire extinguishers in staff pool vehicles to all drivers.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>*Undertake a review of operations to ensure that all activity and training is being carried out as per internal H&amp;S processes.</td>
<td>Liz Ashton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Conducting hazardous activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Injury/death</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverse Weather</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>*Develop protocols for response to adverse weather events (especially at night), and include in Safe Working in the Field Manual</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Include in Emergency Management Plan out-of-hours deployment in adverse weather.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airfield Operations</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>*Develop of Airfield Safety Committee and appointment of Airfield Safety Coordinator to administer all actions from safety review.</td>
<td>Craig Sargison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Develop of Airfield Operations Manual, and adoption of the manual by Council as the key safety document for the Airfield operations.</td>
<td>Craig Sargison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Provide regular Airfield Operations report to Council</td>
<td>Craig Sargison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE UTILITIES AND ROADING COMMITTEE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 20 MARCH 2018 AT 4.00PM

PRESENT
Councillor S Stewart (Chairperson), Mayor D Ayers, Deputy Mayor K Felstead, Councillors R Brine, J Meyer and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE
Councillors K Barnett, D Gordon, W Doody, Messrs J Palmer, (Chief Executive), G Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading), K Simpson (3 Waters Manager), C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager), C Parton (Wastewater Asset Manager), O Davies (Drainage Asset Manager), C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager), Mrs K Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager), S Collin (Infrastructure Strategy Manager), and A Smith (Committee Advisor)

1 APOLOGIES
There were no apologies.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
There were no conflicts of interest.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on Tuesday 12 December 2017

Moved Councillor Brine seconded Councillor Meyer

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Confirms, as a true and correct record, the minutes of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on Tuesday 12 December 2017.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
The Chair thanked Councillor Brine for Chairing the December 12 2017 committee meeting in her absence.

5 PRESENTATION
There was no presentations.
6 REPORTS

6.1 Ohoka Road Sewer Upgrades – Chris Parton (Wastewater Asset Manager)

Mr Parton presented this report to update the committee on investigations toward improving the wastewater reticulation system in Kaiapoi. There have been seven different options considered to improve the system which has experienced overflows and blockages from rainfall events in July and August 2017. Since then there has been three other occasions for the need to use sucker trucks to remove the sewerage from the reticulation system.

Moved Councillor Williams seconded Councillor Meyer

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 170928105216.

(b) Approves the adoption of Option 7 of diverting flow from the Kaikanui pump station into the Courtenay South and Courtenay North pump stations as the recommended solution.

(c) Notes that budget provision of $219,000 is included in the 2018/19 year of the draft Long Term Plan and that the works will be carried out in that year.

(d) Circulates the report to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board.

CARRIED

6.2 Update on the Management of Council Wastewater Treatment Plants – Chris Parton (Wastewater Asset Manager)

Mr Parton presented this report to update the committee on the management of wastewater treatment plants in the Council. The report dealt with five main topics.

1. Midges around wastewater treatment plants. The Council currently has a level of service target of no complaints of midges or other nuisance insects related to its wastewater treatment plants. This target is not always met. Advice has been sought from Beca and options are being reviewed on how to best manage nuisance insects around the Council treatment plant sites, taking into account environmental effects.

2. Generating odours around treatment plants – the level of service target has been set for zero complaints from residents who live near the plants. There has been one complaint received from Kaiapoi, which was received during a period of hot weather. This warm and dry weather caused excessive evaporation in the wetlands at the plant site. The Council has since raised the water level in the wetland.

3. Sea foam – this has been an issue for a number of years. Investigations are ongoing to determine if this is coming from the ocean outfall system. Council staff have been visiting the beach five times a week since 8 January this year and since then there has only been one instance of sea foam witnessed. This was analysed and did not indicate any concerning levels. Members of the public who frequent the beach will continue to advise the Council of any presence of sea foam.

4. Efforts to minimise risk of avian botulism outbreak occurring in the future - This issue is something that the Council has been experiencing for the past five years in Kaiapoi, Rangiora, and Woodend wastewater treatment plants. This year the number of birds removed from Council plant sites is 1,400, which is considerably lower than that of 2015, when 5,500 birds
were removed from treatment plant sites. Birds are being removed daily from the Kaiapoi site and every second day at Rangiora and Woodend sites as a best practice measure to minimize the impact of the disease. Council has sought advice from Keystone Ecology and the Department of Conservation and will continue to do so in future.

5. Efforts to determine the source of elevated enterococci levels in the Ocean Outfall – there has been some instances of elevated levels of enterococci recorded as part of the sampling undertaken to meet resource consent conditions for the ocean outfall. Council has commissioned a number of tests to determine the cause of these elevated levels. To date in the 2018 financial year Council has not breached its resource consent limit, but if levels remain elevated a consent breach is possible.

Councillor Williams asked if the levels of ecoli found in the sea foam tested were from the ocean outfall. Mr Parton suggested it was not likely that this had come from the ocean outfall, but there is a greater chance that it come from the Waimakariri River.

Councillor Barnett questioned the spending of $50,000 budget for midge and insect management at the Kaiapoi wastewater treatment plant. Mr Parton said this would have been included in the budget even if there had not been any complaints on this issue.

Councillor Meyer asked about the levels of birds that are dying at the Council treatment plants and Mr Parton considers the levels this year are still serious losses. The possible link between fewer numbers of birds at the ponds and the increase in midges was noted.

Councillor Stewart asked what insecticide was proposed for the midges and is there any guarantees that this won’t affect the bird life or other insects that are beneficial. Mr Parton noted that a pilot project has been recommended to control midges and the different methods proposed. Information on the particular types of insecticides that would be used was not known at this time, but this information will be sought and provided to Councillors.

Councillor Stewart questioned the term of “sludge becoming septic”. Mr Parton noted this referred to an occurrence during hot and dry weather this summer, when wetlands dried out and the sludge on the edge of the wetlands became exposed to the air and had an offensive odour.

Moved Councillor Brine seconded Mayor Ayers

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 180301021693.

(b) Supports that Council staff will make a staff submission in the range of $50,000 to the draft Long Term Plan for midge and insect management at the Kaiapoi wastewater treatment plant.

(c) Notes that Council staff will continue to monitor for the presence of sea foam along the beach between the Waimakariri River mouth and 1 km north of Council’s ocean outfall.

(d) Notes that Council staff will compile information relative to avian botulism and develop a comprehensive management strategy to minimize the chances of future incidences of avian botulism occurring.

(e) Notes that Council staff will continue work to determine the cause of elevated levels of enterococci in Council’s ocean outfall pipeline.
(f) Circulates the report to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board, the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board, and the Woodend-Sefton Community Board for information.

CARRIED

Councillor Brine believes this should be put to Council for consideration during the LTP process. Councillor Brine also noted that the local duck population has reduced numbers.

Councillor Atkinson suggested that if nutrients weren’t in the water, the birds wouldn’t be dying and believes the Council needs to find a way to correct this issue. Councillor Atkinson has photos available that he wishes to share with all Councillors.

Councillor Barnett noted that the Council needs to look at all the evidence on this issue, before making any ecological change. It is important that the Council tries to stay on top of the issue but it is also important that the whole picture needs to be looked at.

Councillor Stewart shares concerns with the wildlife on the ponds, and these sewerage treatment ponds include high level of chemicals and nutrients, a biological treatment system. It is unfortunate that these ponds attract the birdlife and other animals because of the water.

6.3 Poyntzs Road Source Upgrade Project – Consultation – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)

Mr Roxburgh presented this report to provide an update on the progress with consultation for the Poyntzs Road source upgrade project and seek approval on the proposed way forward. The water scheme does not comply with the current drinking water standards and is deemed to present a health risk regarding protozoa. There is also a risk of nitrate levels becoming an issue in the future. This is a revised timeframe for this project and there are many different parties involved in consultation, including the West Eyreton Water Supply Advisory Group, Summerhill Water Supply Advisory Group, Oxford-Ohoka Community Board, Rangiora-Ashley Community Board and three respective water supply schemes (Poyntzs Road, West Eyreton and Summerhill water supply schemes).

Issues were raised on funding options that were presented at meetings with the water supply advisory groups. This has impacted on timing with the budget for the project already being included in the draft Long Term Plan while the required targeted consultation has not been able to be completed.

Mr Roxburgh noted that nitrate levels are below the maximum value, but over time it is likely that these will go up rather than go down. The testing has never exceed the value.

Moved Councillor Williams seconded Councillor Brine

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee recommends:

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180305022630.

(b) Notes that staff have not been able to complete the required community consultation with the Poyntzs Road, West Eyreton and Summerhill water supply schemes regarding the proposed Poyntzs Road source
upgrade prior to or to coincide with the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan consultation.

(c) **Notes** that the budget allowance of $793,000 for the Poyntzs Road scheme source upgrade in the 2018/19 financial has been included for consultation as part of the draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

(d) **Resolves** that the physical works that this budget is intended for will not be implemented until Council has specifically approved this occurring, following consultation with the relevant advisory groups, community boards and communities.

(e) **Notes** that this strategy will give staff the required time to undertake the necessary consultation, without requiring that the project be delayed for an unnecessarily long period of time.

(f) **Notes** that the significant rating implication of the proposed expenditure does not eventuate until the 2019/20 financial year, by which time targeted consultation will have been completed.

(g) **Circulates** this report to the Oxford-Ohoka and Rangiora Ashley Community Boards for their information.

**CARRIED**

7 REPORTS/MEMOS FOR INFORMATION ONLY

7.1 **Pedestrian Refuges in the Ashgrove School environs – Kathy Graham (Journey Planner/Road Safety Co-ordinator)**

(refer to attached copy of report no. 171201130547 to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting of 13 December 2017)

7.2 **Request Authorization for Direct Engagement of Kauri Park Nurseries – Chris Parton (Wastewater Asset Manager)**

(refer to attached copy of report no. 180208013505 to the Management Team meeting of 26 February 2018)

7.3 **Drainage Maintenance Contract – Simon Collin (Infrastructure Strategy Manager)**

(refer to report no. 180213014265 to the Management Team meeting of 26 February 2018). *This report has been circulated to members separately.*

Item 7.3 was considered in the public excluded portion of the meeting.

Moved Councillor Stewart seconded Councillor Brine

**THAT** the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Receive Items 7.1 to 7.2 for information.

**CARRIED**
8 PORTFOLIO UPDATES

8.1 Roading – Councillor John Meyer

Councillor Meyer noted the good progress with the new road in the Kaiapoi red zone.

8.2 Drainage and Stockwater – Councillor Sandra Stewart

Councillor Stewart noted there is a current round of the Rural Drainage Advisory Group meetings underway. It has been beneficial to be able to share with members of these groups the projected LTP drainage rates.

The Stormwater Drainage and Watercourse Protection Bylaw has been considered in two sessions by the Hearing Panel. This will be presented to Council for adoption.

Solution and emergency work is underway with the Springbrook subdivision flooding issue following the February 20 rain event. Councillor Gordon commended the Council staff for the response in this matter.

8.3 Utilities (Water Supplies and Sewer) – Cr Paul Williams

Councillor Williams has attended two meetings recently including one on the new well for Oxford Rural No 1.

There is a Public Meeting being held tonight to discuss the Garrymere Water Scheme, and any members who are able to attend to support staff at this meeting are encouraged to attend.

8.4 Solid Waste– Cr Robbie Brine

Matters to be discussed at the upcoming Briefing following this meeting.

9 MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Moved Councillor Stewart Seconded Mayor Ayers

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

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution, are as follows:
This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

CLOSED MEETING

Moved Councillor Stewart seconded Mayor Ayers

THAT the open meeting resumes and that the resolution made with the public excluded remains public excluded.

CARRIED

10 QUESTIONS

There were no questions.

11 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

There was no urgent general business.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 5.10pm.

CONFIRMED

________________________
Chairman

________________________
Date
At the conclusion of the meeting, there was a briefing for the committee, on the following matters:

- **20 February 2018 Flood Event – 3 Waters Debrief**
- **Pond C Update**
- **Recycling and upcoming kerbside collection contract**
MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL HUI OF NGĀI TŪĀHURIRI RŪNANGA AND WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD IN COUNCIL CHAMBERS, RANGIORA SERVICE CENTRE, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON THURSDAY 22 MARCH 2018 AT 7.25PM.

PRESENT

Rūnanga: Gabrielle Huria (acting Chair of Runanga Executive Committee), Te Maire Tau, Hoana Burgman, Clare Williams, Tehau Anglem, Makarini Reupene, Richard Bennett, Jasmine Burgman, Kyle Davis, Tania Wati, Meri Jacobs, Mary Te Aika (Schmidt), Mahara Te Aika, Denise Hamilton, Kevin Hamilton and Rhys Head.


Community Board members Jim Gerard, Doug Nicholl, Jackie Watson, John Archer, Judith Hoult, James Ensor, Rhonda Mather and Philip Redmond.

Council staff: Jim Palmer (Chief Executive), Gerard Cleary (Manager, Utilities and Roading), Simon Markham (Manager, Strategy & Engagement), Craig Sargison (Manager, Community & Recreation), Nick Harrison (Manager Regulation), Kalley Simpson (3 Waters Manager), Duncan Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager, Regeneration), Chris Brown (Community & Green Space Manager), Geoff Meadows (Policy Manager), Chris Parton (Wastewater Asset Manager), Simon Hart (Business & Centres Manager), Tessa Sturley, (Community Team Leader), Madeleine Burdon (Community Development Advisor), and Sarah Nichols (Governance Manager).

1. WELCOME
David Ayers, as Chair, welcomed all attendees.

2. APOLOGIES
Moved: Mayor Ayers seconded: Councillor Atkinson
That the following apologies be accepted:
Aroha Crofts, Michelle Philpott, Trisha Anglem, Councillor Robbie Brine, Board members Shona Powell, Martin Pinkham, John Lynn, Mark Brown, Duncan Lundy, Chris Greengrass, Andrew Thompson and staff Jeff Millward and Liz Ashton, tendered apologies for absence.
Apologies for late arrival were tendered by Councillor Gordon and Board member Jim Gerard (7.35pm).
An apology for early departure was tendered by Councillor Neville Atkinson for 7.45pm.

CARRIED

3. MINUTES
The minutes were taken as read.
Moved: Councillor Blackie seconded: Councillor Doody
THAT the minutes of the annual hui of Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga and the Waimakariri District Council held on 16 March 2017, are received as a correct record.

CARRIED
4. MATTERS ARISING
Nil.

5. BUSINESS
5.1. Tuahiwi Roading and Footpaths – Gerard Cleary, Manager Roading & Utilities

G Cleary provided an overview of previously raised matters, advising that repairs to the footpath had occurred and the extension to the footpath had recently been completed. No other footpath work was proposed at this time. The sealing at the end of Waikoruru Road was completed several weeks ago.

It was advised that proposed works on the Rangiora-Woodend Road would occur in the near future and involve road markings providing a right hand turn bay at five-cross-roads. The work can occur within existing road reserve.

G Cleary advised that there would be further discussions and consultation to occur on future roading upgrades in the Tuahiwi area, especially if they were to propose land purchase. Any future works was not yet programmed.

G Cleary informed the Hui that the Rangiora-Woodend Path (cycle and walking path) was due for completion in May. Comment was made of the popularity of the Passchendaele Path between Kaiapoi and Rangiora, and the anticipation of similar high usage for the new Rangiora-Woodend Path.

Denise – enquired if there was any proposal to extend the Rangiora-Woodend Path through Tuahiwi. G Cleary responded that it would be suitable to propose such a project through the Long Term Plan. Denise commented on increased traffic, vehicle speed and how a walkway would assist the safety of locals and encourage walking and cycling.

G Cleary commented that enforcement matters lay with the Police, and reflected on current signage and flashing speed signs.

Joan commented on the narrowness of the current footpath, and it was particularly noticeable for mobility scooter users. It was not possible for another person to walk beside a person in a mobility scooter due to the narrowness of the path.

Tania asked if there were any plans with NZTA for a shared path. J Palmer advised the new Government were more interested in cycle/walking paths, reflecting on government policy, and the possibility of more news in the coming months from the government. Management were not aware of what may be proposed by the Government or NZTA going forward. J Palmer commented on the costs involved in the walkways, being $1.2m to $1.5m each and the need for substantive funding from the Government to bring them to fruition.

Denise stated the group would be asking the same questions next year. J Palmer noted the feedback. G Cleary commented that any extension of pathways was getting momentum however the Council has not yet identified the next priority. He agreed with comments relating to the benefits to the whole district with the current new paths.

Doug Nicholl enquired, if there was to be such a path, where would the people of Tuahiwi want the path to start and finish. Denise spoke of starting at five-cross-roads and continuing down to Church Bush Road; and it would need to be wider. Staff noted the feedback.

Richard suggested such a pathway could become a cultural path, incorporating Marae signage, and an experience for visitors to the area. G Cleary agreed signage would be a good starting point and noted comments for the Long Term Plan.
5.2. **Water Management** - Gerard Cleary and Kalley Simpson, 3Waters Manager

K Simpson commented on stormwater matters advising that works were still to be undertaken on the Tuahiwi Stream. It was acknowledged the culverts had been identified after the June 2014 floods to alleviate flooding in the area.

K Simpson spoke of the drainage maintenance contract and explained it was combined with roading for rural works and greenspace for urban works. Staff were working with Sicon (existing roading contractor). Sicon had sub-contracted Michael Stopworth for work involving the Tuahiwi area, and staff outlined the work involved. K Simpson offered assurance that cultural and environmental issues would be covered appropriately for any works that will occur.

Te Maire clarified the area involved and enquired about all the paddocks that have their own drains that flow into the main drain and if work could occur at the same time. Te Maire suggested staff talk to Michael Stopworth about contacting such property owners, so they could employ him for private work. Te Maire addressed the Hui on the importance of the linkage drains being maintained as the area is like a swamp in winter.

K Simpson spoke of two taps being installed at the urupa in the next four to six weeks. Gabrielle was very pleased to hear this was occurring.

C Parton provided an overview of five environmental issues. He emphasised the desire to be good neighbours in relation to the operation of the waste water facilities, particularly the control of odours and midges. The Council had commissioned consultants Beca to address the matter of midges at the treatment plants, with a proposal to gather information, and run a pilot plan before deciding on future treatment methods. Staff advised only one complaint regarding odour at the Kaiapoi waste water facility had been received this year.

Staff commented on two issues related to the ocean outfall operation. A question followed, asking if the ocean outfall contributes to the sea foam issues. Staff explained there was regular monitoring on the beach; daily in the summer. Samples had been taken and tested once and results did not indicate a definitive linkage to the ocean outfall. Staff assured attendees that the matter will continue to be monitored and it was proposed a report would be considered at an upcoming Council meeting.

Staff advised that at the ocean outfall spikes of bacteria were detected in the wastewater samples and this week a consultant had been contracted to investigate and report back in several months’ time.

Clare explained where sludge and foam occurs near the ocean outfall. Makarini reflected on the ocean outfall sludge matter, odour and had seen samples as he had spoken to the water testers. Makarini was keen to see the next stage of information. C Parton explained the next phase of testing would begin in late April.

Staff acknowledged avian botulism with examples at Kaiapoi and Rangiora treatment plants for the past five years. It was advised that this year it primarily occurred at Kaiapoi. C Parton explained that a contractor was on site daily removing dead birds and continuing to monitor the situation. Staff were taking the matter seriously and investigating what could be done to minimise it reoccurring in future years.

Councillor Blackie commented on the recent Stormwater Bylaw Review and the effects on property. K Simpson outlined the process to date, the new name of the bylaw (The Stormwater Drainage and Water Course Protection Bylaw) and what aspects the bylaw covers.

A question from the floor enquired if the stormwater is flushed before going out to sea. K Simpson explained the network discharge consents required to be submitted by June 2018, which also sets out how the Council covers the urban area. K Simpson explained that with existing roads there is no treatment, however going forward, for any new roads consideration of drainage systems will be given during the planning phase.
Urban stormwater is tested for metals such as copper, lead and zinc. K Simpson spoke of current issues and funding coming through in 2023, along with possible treatment mechanisms. G Cleary commented on stringent testing levels for zinc and copper in urban waterways outlined in the urban plan. G Cleary commented on how brake pads were the biggest cause of lead contamination and zinc that comes off roofing. If people used other car parts/roofing that does not have these metals in the manufacture, then a reduction of contamination would occur. Staff are continuing to work with other councils through the Stormwater Forum.

Tania advised it was beneficial to consult with MKT early, ie at the design stage. Staff noted the comments.

5.3. Kaiapoi and Cam Rivers Enhancement - Gerard Cleary and Kalley Simpson

G Cleary spoke about the Kaiapoi River and outlined the Rehabilitation River Group work and significant plantings. Kaiapoi River is a challenging environment for waterway management and G Cleary explained its history and the streams that feed it along with the back up from the Waimakariri River. G Cleary commented on concerns of plant die-back. Environment Canterbury (Ecan) studies show salt water travelling further upstream than originally thought. Several aspects attribute to this; sea level rise is one key aspect and will become more of a problem over time. The other aspect is the three contributory flows of freshwater coming in and if the Waimakariri River flow comes up high then that has an impact on the Kaiapoi River. The Kaiapoi River first showed signs of salt intrusion in 2012 and the Ecan studies are ongoing. Staff will continue to keep you informed as this affects the riverbanks.

A question was posed if Ecan is investigating aquifer levels and if it has an effect on salt water levels. G Cleary responded that staff are working with Ecan and acknowledged the linkage with aquifer levels and water flow. He commented generally about Silverstream, nitrate levels and the water draw from irrigators. G Cleary spoke of the complexities of irrigation impacts on the environment, change to dairy farm practices and ongoing research. The matter is a high on the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee radar.

G Cleary spoke of dredging the Kaiapoi River and silting issues, often caused from the Waimakariri River and the issues for boat navigation. The Coast Guard had advised that at low tide there are issues for navigation of vessels. Staff were looking at options such as dredging for a navigation channel and were asking Ecan if it has an impact on the salt issues.

Makarini asked when the Kaiapoi River was last dredged. Staff advised that the river was last dredged back in the 1960’s, other than a channel for the Tuhoe a few years ago. Makarini asked if sediment dredged will have an impact on the river ie contaminants. G Cleary commented that by dredging at the wrong time of year it would have impacts, but salt may also be assisting with reducing risk of contaminants.

K Simpson spoke of a $200,000 fund for the enhancement of the Cam River catchment. Work was likely to look at silt traps and create an enlarged basin, whilst other sections of the catchment would have bed raking. This process was explained as an agitation process. K Simpson commented on Dr Henry Hudson’s advice and University of Canterbury suggestions following studies. Bank stabilisation work was also being considered with a likelihood of pilot areas first to ensure the projects were targeting the most appropriate areas.

K Simpson commented on Tuahiwi Stream, and work driven by Ecan, explaining the area involved by five-cross-roads and other area by Church Bush Road with a silt trap wetland. He also commented about protection mechanisms for the lower Cam River area.

Rhys enquired further on the bed raking process. K Simpson explained bed raking by way of shaking gravel to loosen shingle. J Archer commented on bull rush and water cress
was used many years ago to assist cleaning of rivers, however modern practices remove such plants from the waterways. J Archer felt the methods were done for drainage purposes and not for wider ecological benefits. K Simpson acknowledged the comments, other plants used now that enhance aquatic life and longer term benefits. K Simpson explained some works on two channels occurring with planting on the upper banks, and benefits particularly during flooding events.

Joan enquired if there was any law requiring fencing around the Cam River. K Simpson advised there were no regional plan comments on excluding animals from major rivers, but there was comment on smaller contributories and advice to land holders. Joan commented on cattle walking in the stream. K Simpson advised if the Council know more details they would pass the information on to Ecan.

Te Maire reflected on Tuahiwi’s history as a place of residence and food gathering. During the 1960’s that role played by the village declined in part due to impacts of local farmers and zoning practices of the Council. Te Maire asked if the village could be re-zoned to not to allow cattle on the land. G Cleary commented on land use.

S Markham commented on land use and such conversations to be had now are timely because of the work being done on the District Plan Review. He explained working with MKT was currently underway and how early conversations would aid an easier way forward through the required RMA process.

Rhys stated he would like to see improvement to Mahinga Kai areas and work involved to cleanse it. S Markham commented on the Zone Implementation Plan Addendum (ZIPA) and how to work through Waimakariri Water Zone Committee. S Stewart commented on existing rules under Plan Change 4; ie no stream should have cattle. She encouraged people to use the Ecan hotline. Comments were acknowledged.

A Blackie enquired how many dairy/beef units were operating in the wider Tuahiwi area. The attendees were unsure of the volume.

Mary reflected on watercress abundance and taste as a child, and how in the last 50 years the stream (that flows to the Cam River) does not grow watercress. She acknowledged the family had a milk shed up the road away from the stream but was unsure what stopped water cress growing. Her nephew said properties on Greens Road have septic tank that runs into the creek. It was asked if testing could be done on the creek. Staff advised it was an Ecan matter. Joan acknowledged it was better to work with WDC to ask to pass information onto Ecan, as residents felt they may progress matters further by taking that route.

Makarini commented on the importance of drainage in relation to Mahinga Kai.

D Nicholl commented on watercress at markets can only be commercially grown and the market had banned all watercress harvested from drains. Te Maire advised he had had scientists look at that matter however, the Reserve (MR873) was set aside for the purposes of Mahinga Kai.

5.4. **MR873 Residential Development** - Simon Markham, Manager Strategy & Engagement and Chris Parton, Wastewater Asset Manager

S Markham outlined the zoning provisions, opportunities for cluster housing and work done to date. It was advised several cluster housing applications were underway. These applications had highlighted impacts on the sewerage system.

C Parton outlined both short and longer term plans in relation to sewerage improvements, and referred to several maps, via PowerPoint. The current pump system was near capacity and improvements to serve new areas were required. A longer range pump station to handle the required capacity and the starting of a master plan for 50 years (and beyond) for potential residential areas was discussed.
S Markham commented on the economics and value for money of having a master plan to guide the best use of funds. The Council acknowledged the financial contribution from Ngai Tuahuriri towards assisting or those that will connect to the proposed systems. Coming up there will need to be discussion with land owners on requirements and gauging the level of interest, including potential cluster housing possibilities. Following that staff can undertake realistic costings. A Hui at the Marae would occur and the Council would like to work together on future plans with the Tuahiwi community.

Te Maire commented about an agreement. S Markham responded with information related to the second and third stages (1-3 years) of the initial extensions but the need also for a long term strategy. Te Maire advised the community can contribute. The only concern is at Church Bush Road and issues involving building at that location due to flooding issues.

Tania asked what was included in the LTP and where is the budget for Tuahiwi. C Parton explained that in years four and five there were planned upgrades of approximately $2m and explained possible options as part of the master plan.

Tania advised MKT would like to be part of the master planning. Staff acknowledged the comments.

Richard clarified the areas of cluster housing. S Markham explained further in response. Richard asked if some zone changes could occur. S Markham explained the District Plan Review was the opportunity currently occurring for that and some similar questions that had been raised through MKT. The Council would need to work through various options with the community.

Te Maire acknowledged the 2015 plan (cluster housing), but it would be good if all the residents views were represented. S Markham advised now was the right time to discuss such matters.

Te Maire asked C Parton if work can link into the LTP. He stated the village already has a series of principles on MR873. The Runanga would like to move the principles through the Runanga Executive in April and May. Rather than react, through MKT, we negotiate with the Council then we talk for the next 20 years but only can do if the Runanga can invest.

S Markham acknowledged further conversations were required between the parties.

J Palmer acknowledged the District Plan and what that does and provisions to achieve outcomes were explained in relation to the LTP purpose and statutory requirements. However these processes do not lock out conversations for resolution of the Council unless it involves many $millions, then a wider conversation with the wider community is required.

J Palmer acknowledged ongoing conversations.

Richard spoke of the current situation and impacts on families. Te Maire commented on Maori land title and his suggested process to create another title that is not Crown title or Maori title but its own tribal title. He acknowledged the assistance of the Council would be needed to progress such an action. J Palmer commented the Council would like to help Te Ngai Tuahuriri.

Some general discussion followed.

5.5. **Kaiapoi Regeneration Areas** - Craig Sargison, Manager Community & Recreation and Duncan Roxborough, Implementation Project Manager

C Sargison acknowledged the Runanga representative on the Regeneration Steering Group and was always happy to have further conversations in relation to progressing matters.
D Roxborough commented on the new terrace building and pontoons. Currently plans were going through the Resource Consent process. Staff had taken on board the Runanga feedback, including dredging issues and cultural design elements through the terraces. D Roxborough outlined budgets and proposed works timing. More information was available in the LTP consultation document and on the Council website.

C Sargison commented on incorporating further conversations and opportunities relating to commercial operations, including trees.

5.6. **Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw and Fenton Reserve Areas** - Geoff Meadows, Policy Manager

G Meadows advised on the NPBB Implementation Plan and mentioned side agreements (signed with horse trainers and kite surfers), however there was an urgent need to progress matters with the Fenton Reserve Trustees. G Meadows sought advice from the Runanga on who staff should liaise with.

Makarini outline information sent in, including the Code of Conduct and a few minor tweaks required to finalise. G Meadows advised documents mentioned were only the first aspect of the overall Plan and the second, non-actioned aspect involved the Memorandum of Understanding and Fenton Reserve Agreements.

G Meadows commented on the Implementation Plan Working Group and Greenspace staff working through the logistics. G Meadows was happy to take advice on who should be on the group.

5.7. **LTP 2018-28 Briefing on Key Issues** - Jim Palmer, Chief Executive

J Palmer outlined the key issues contained in the Draft Long Term Plan.
- Rubbish collection choices implemented from 1 July 2019.
- Multi-use sports facility
- Rangiora Library extension
- Regeneration, including Mahinga Kai and working together to secure government funding
- Wastewater Network Upgrades
- Flooding mitigation
- New library and community space in Woodend/Pegasus
- Rangiora Service Centre alterations
- Skewbridge Road alignment/replacement

Te Maire signalled interest in any commercial development in the Kaiapoi Red Zone areas.

J Palmer explained how the Council was in the concept planning phase now and would welcome any such conversations and this was an opportunity to work together.

J Palmer advised the average rates increase for the coming financial year was 4.4%.

5.8. **Council and Runanga Engagement** - Jim Palmer and David Ayers

J Palmer reflected on tonight’s issues discussed and reflected on issues and conversations that need to occur; Mahinga Kai, water, engagement and working together, and the District Plan. The Council want to be closely aligned with Ngāi Tūhuriri for such matters as economic partnerships and reflected on Runanga principles. It was suggested that over the next few months the Council and Runanga have further discussions on how we can be effective together.
Tania enquired about a Maori ward (electoral). J Palmer explained the legal aspects and timing of the next Representation Review and other options available. Te Maire said Ngai Tuahuriri were interested in co-governance. Economic drivers will be involved and he commented on rates that the tribe generate. Te Maire stated if Ngai Tuahuriri are investing, they expect a level of governance involvement. J Palmer posed the question if there were other ways of giving effect to Ngai Tuahuriri aspirations. Gabrielle stated Ngai Tuahuriri were more interested in co-governance rather than one person on the Council. Gabrielle spoke of the importance of finding other ways to co-operate together.

6. **GENERAL BUSINESS - GABRIELLE HURIA AND DAVID AYERS**

Mary raised a matter relating to a power station proposed on a family paddock that had no consultation. J Palmer understood MainPower had purchased the land to strengthen the local power supply requirements. S Markham would check with the planners, but the last known contact was in 2008. The plan is not provided for in the District Plan and it would require a Resource Consent, through RMA processes.

Mary strongly expressed her views. J Palmer suggested the Runanga have a conversation with MainPower. He explained there was a change in the management structure and they may not be aware of the current situation. The new Chief Executive of MainPower was very open to conversations with the community.

Gabrielle thanked the Council for hosting the evening and had enjoyed the many conversations. Gabrielle stated that Ngai Tuahuriri were committed to working with the Council and finding resolutions. Ngai Tuahuriri have a focus on regional development and partnerships.

Mayor Ayers thanked for everyone for their attendance and feedback. He reflected on the importance of the coming together of the Council and Runanga and on the importance of partnership for the district. It was important to move forward together he stated.

Mayor Ayers thanked for everyone for their attendance and feedback.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS THE MEETING CLOSED, WITH A KARAKIA FROM TE MAIRE TAU, AT 9.31PM.

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 27 MARCH 2018 AT 1.00PM.

PRESENT
Councillor W Doody (Chairperson), Mayor D Ayers, Councillors K Barnett, A Blackie, R Brine and D Gordon.

IN ATTENDANCE
Councillors K Felstead, P Williams and J Meyer
Messrs C Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation), C Brown (Community Green Space Manager), M Greenwood (Aquatic Facilities Manager), Mrs T Sturley (Community Team Manager), Mrs P Ashbey (District Libraries Manager) and Mrs E Stubbs (Minute Secretary).

1 APOLOGIES
An apology for absence was received and sustained from Councillor Atkinson.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee held on Tuesday 13 February 2018

Moved Councillor Gordon seconded Councillor Brine

THAT the Community and Recreation committee:

(a) Amends the minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee, held on Tuesday 13 February 2018. Item 5.3, page 4, has minor punctuation corrections. Item 6.2, page 6, last paragraph should read ‘...it is important for this Council to align with this and there will be a hui here on 29 October’.

(b) Confirms the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee, held on Tuesday 13 February 2018, as a true and accurate record, with the above amendments.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
Nil.

5 DEPUTATIONS

5.1 Waimak United Football Club

C Sargison advised that a representative of the Waimak United Football Club was unable to attend and instead C Brown would provide a quick update.

C Brown advised that the Waimak United Football Club (WUF) had a new President – Marcus Deedman. At the start of the last playing season the club made changes in order to recover costs. Charges to members were increased
by a considerable amount making the club one of the most expensive in the greater Christchurch area. As a result members switched to Christchurch clubs. The President and a number of Board Members resigned and the decision was made to reduce player fees. From 1100 members, last year player numbers reduced to 850 members and around 690 this year. Those members that had left would not return straight away even with changes made. Based on those member numbers, the Club had indicated they would struggle to pay $10,000 for the use of the artificial turf and would look to make a submission to the LTP to request to use the turf at no cost to the Club. The Club were happy to open their books. C Brown advised that they would assist the club as much as they could.

Questions

W Doody asked if the Club had exclusive rights to Kendall Park and C Brown replied no. The Club had advised that $10,000 was the maximum they could pay. Unless it was a Saturday WUF would move aside for any other team who would pay to use. Kendall Park was in the process of accreditation for rugby and if a rugby team wanted to train on a certain night and paid for that use, WUF would not be able to use it on that night. He noted that if WUF did not pay for use of the turf then it made it difficult to charge other clubs to use. It was something the Council would need to consider.

K Barnett asked how it would affect the operations budget going forward and C Brown replied that it effected the replacement budget for the turf and would mean the Council would have to foot the bill for replacement.

K Barnett asked what the situation would be if a group outside of the Waimakariri District wanted to use and pay for the turf and C Brown advised that those details had not been worked out.

C Sargison suggested it would be helpful to arrange a meeting pre the Annual Plan hearing to explain the issues. He noted that other clubs were more active in seeking sponsorship than WUF. He was concerned there was an expectation that the Club could submit to the Plan and have an automatic waiver of fees, it would create issues and set a precedent with other clubs. A grant for fees could be considered as that would still mean the club paid fees.

5.2 Mainpower Oval

C Brown took the opportunity to provide an update on the Mainpower Oval turf. At the request of the Auckland team the umpire stopped a game at the oval, as a result the field no longer has a warrant of fitness (WoF) for first class cricket. A turf expert had advised that the top needed to be taken off and turf experts would be employed to undertake the work. The Canterbury Country Cricket Association (CCC) would likely prepare a submission to the LTP for the cost of retaining a WoF as the costs are increasing and they would request more assistance from Council going forward.

Questions

W Doody noted that in 2021 the Women’s World Cricket Tournament would be held and the first class cricket status would be important for that.

R Brine asked if Selwyn District Council contributed to pitches at Lincoln and C Brown replied he did not believe so. Lincoln was under New Zealand Cricket whereas Mainpower Oval was the responsibility of Canterbury Country Cricket. C Brown noted that CCC received an annual Council grant of $14,000 and assistance with mowing and fertiliser.
6 REPORTS

6.1 Models for Community Safety and Community Development – Tessa Sturley (Community Team Manager)

T Sturley presented this report which provided an overview of three models for building stronger communities. She highlighted as well as approving reaccreditation as an International Safe Community, that the Committee noted the value of an alignment with Healthy Greater Christchurch.

T Sturley highlighted the comparison table the Safe, Healthy and Welcoming Cities community models noting the Safe Communities model covered more community priorities. She noted funders recognised Safe Communities. T Sturley advised that accreditation for Safe Communities cost very little - $2000 every 5 years and its essential approach was community led.

T Sturley advised that in practice Healthy Cities was not an accredited programme and collaboration was only at management level. However she advised that being at that table with Christchurch City Council provided good regional connections, creating a local mechanism to advocate to central government.

Questions

D Gordon referred to the Welcoming Cities pilot and asked if there was anything stopping Waimakariri District looking to that in the future and retaining Safe Communities status. T Sturley advised that staff had looked closely at Welcoming Cities and what Waimakariri did aligned with that. To adopt and apply another model required significant staff resource. C Sargison commented that reaccreditation was a regular event and other models could be looked at then, we are not stuck with one model indefinitely. He noted that the Safe Communities model had status with the Rata Foundation who were key funders of a lot of work in the district.

K Barnett asked if the Healthy Cities and Welcoming Cities were subsets of Safe Communities. T Sturley replied no, they were recognised as different models. K Barnett clarified, asking if Waimakariri were already aligned with Welcoming Cities and C Sargison replied yes.

K Barnett asked if reaccreditation required a lot of resource and T Sturley replied that it was significantly less than previously, as they had been through the process three times now.

W Doody asked if Safe Communities were now coming to the community for reaccreditation and C Sargison commented that was part of the process.

Moved Councillor Barnett seconded Councillor Gordon

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 180313026338

(b) Notes the value of an alignment with Healthy Greater Christchurch and Safe Community accreditation to ensure best practice in creating a safe, healthy, connected Waimakariri District.

(c) Approves staff pursuing reaccreditation as an International Safe Community

CARRIED
K Barnett was happy to move the recommendation having discussed with T Sturley and believed there was no need to ‘reinvent the wheel’. To change to another model required significant resource. The current fee was minimal to receive information, training and resources.

D Gordon supported K Barnett’s comments. He also had concerns to ensure what Waimakariri was doing was still relevant and appreciated the efforts of T Sturley and also Tania Peters (Certifier and Trustee of Safe Communities Foundation) who had spoken to the Committee at the February meeting. He was comfortable with continuing with the current model noting the cost was minimal. He noted it was three years to the next accreditation and suggested staff continue to monitor other models.

Mayor Ayers supported the recommendation commenting that it provided a valuable checklist and method of judging against outside standards which was important. He noted that two schools in the district, Woodend and Kaiapoi North were under this umbrella. He commented there was value in the Healthy Cities model. Mayor Ayers provided some background to the Welcoming Cities model used in Selwyn and Ashburton advising that it had its origin in the Mayoral Forum work stream from an economic development point of view. Its purpose was to welcome migrants and retain those migrants in Canterbury.

### 6.2 Community Development Strategy Implementation Plan 2018-2019 – Tessa Sturley (Community Team Manager)

T Sturley spoke to a PowerPoint presentation for the report. She noted that the WDC Community Team Facilitation of a Safe, Healthy, resilient Waimakariri Table detailed the priorities of the work streams and the key outcomes of Safe Communities, Inclusive Communities and Empowered Communities. T Sturley advised that the included Implementation Plan for 2018-2019 provided the framework for those outcomes. T Sturley advised that the Civil Defence welfare role was not captured rather it was the overall role with respect to resilience and preparedness, doing that groundwork first was crucial to the Civil Defence Context.

T Sturley advised that Implementation aligned with four strategic goals,

1. Engaging
2. Informing
3. Connecting, and
4. Empowering.

T Sturley provided some background around each of those goals including reviews, initiatives and examples.

**Questions**

D Gordon noted that the Mayor and two Councillors were on the Youth Council.

D Gordon asked if the Kippenberger Community Project including partnering with the Community Board would be rolled out to other communities and T Sturley noted there was an intentional plan around that, however it was important to listen to the community to see how they wanted to approach it.

D Gordon referred to initiatives around an ‘older persons strategy’ that the Council had requested and asked if that would naturally be picked up through the Community Strategy. T Sturley advised that working with older people had to be part of what they did. D Gordon asked how that could be picked up as part of a work stream and C Sargison replied that he believed it had been picked up as part of the Policy work plan and he would advise.
THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 180313026666

(b) Adopts the Community Development Strategy Implementation Plan (Trim 180315027955)

CARRIED

W Doody believed the Plan helped provide an understanding of how much work the Community Team did in the community for the wellbeing of the whole district.

Mayor Ayers referred to the World Health Organisation guide around age friendly cities.

D Gordon believed it was an excellent document. He believed the Kippenberger model on engagement should be looked at with other communities to help keep connected. He noted the Kippenberger event had enabled him to pick up on a lot of things people were concerned about. He believed the older persons strategy was an important part of the community and wanted to see relevant connections made, for example the Rymans community was relatively disconnected which could be improved easily with footpath access.

6.3 Community Team Update – Tessa Sturley (Community Team Manager)

Mrs Sturley presented this report providing an update on key activities of the Community Team in February and early March 2018 against the three priority areas. Of note is that Rata Foundation had granted $25,000 to assist with Safe Community family violence and suicide prevention project costs, and staff had submitted an application of behalf of the Community Health Steering Group to the Department of Internal Affairs Facilities funding round for $25,000 to cover the cost of a feasibility study.

T Sturley advised that included in the report was a significant amount of work carried out in the period. She highlighted the feasibility study, supporting social enterprise, Satisfy Food rescue, a number of migrant opportunities, the Festival of Colour, Sister City celebrations, new neighbourhood groups in Waikuku and Kippenberger and the review of the Youth Development Strategy. Referring to supporting older people, T Sturley noted the several hundred people who attended the Active Aging Expo.

Questions

A Blackie asked for clarification of the Feasibility Study in recommendation (c). T Sturley explained the study was looking to develop a potential model of a community house across the district. Stakeholders considered the value of a collaborative space for service providers and community groups, for example Wellbeing North Canterbury, Kaiapoi Community Support and counselling services, so that people would not need to tell their story to six different people. The ‘community house’ idea had evolved and the broad range of ideas were being scoped through the feasibility study. C Sargison advised that there was no Council funding for the study so there was an application to Lotteries. It required an umbrella organisation.

K Barnett asked about timing around WaiYouth and Youth Council recruitment and T Sturley advised that Youth Council recruitment for the upcoming round ended on 28 March 2018.
Moved Councillor Barnett seconded Councillor Blackie

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180315028131

(b) **Notes** that Rata Foundation have granted $25,000 in funding to assist with Safe Community Family Violence and Suicide Prevention project costs

(c) **Notes** that staff have submitted an application on behalf of the Community House Steering Group to the Department of Internal Affairs Community Facilities funding round for $25,000 to cover the cost of a feasibility study.

CARRIED

K Barnett thanked the team for their work in community development to get a lot of community volunteers onside.

6.4 **Aquatic Facilities Update – Matthew Greenwood (Aquatic Facilities Manager)**

This report was presented by Matthew Greenwood to summarise the performance of the aquatic facilities in the year to date. M Greenwood advised that the Oxford Community Aquatic Centre was now closed, it had had a strong season with a 30% increase in the number of casual and prepaid swimmers and programmed activities up 10%. The Doggy pool party was a success with over 140 dogs. After gathering feedback there are plans to build a stronger event next year.

The financial figures show income lower than forecast however that was due to timing with fewer learn to swim activities over the Christmas period. C Sargison explained that next year changes would be made to reporting for aquatic facilities, so that they more closely aligned with school terms. He was confident the financials were on track.

Questions

K Barnett asked should the Oxford Community Aquatic Centre season more closely align with daylight savings. M Greenwood advised that had been trialled and it was found that attendance dropped off and was hard to financially justify. C Sargison commented it was difficult as the weather was changeable and hard to predict, for example it had been only 12°C the previous week. The season they had been running recently roughly aligned with Christchurch.

K Barnett asked if there had been feedback from the public regarding the covering of the Oxford pool. M Greenwood advised at the LTP meeting at the Oxford Area School a student had asked why Oxford did not have a covered pool.

A Blackie advised that he had been questioned by two members of the public regarding school use of the pool – did they pay and was it an area for revenue? M Greenwood advised that the pools made more out of school than recreational swimming.

Moved Councillor Doody seconded Councillor Brine

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180305022770.
(b) **Notes** Aquatic Facilities achievement against key performance indicators including Water Quality, Facility Attendance and Financial results.

**CARRIED**

K Barnett commented that she attended the dog party and it was a good event and good for Oxford, she would like to see it continue.

**6.5 Library Update – Philippa Ashbey (District Libraries Manager)**

P Ashbey presented this report providing an update on the libraries strategic development planning and progress. Under the Strategic Framework 2014-2017 some of the achievements in customer service were highlighted during the period.

P Ashbey noted that a commentary of the objectives and future actions for 2018 to 2020 were included in the report. Through this plan they wanted to give every person in the district the opportunity to be a member of the library and for every child to have a connection with the library and be ready for school with a love of books.

P Ashbey as an update noted that the library budget for books and resources was on track. The total budget was $434,000 so far $326,000 had been spent and there was a $100,000 of resources on order.

P Ashbey advised that two ‘master classes’ in creative writing for 40 students from ten schools, along with six teachers (for professional development) had been held and were very well received. The opening of the Enshi Prefecture photographic exhibition was held successfully in the Chamber Gallery with 100 attendees. The information sessions with Citizens Advice, Council and Library were well received. Looking to Easter and the school holidays there would be the school holiday programme and mystery trail and Easter storytimes. In May there would be a Ngaio Marsh event in the Library.

Moved Councillor Blackie seconded Councillor Gordon

**THAT** the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No.180316028214

(b) **Notes** the achievements and customer service improvements attained by the Waimakariri Libraries under the 2014-2017 Libraries’ Strategic Framework.

(c) **Notes** the intent of the Waimakariri Libraries’ Strategic Framework 2018-2020.

(d) **Circulates** the report to the Boards for their information.

**CARRIED**

D Gordon commented that it was a thorough report and great to see the library broadly used. He referred to the meeting room in Ruataniwha and asked if meeting room space similar to that had been considered for the Rangiora Library in the future to create an open space for events. P Ashbey replied that Rangiora had been chosen for the Ngai Marsh event due to the exhibition area. Staff had moved every table for the event. She commented that a dedicated space to provide flexibility would be superb.
7 PORTFOLIO UPDATES

7.1 Greenspace (Parks Reserves and Sports Grounds) – Councillor Robbie Brine

R Brine noted an email with respect to issues raised and addressed.

D Gordon asked if there was an update on the Ashgrove School Playground. C Brown advised that he had had a meeting with the North Canterbury Athletics Club, Ashgrove School and Fernside Cricket Club. They were happy for the Athletics Club to use the building and currently they were waiting on a yes or no to that from the Athletics Club. In the meantime they were still using the field for training. Ashgrove School would be looking for somewhere else for scooters.

7.2 Community Facilities (including Aquatic Centres, Halls, Libraries and Museums) – Councillor Wendy Doody

W Doody thanked C Brown, C Sargison and the team for the multiuse stadium drop in sessions and asked the number of attendees. C Sargison replied there were 30 attended in Rangiora and 50 in Kaiapoi. W Doody noted she and K Felstead had attended the LTP presentation at Oxford Area School.

W Doody congratulated staff on a well worthwhile Pensioner Road Show. There had been good presentations and service providers present including WINZ, Falls Prevention and Michael Begg from Community Energy Action.

W Doody advised that she had organised a visit for the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board to the Mandeville Sports Centre so that they were aware of how large a facility it was, and the amount of work required to bring it all up to standard. She suggested it would be beneficial for Councillors also to visit the facility.

7.3 Community Development and Wellbeing – Councillor Kirstyn Barnett

K Barnett noted that it was her first meeting as portfolio holder. She was impressed with the Enshi photographic exhibition and the Holi Festival commenting it brought an injection from an amazing culturally diverse community, and the district was seeing the benefit of the sister city relationship.

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 Councillor Brine seconded Councillor Blackie

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of:</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of the Community and Recreation committee meeting of 13 February 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 from Craig Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)</td>
<td>Mandeville Sports Club</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 from Craig Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)</td>
<td>Naming Right for Hockey Turf</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 to 10.3</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLOSED MEETING**

**Resolution to resume in Open Meeting**

**RECOMMENDATION**

Moved Councillor Doody seconded Councillor Gordon

**THAT** open meeting resumes and the business discussed with the public excluded Items 10.1 and 10.2 remains public excluded and that the resolutions in Item 10.3, made with the public excluded, be made public following a public announcement on the matter.

**CARRIED**
OPEN MEETING
There being no further business, the meeting closed at 2.44pm.

CONFIRMED

________________________________________
Chairperson

________________________________________
Date
MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE REGENERATION STEERING GROUP HELD IN THE RUATANIWHAKAIAPOI CIVIC CENTRE ON MONDAY 9 APRIL 2018 AT 4.00PM

PRESENT:
J Palmer (Chief Executive), C Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation) and D Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager - District Regeneration).

IN ATTENDANCE:
M Flanagan, WDC, S Markham, WDC, S Hart, WDC, and T Ellis, WDC

1. APOLOGIES
An apology was received and sustained from D Ayers, A Blackie, S Stewart, C McKay and C McMillan for absence.

Moved: R Blair
Seconded: J Watson
CARRIED

APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR FOR MEETING
The meeting was opened by Mr C Sargison, who called for nominations for a Chair for this meeting, in the absence of A Blackie.

Moved: J Meyer
THAT N Atkinson be appointed Chair of the group for this meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group.
CARRIED

N Atkinson assumed the Chairpersons role at this time, for the duration of the meeting.

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Moved: J Meyer
Seconded: P Redmond
THAT the Regeneration Steering Group:
Confirms as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting held on Monday 5 March 2018.
CARRIED

3. MATTERS ARISING
N Atkinson noted that there was a question raised by S Stewart at the previous meeting in regard to the types of trees being planted in the Food Forest. B Cairns has supplied this information and N Atkinson will arrange for this information to be emailed to all.

4. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
There was no deputations and presentations.
5. **LINZ UPDATE**

C Sargison advised that in regard to the Council Delegated Authority to the Chief Executive to conclude the regeneration agreement, that he met with Corcoran French on Friday and all outstanding matters except for one minor one have been resolved and there should be a resolution this week.

6. **TE KŌHAKA O TŪHAITARA TRUST UPDATE**

N Atkinson advised that the Trust have received four submissions to date on The Pines Kairaki and they know of another two that are yet to be received. The Trust have been talking with The Pines Kairaki Beach Association and are in the same timing as the Council in regard to the land negotiations.

7. **KAIAPOI TOWN CENTRE 2028 PLAN UPDATE**

S Hart provided an update to the group and advised the following:

- 80% of draft KTC Plan has now been written.
- Still waiting on some work from various consultants.
- Summary has been done on the full three IBD workshops and will look to send this out to stakeholders this week.
- Now turning our minds to what the implementation and activation of these plans will look like.
- Looking to have the draft KTC plan and supporting documents presented to the Regeneration Steering Group and Council on Monday 11 June to workshop and receive feedback. A report will go to Council on 3 July
- The consultation process is anticipated to take around four weeks and there will also be a submission process. This will be undertaken through July and August.

M Pinkham asked where they are at with the funding.

S Hart advised that the LTP does not have specific funding for the activities that fall out of the KTC Plan, partly due to the timing as the plan has not yet been through consultation and the projects have not yet been through the workshop or Council.

8. **REPORTS**

8.1 **Regeneration Areas – District Plan Matters** – Trevor Ellis, Development Planning Manager and Michelle Flanagan, District Regeneration – Landscape Planner

M Flanagan advised that the purpose of the report is to seek recommendations from the Steering Group to the District Planning and Regulation Committee on undertaking plan changes to implement the recovery plan through the current District Plan Review. The recovery plan concluded agreed land uses through the regeneration areas but did not provide corresponding district plan zones, this has been left to Council to determine through the implementation of the recovery plan. Currently the regeneration areas have a mix of residential and rural zoning. To implement the recovery plan, district plan changes can be undertaken by the Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act or via the Resource Management Act and the recovery plan makes either pathway available to Council. Using the RMA would be via the District Plan Review process currently underway. Overall the current district plan zones are not considered a significant impediment to the implementation of the recovery plan and it is considered there is a general fit between the current land use zone objectives and agreed recovery plan land uses therefore undertaking district plan changes in the immediate short-term under the GCR Act is not considered necessary, any plan changes could be undertaken as part of the district plan review. For the mixed-use business area there is less compatibility with the current residential zoning and the limitations on current zoning on development is being looked at through the KTC Town Centre Plan. The zoning approach in the town centre plan will need to consider the timing of development for mixed use business area and should there be an opportunity to develop prior to completion of the district plan review, consideration could be given to advance a plan change under the GCR Act. While the current district plan zones are not generally considered to be a significant impediment to implementation, resource consents are likely to be required for specific land use matters such as earthworks and the bulk and location of structures. Any applications will follow the standard resource consenting process and it is anticipated that such consents would be granted subject to appropriate conditions. The benefits of undertaking that plan changes via the district Plan Review process, we are not drawing resources away from that current district plan review process, the plan changes would then be undertaken through the process, the plan changes would follow the proposed activities rather current effects based format and they would also take into account any additional research that is currently underway to making better and more consistent plan changes.
N Atkinson noted that under the GCR Act there is no right of appeal which means we can go ahead and do what we are doing on what we consulted on. The process is pretty drawn out under what we could do tomorrow if we had funding and took the GCR Act process as opposed to the normal RMA process.

T Ellis replied that the concern is that if we go through the GCR Act process it will be resource hungry up front. To go through this process and get it in place we would then effectively have to follow it up again with the District Plan Review process, and Council are yet to make a decision on how this would go but then it would be open again in the District Plan Review process notification.

S Markham noted that if the sole reason for using the GCT Act is to defeat public participation then from a staff point of view this is not a good reason.

M Pinkham raised his concern in relation to the sports fields area and the Mahinga Kai areas as we have already made decisions around those and as noted in the report they will effectively become reserves. Why wouldn’t we consider using the GCR Act provisions for changing the zone of any properties that are surrounded by those reserves.

C Sargison replied that the Council has never had a green open space zone so all of the reserves have always been in with a zone that have either been a rural or urban zoning. We have never had a special zone. We will be developing the sports fields and Mahinga Kai areas as we have right across the district.

Moved: J Palmer    Seconded:  J Watson

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group recommends:

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee:

(a) Receives report No.180307023913.

(b) Approves the retention of the existing Waimakariri District Plan zones for the implementation of the agreed land uses in the Waimakariri Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan until they are replaced by those in the Reviewed Waimakariri District Plan.

(c) Approves any changes to District Plan zones in the Regeneration Areas, affecting the reserve, rural, private lease, or private residential land uses, being advanced via the District Plan Review.

(d) Notes that the zoning approach for the mixed-use business areas will be considered through Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan refresh currently underway (Kaiapoi 2028).

(e) Notes that should consent be required for interim use of the regeneration areas referred to in (c) above, this would proceed via resource consent processes consistent with current practice.

CARRIED

P Redmond abstained.

8.2 Murphy Park – Proposed Permanent Rowing Base – Michelle Flanagan, Landscape Planner – District Regeneration

M Flanagan advised that the Murphy Park report follows on from the staff briefing at the last Steering Group meeting and are looking to seek approval to undertake public consultation on the preliminary draft concept plan for permanent rowing base at Murphy Park.

N Atkinson asked why is the fixed boat ramp there.

M Flanagan replied that if we locate the clubs up the top, there will be a good 250 – 300 metres to get to the other fixed boat ramp down at the bottom near Raven Quay. Some of the support vehicles come of hand to pull the trailers and they have advised us that it is impracticable for them to hand wheel their trailers from the upstream boat ramp area down to the fixed boat ramp at the bottom.

J Meyer asked if the boat ramp could be built on of different angle to follow along the bank.
M Flanagan advised that this in entirely possible and can change this on the plan.

M Pinkham noted that he would have liked to have seen the plan include more comprehensive landscaping between the existing boat ramp and alongside the croquet club right down to the new area.

N Atkinson noted that he is not in favour of the boat ramp.

J Palmer suggested that it would be good to include in the commentary that the existing areas where the current buildings are will be tidied up once they are removed.

D Roxborough noted that there is a $200k provision in the Long Term Plan for reinstatement of that area once the boat shed have been removed.

Moved: N Atkinson   Seconded: M Pinkham

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group:
(a) Receives report No. 180326032473.
(b) Approves the preliminary draft concept plan for the permanent rowing base at Murphy Park for consultation.
(c) Notes that the Council budget for the permanent rowing base at Murphy Park is $283,000.
(d) Notes that feedback will be sought on the preliminary draft concept plan in April/May 2018, including seeking feedback from the Northern Bulldogs Rugby League Club and Kaiapoi Croquet Club.

CARRIED

8.3 Kaiapoi Wharf and Marine Precinct Floating Pontoons Design Update and Procurement Strategy – Duncan Roxborough, Implementation Project Manager, District Regeneration

D Roxborough advised that the purpose of the report is to seek the Regeneration group’s approval of the final configuration. In principle it is the same as the layouts that we brought for this group at the feasibility stage as is the level of service table.

M Pinkham asked why timber deck is being used rather than a concrete deck.

D Roxborough advised that the intent for the timber deck is to tie it in with the adjacent terraces.

Moved: N Atkinson   Seconded: C Greengrass

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group recommends:

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report No. 180321030331
(b) Approves the level of service for the Boat Ramp and Riverview Pontoons as detailed in Section 4.1
(c) Approves the proposed design configuration and general arrangement of pontoons
(d) Approves staff proceeding to procurement stage for the pontoon package via open tender on a price-quality method
(e) Approves staff negotiating a contract variation with Daniel Smith Industries under current contract 17/42 (Kaiapoi River Wall Upgrade) for undertaking the piling for the pontoon developments; up to a total variation cost of $200,000 for both the Riverview pontoon piling and the Boat-ramp pontoon piling.

CARRIED
9. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT


D Roxborough advised that the purpose of the report is to update the group on the comm’s and engagement activities undertaken during March 2018.

Moved: J Meyer     Seconded:  J Watson

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group

(a) Receives report No. 180328033503.

CARRIED

MINUTES FROM PCG MEETINGS

9.1 Kaiapoi River Marine Precinct Project Control Group (PCG) Meeting Minutes – Thursday 15 March 2018

D Roxborough advised of a correction in Item 3. The minutes noted that the River Rehabilitation Group have already engaged Tonkin and Taylor. By way of correction, this is through the Kaiapoi Wharf Marine Precinct project that we have engaged them for work related to de-watering that is associated with the dredging works.

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group receives the information in items 10.1.

Moved:  N Atkinson    Seconded:  P Redmond

CARRIED

10. CORRESPONDENCE

11.1 Menz Shed of Kaiapoi

Received for information.

11. GENERAL

12.1 Update on the Courtenay Drive Threshold Feedback

D Roxborough advised that in regard to the proposed design for the new entrance threshold at Courtenay Drive that consultation was undertaken with the three property owners. Feedback was received from one of the property owners who opposed to the design as they had the following concerns, loss of on-street parking, reversing trailers in and out of their driveway and the possible effect this could have on diminishing their property value.

It was agreed that the middle island be shortened.

12. MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Moved:  J Palmer      Seconded:  N Atkinson

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of:</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground() under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of the Regeneration Steering Group meeting Monday 5 March 2018</td>
<td>Confirmation of minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons</td>
<td>A2(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

CLOSED MEETING

The public were excluded from the meeting from 5.05pm.

13. NEXT MEETING

The next scheduled meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group commences at 4.00pm on Monday 7 May 2018 at the Ruataniwha Centre, Kaiapoi.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS THE MEETING CLOSED AT 5.10PM.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WOODEND-SEFTON COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN THE WOODEND COMMUNITY CENTRE, SCHOOL ROAD, WOODEND ON
MONDAY 12 MARCH 2018 AT 7.00PM.

PRESENT
S Powell (Chairperson), A Thompson (Deputy Chair), A Allen, J Archer, A Blackie,
R Mather and J Meyer.

IN ATTENDANCE
C Sargison (Community and Recreation Manager), Grant Stephens (Greenspace
Community Engagement Officer) and E Stubbs (Minutes Secretary).

Two members of the public were in attendance.

The meeting adjourned for a workshop from 7.32pm to 8.05pm.

1 APOLOGIES
Nil.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Nil.

3 CONFIRMATION MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board – February 2018
Moved J Archer seconded R Mather
THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community
Board meeting, held 12 February 2018, as a true and accurate record.
(b) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Extraordinary
Community Board meeting, held 26 February 2018, as a true and
accurate record.

CARRIED
S Powell thanked A Thompson for chairing the Extraordinary meeting in her absence.

4 MATTERS ARISING
Nil.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS FROM THE COMMUNITY
5.1 C Sargison introduced Michael Sharpe and Rosie Oliver from the North
Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust (NCSRT) who spoke to the Board
about the Trust and the proposed Multi Use Sports Facility. They showed a
video presentation that highlighted the benefits of the stadium and types of
activities that could happen in the building including; netball, basketball, futsal,
badminton, volleyball, archery tag, indoor bowls, roller derby, table tennis,
korfball, dodgeball, handball, gymnastics and tumbling, group fitness, fitness
centre, community use, cultural events, corporate events and civil defence.
R Oliver noted that the activities available were greater as the community became more diversified.

It was highlighted that the building was designed for future expansion. It would be facilitated by NCSRT.

R Oliver commented that there were different perceptions of the NCSRT in the community. She explained that the Trust was an umbrella organisation to deliver sport in the area, which included from grass roots to elite athletes. They were in schools every day delivering programmes to all 29 schools in the Waimakariri District. They provided school holiday programmes and swimming lessons. There were four gyms in the area, which were the main source of revenue for the Trust. They provided ten scholarships per year for athletes who had made it to the elite level but were not being funded; four previous recipients were competing at this year’s Commonwealth Games.

R Oliver explained that they were constantly being asked for indoor space and she noted that the Community Centre in Woodend was highly used. The stadium would provide a venue to host and deliver more to the growing community. She noted that many in the community, particularly the elderly did not want to drive to Christchurch for activities.

A Thompson thought the stadium was a very good idea and was supportive. He noted the establishment of Saxton Fields in Nelson and what a fantastic asset it was to Nelson, Stoke and Richmond. He believed the co-location would prove most beneficial, it would cost more and not be as well utilised if spread across the district.

J Archer asked whom the facility was for? Residents of Woodend, Pegasus and Kaiapoi would have to travel quite a distance to the facility. He asked how they would train to be fit and suggested there needed to be satellite-training areas. He could not see young people going from Woodend to train in Rangiora. He believed only the elite could afford to go, and as such, it did not service the youth of satellite towns.

C Sargison commented they were good points raised. Council had spent time looking at the options and could only afford one stadium. An Indoor Court working party had been set up at the time to analyse many different locations across the district and ranked as to preferred site. He noted the success of Dudley Park pool where the same concerns had been raised. Working with NCSRT, and Mainpower as sponsor had enabled schools across North Canterbury to receive lessons for $1.50 per student. He noted that the students across North Canterbury travelled to Dudley for ‘learn to swim’ lessons also. Currently parents of children playing basketball were required to travel to 8 different venues.

R Oliver advised that following the earthquakes parents did not like children to travel into Christchurch for school sport. In response to that, the Trust had set up a primary school sports programme which initially had 37 teams and had grown to 196 teams. Currently those children could only play outdoor sports. She noted that the programme had been driven by the schools; it had not been instigated by the Trust.

J Archer asked if they expected elderly to drive from Woodend for an exercise class. M Sharpe commented that there were two aspects. Firstly fitness – they had fitness centres in Kaiapoi, Amberley and Oxford for those residents. However for competition sport, large spaces were required. A big hub was required as well as the small facilities. He took the example of hockey where previously all teams had had to travel to Christchurch each week, now they had the opportunity for both home and away games.

S Powell asked in regard to the balance of usage through the day as there would be high demand on weekends and evening. M Sharpe noted there could be multiple activities during the day including indoor bowls and toddler groups.
A Allen thought the stadium was a wonderful idea, however she acknowledged the transport concerns and questioned if there had been discussions around how children could travel to the venue. C Sargison advised that there had been initial discussions however if approved the venue would not open until late 2020. ECan bus routes were constantly under review. Discussions could also be held with regard to Mainpower sponsorship to run buses for school teams, and with the North Canterbury Minibus Trust.

C Sargison commented that the stadium was designed to be complementary to existing facilities – he did not see those classes vanishing.

S Powell asked about the expense of running/operating costs and C Sargison advised that the model would be for Council to build the stadium and the NCSRT would operate on behalf of the community and also pay rent to the Council for the building. The concept was currently being worked through, however rates would not pay for operating costs.

A Blackie referred to the tabled Frequently Asked Questions booklet and asked why the $91 a year figure on rates was not included. C Sargison advised that the publication was complementary to other LTP publicity (which included the $91 figure) and had answers to supplementary questions.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
Nil.

The meeting adjourned for a workshop from 7.32pm to 8.05pm.

7 REPORTS

7.1 Adoption of Community Board Standing Orders – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

C Sargison spoke to the report. Council had adopted a revised set of Standing Orders. Community Boards were now being asked to consider an equivalent set for adoption. Technically boards could have different Standing Orders to those of the Council however any changes would need to be assessed against legislation.

J Archer asked how close the proposed Standing Orders were to the Local Government New Zealand version and C Sargison replied that these had been the basis for the proposed Standing Orders.

Moved A Blackie seconded R Mather

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 180130008516.
(b) Adopts the Draft Waimakariri District Council Community Boards’ Standing Orders (Trim 180124006310) effective from 20 March 2018.

CARRIED

A Blackie was happy to see the Standing Orders adopted.

R Mather liked that they were written in plain English and S Powell agreed.
7.2 Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group Membership – Chris Brown (Greenspace Manager)

S Powell commented that the group was important to the community that it represented and requested that the Board appointed representative provide regular updates to the Board on the work of the Advisory Group. C Sargison commented that was the intention. A Blackie noted he was the Chair and J Archer was the Woodend Residents Association representative so the Board would have good coverage.

Moved R Mather seconded A Blackie

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180223019193.

(b) Approves Board member A Thompson to represent the Woodend-Sefton Community Board on the Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group.

CARRIED

7.3 Application to the Woodend-Sefton Community Board Discretionary Grants 2017-2018 – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

Moved J Archer seconded A Blackie

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180222019062.

(b) Approves a grant of $500 to Waimakariri Arts Trust-Kaiapoi Art Expo towards running costs associated with the Kaiapoi Art Expo and Schools’ Art Expo, particularly advertising in the North Canterbury News and the provision of music.

J Archer commented that he attended the event every year and was amazed by the number of people who attended from all over North Canterbury.

A Blackie commented that it was a great project every year and he believed it was a ‘no brainer’.

Amendment

Moved R Mather seconded A Allen

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180222019062.

(b) Approves a grant of $300 to Waimakariri Arts Trust-Kaiapoi Art Expo towards running costs associated with the Kaiapoi Art Expo and Schools’ Art Expo, particularly advertising in the North Canterbury News and the provision of music.

CARRIED

R Mather commented on the 15% attendance from the Woodend Sefton Ward and suggested on that basis there be a $300 grant approved. She noted that $300 had also been approved for the previous year.

A Allen provided feedback to the applicant commenting it was obviously a generic application to all the Community Boards and suggested effort be made to make applications to individual boards more relevant and unique.

S Powell commented that she believed $500 would be of more assistance to a local community group than the Kaiapoi Art Expo and she would not like the Arts Trust to see it as an annual contribution.
8 CORRESPONDENCE

S Powell tabled correspondence from V Spittal (Senior Policy Advisor) regarding the summary outcome from the submission process for the draft Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw Implementation Plan (Trim 180309025187).

Moved J Meyer seconded Archer

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Notes the letter to Safe Roads, NZTA regarding the proposed Ashley to Belfast Safety Improvements (Trim 180226019900).

CARRIED

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chairperson’s Report for February–March 2018

- Attended Waimakariri Access Group meeting and noted it was a very proactive group with good support from staff. J Meyer concurred with observations.
- Advised she was following up on resident’s issues.

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 8 February 2018 (Trim No. 180201009687).

10.2 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 14 February 2018 (Trim No. 180208012097).

10.3 Youth Council meeting minutes – 28 November 2017 (Trim No. 180115002480).


10.6 Herbicide, Glyphosate use for Waimakariri District Council weed control operations Report to Council 30 January 2018 (Trim No. 180111001840).


10.9 China Sister City Visit to Enshi & Establishment of an Advisory Group Report to Council 7 February 2018 (Trim No. 180117003619).

10.10 Capital Projects Report for the period ended 31 December 2017 Report to Audit and Risk Committee 13 February 2018 (Trim No. 180117003619).

10.11 Library Update Report to Community and Recreation Committee 13 February 2018 (Trim No. 180201010087)

Moved A Blackie seconded J Meyer

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.11.

CARRIED
11 **MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

**February/March Diary for R Mather, J Archer and A Thompson**

(Trim No. 180305022812)

11.1 **J Archer**
- Ongoing process to put information together regarding molluscs on beach.

11.2 **R Mather**
- Noted Easter Extravaganza for LTP and commented she would like to see an event in Woodend.
- Had contacted Council regarding painting yellow lines – the answer had been no.

11.3 **J Meyer**
- Attended opening of Passchendaele Walkway and noted it was already busy.
- Council was very busy with LTP and District Plan.

11.4 **A Blackie**
- Council had named the Rangiora-Woodend Cycleway the Rangiora-Woodend Path.
- Advised B Rice (Senior Transport Engineer) had had a workshop with Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board (KTCB) regarding speed limit issues and generally, that the KTCB was supportive of the discussions of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board. They were happy for this board to take the lead on speed limit consultation. A report would come back.

11.5 **A Thompson**
- Attended All Boards Briefing and was interested in the NZTA presentation highlighting the NZTA speed limit assessment and national trends.
- Noted that a group from Waikuku Beach was meeting on Thursday night to discuss water and drainage issues. They had contacted a number of people including Matt Doocey (MP). C Sargison advised that the Council had become aware of the meeting that morning and were trying to arrange for staff to attend, however, there were already a number of meetings scheduled for that evening.

11.6 **A Allen**
- Attended North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support meeting. People joining were not getting the attention they need and so an administration person would be hired. A job description was currently being put together.

12 **CONSULTATION PROJECTS**

The upcoming events for LTP consultation were noted. C Sargison advised that it was difficult to get a suitable booking in the Woodend Community Centre to use it as a venue.

13 **FOSTERING COMMUNITIES**

14 **REGENERATION PROJECTS**

14.1 **Town Centres, Woodend-Pegasus**

Updates on the Woodend-Pegasus area projects are emailed regularly to Board members. These updates can be located using the link below:
15 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

15.1 Board Discretionary Grant
Balance as at 8 March 2018: $1,935.97.

15.2 General Landscaping Fund
Balance as at 8 March 2018 $10,533.

16 MEDIA ITEMS

17 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

18 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Monday 9 April 2018 at the Pegasus Community Centre.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 8.42pm

CONFIRMED

________________
Chairperson

________________
Date

Workshop – 7.06pm – 7.54pm.

1. General Landscaping Fund Workshop: Grant Stephens (Greenspace Community Engagement Officer)
   ▪ A number of potential General Landscaping projects raised.
   ▪ Report requested on General Landscaping projects for Sefton and strategy for welcome signs.
   ▪ General Community and Greenspace update and questions
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE RANGIORA-ASHLEY COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN THE LOBURN DOMAIN PAVILION, 154 LOBURN-WHITEROCK ROAD,
LOBURN ON WEDNESDAY 14 MARCH 2018 AT 7PM.

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

IN ATTENDANCE
J Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support), J Palmer (Chief Executive), G Cleary
(Manager Utilities and Roading), C Brown (Manager Greenspace), K Simpson (3 Waters
Manager), C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager), S Hart (Business and Centres Manager),
Sean de Roo (Project Coordinator), E Cordwell (Governance Adviser) and E Stubbs
(Minute Secretary).

1 APOLOGIES
An apology was received and sustained from R Brine for early departure at 8.30pm.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Nil.

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

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
R Brine provided additional information to item 12.7 in the February Minutes, the
$40,000 requested by Neighbourhood Support had not been included in the draft
LTP.

C Prickett and M Clarke arrived at 7.05pm and 7.09pm respectively

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
5.1 C Brown introduced Rosie Oliver and D Robertson from the North Canterbury
Sports and Recreation Trust (the Trust). C Brown played two videos, one a
‘flyover’ of the proposed Multi Use Sports Facility and the other from the Trust
showing the possible uses of the proposed facility. These uses included:
netball, basketball, futsal, badminton, volleyball, archery tag, indoor bowls,
roller derby, table tennis, korfball, dodgeball, handball, gymnastics and
tumbling, group fitness, fitness centre, community use, cultural events,
corporate events and civil defence.
R Oliver was excited to help in the consultation process for the new multi-use sports facility. The Trust was working with grass roots sports every day.

P Williams asked what were the criteria for introducing a new kind of sport. R Oliver commented that newer sports could be introduced before high usage sports. There would need to be some ‘give and take’. With the ability to curtain off four courts, it would provide more flexibility.

P Williams asked if new sports would require unique equipment, and if money was to be spent on new equipment, was there a criteria. D Robertson commented that they did not know what the trends were, however, a number of the new sports on the videos used equipment already available. C Brown commented that the facility would cater for the real demand in the current main sports. When the facility was built, there would be flexibility to cater for new sports and staff would work with those sports as they emerged. Often ‘fringe’ sports had their own equipment. New sports could be introduced on the ‘shoulder’ seasons when it was not so busy. Other spaces could also be used including the Woodend Community Centre.

R Brine requested clarity on the situation with the Rangiora High School gym. D Robertson advised that the current building required refurbishment, which was likely to begin in Term 4 and would require the building to be plastic wrapped. It would be closed for 12 months. Once the building reopened, it became a little more complicated, as there would be new requirements under the Vulnerable Children’s Act in order for the Trust to negotiate access.

C Prickett asked if the new stadium had been designed with enough storage. C Brown advised that had been a part of the functional design brief. There was considerable storage at the rear of the facility and there was a lot more storage percentage wise than the Woodend Community Centre.

C Prickett asked if it was an open space such that one sport could not dominate an area and C Brown commented that the Trust had experience in managing equipment, and there were options such as roll out cages.

C Prickett asked if there had been consideration for a café space in the stadium. C Brown advised that it had been considered in the working group. The decision at the time was that a café facility was not viable. There was space for caterers and mobile food vendors. The financial viability of a café required consideration as well as the availability of space due to the requirements for a commercial kitchen and the impact on the space available for sports.

K Barnett asked about the arrangements for ongoing management by the Trust. D Robertson advised that management by the Trust on behalf of the community had been accepted in principle, however the arrangement had not been finalised.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

Nil.

7 REPORTS

7.1 Rangiora town entrance enhancement – Tori Stableford (Green Space Landscape Architect)

C Brown spoke to the report highlighting that the Board had allocated $30,000 towards the enhancement of Rangiora town entrances, as a number of the entrances were looking tired. He noted that following concerns raised by the Board, bollards had been temporary installed to restrict car parking at the Lineside Road entrance and they appeared to be working.

C Brown advised that the report proposed implementation of stage 1 followed by stage 2. C Brown explained the different aspects of stage 1 noting that
part of the solution would be to take over maintenance of the area from NZTA who were not focused on the amenity of the area. The costs of stage 1 were lower cost as compared to stage 2, as much of the work had already been completed with the Passchendaele Path. The cost for the proposed kerb and channel would come from the roading budget.

C Brown noted that staff would be preparing a report to Council seeking funding to prepare a strategic town entrance plan in order to get consistency around town entrances. It was recommended that stage 2 of the report be implemented after the strategy was completed.

C Brown explained various aspects of stage 2. He highlighted the problem with the fastigiated oaks requiring trimming on one side of the road and the suggestion that these be replaced with a more suitable species. He noted that there would be strong public interest in the possibility of removing entrance trees and would require community consultation. C Brown commented that the worst area in stage 2 was directly outside the old Lineside Auto and it was possible that this one section of stage 2 could be included.

C Prickett asked why the price of the ‘extra area’ outside Lineside Auto was $22,000 compared to $30,000 for all of stage 1 and C Brown advised it was due to the large number of plants required.

R Brine asked if there were economies of scale of completing stage 1 and the extra area together and C Brown said there may be cost savings as there would be one set up cost, less traffic management costs, however the cost for the plants would be the same.

R Brine asked how the extra area could be funded and J Gerard advised there was $23,000 remaining in the Board’s General Landscaping Fund. D Gordon asked if there were any projects identified for that and C Brown advised that they had a list of Board requests however, there was nothing that the Community Board had currently asked for. E Cordwell advised there would be another allocation in the next financial year.

G Miller asked about large trees on the entranceway and C Brown advised that they would be looking at the most practical way of getting the most amount of large trees on entranceways, as it was important for biodiversity and amenity. There were complications with the presence of powerlines. G Miller commented that Keep Rangiora Beautiful wished also to see greater enhancement of the area and asked C Brown if the community could provide assistance. C Brown advised they would welcome funds and assistance to help reduce the cost of planting.

Some concerns were raised regarding the use of London Plane trees and C Brown acknowledged the concerns, and commented there were other options that could be considered.

K Barnett asked if care and maintenance of the plants had been considered while they were becoming established. C Brown advised that watering was included as part of the first year growing period. In addition hardy species were selected, including wind, drought and wet feet tolerant so that they had a low maintenance cost.

K Barnett asked if there were plans to make the Lineside Road corner safer and C Brown advised that there was to be a meeting to discuss that corner with NZTA. K Barnett asked about the level of maintenance and C Brown advised that roading were already in discussion with NZTA.

D Lundy asked if there was any discussion at a political or staff level regarding Mainpower overhead wires in that area of town. D Gordon advised that there was an upcoming meeting with the Chief Executive of Mainpower, Councillors, the Board Chair and Craig Sargison to discuss that area as well as wires on Kippenberger Avenue.
K Galloway asked for trees planted in front of businesses was any consideration given to the effect on those businesses and C Brown replied yes, the plants were low growing and they would discuss with business owners. In stage 1, there were only a few businesses to consult. Subject to the outcome of the proposed strategy for town entrances there would be wider community consultation.

Moved D Gordon   seconded R Brine

THAT the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180302022080.

(b) Approves the implementation of Stage 1 of the Rangiora Town entrance Lineside Road planting scheme. This involves planting of new berms and the creation of new planting areas in the area between the railway and the new cycleway road crossing.

(c) Notes that the cost of implementing stage 1 is estimated to be $30,000. The Rangiora – Ashley Community Board have already allocated this amount of funding towards town entrance enhancement.

(d) Approves the inclusion of the area in stage 2 as set out in section 4.22 of the report, and allocates $22,000 from this year's General Landscape Fund to fund it.

(e) Notes that the extension to the kerb to the rail crossing will cost $30,000 and will be undertaken by the Roading Unit.

(f) Notes that staff will be preparing a report for Council consideration which will seek funding to prepare a strategic plan for town entrances in the district. This will look to ensure consistency in levels of service relating to development and maintenance.

(g) Notes that subject to the outcome of the town entrance strategic plan staff will look to undertake consultation with affected business owners and the general public regarding the implementation of stage two which is proposed to include a tree replacement programme and that staff will consult with Mainpower regarding the potential for possible undergrounding or services.

(h) Notes that at this stage there is no funding available for the implementation of stage two for either the proposed shrub beds or tree replacement.

CARRIED

D Gordon commented that it was good timing while the old Lineside Auto was vacant to tidy the area up and start a precedent. He appreciated the work of staff already to prevent car parking and noted he was not getting the same number of complaints. The Strategic Plan for town entrances was important and the report was timely as many places were poised for development, as well as the Rangiora Town Centre Strategy about to be raised. He was pleased to see progress.

R Brine concurred with D Gordon.

C Prickett referred to potential cost savings with the 'extra section' of stage 2 included and suggested the $22,000 may not all be spent. He agreed with the concept of completing stage 2 at some time.

7.2 Adoption of Community Board Standing Orders – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

E Cordwell spoke to the report reassuring the Board the content was the same as within the current WDC Standing Orders, but it was now easier to read. It mirrored those adopted by Council but did not include sections only relevant
to Council. Council had lengthened their allowable meeting time from 6hrs to 10hrs, however 6hrs had been retained for the Boards. The length of time to wait for a quorum had been extended to 15 minutes and there was the inclusion of a section regarding the use of electronic devices in meetings. E Cordwell drew the Board’s attention to a 75% voting requirement to adopt rather than a majority. There was a refresher session available 5.30pm Wednesday 21 March in the Rangiora Council Chambers.

E Cordwell advised that the three other Boards at their previous meetings had adopted the Standing Orders. Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board in Section 12.3 had decided to delegate leave of absence to the chair to ensure confidentiality.

J Gerard highlighted Sections 19.7/8 where if a financial conflict of interest was declared the member should withdraw from the table and leave the room. In a non-financial conflict of interest was declared that member should leave the table but not the room.

C Prickett asked if there was a threshold for financial interest and J Gerard stated that was a matter for members to determine for themselves.

D Lundy asked for clarification around a member of the public attending a meeting and wishing to speak, he was aware that they would be required to apply to the Community Board Advocate beforehand. He suggested the Community Board would be seen in a poor light if that person were not allowed to speak. E Cordwell advised that if a member of the public turned up on the night, it would be at the Chair’s discretion prior to the meeting to decide if it was a relevant and reasonable request. She noted that on occasion there could be a public forum. This had a slightly different format and the public forum would be on the agenda. C Prickett commented in the past it was not unknown for the members of the public to answer questions during debate.

D Gordon supported the comments of D Lundy and suggested consideration be given to holding public forums and advertising of those.

K Barnett asked whether assisting with a funding application should be considered a conflict of interest. J Gerard suggested it would be as the member had made a decision prior to debate, however ultimately it was an individual responsibility.

Moved G Miller seconded J Hoult

THAT the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180130008380.

(b) Adopts the Draft Waimakariri District Council Community Boards’ Standing Orders (Trim 180124006310) effective from 20 March 2018.

(c) Notes that once adopted these Standing Orders will also apply to the Rangiora-Ashley Road and Reserve Naming Committee.

(d) Delegates the Chairperson of the Rangiora Ashley Community Board to grant a member leave of absence pursuant to Standing Orders Rule12.3.

CARRIED

G Miller believed the Standing Orders were right and proper.

J Hoult supported the inclusion of the right to delegate leave of absence to the Chair.

8 CORRESPONDENCE

Nil.
9 CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT

9.1 Chair's Diary for February/March 2018

Moved J Gerard  seconded D Lundy
Moved M Clarke  seconded J Hoult

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 180305022847.

CARRIED

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 8 February 2018
(Trim No. 180201009687).

10.2 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 12 February 2018
(Trim No. 180208012087).

10.3 Youth Council meeting minutes – 28 November 2017  (Trim No. 180115002480)


10.6 Herbicide, Glyphosate use for Waimakariri District Council weed control operations Report to Council 30 January 2018 (Trim No. 180111001840).

10.7 Additional Business and Centres Unit Resource Report to Council 30 January 2018 (Trim No. 180109001129)

10.8 Community Facilities Provision Report to Council 30 January 2018 (Trim No. 171026115830)

10.9 China Sister City Visit to Enshi & Establishment of an Advisory Group Report to Council 7 February 2018 (Trim No. 180117003619)

10.10 Capital Projects Report for the period ended 31 December 2017 Report to Audit and Risk Committee 13 February 2018 (Trim No. 180117003619)

10.11 Library Update Report to Community and Recreation Committee 13 February 2018 (Trim No. 180201010087)

Moved C Prickett  seconded R Brine

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.11.

CARRIED

11 MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE

11.1 M Clarke

- Drafted letter on behalf of Waimakariri Health Advisory Group regarding inclusion of a waiting room for those discharged at night.

11.2 J Hoult

- Attended North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support (NCNS) strategic meeting to increase effectiveness of group within the district. Represented NCNS at an Older Peoples Expo and suggested that
there were a number of groups trying to do the same thing and that it would be good to improve co-ordination.

- Timebank – had initially made good progress however now required financial advice to further its intention to become an incorporate society.
- Attended ‘Rubbish Trip’ presentation regarding ecoeducation around waste. Information regarding Waimakariri businesses without packaging would be included on the Rubbish Trip website.
- Attended All Boards Briefing.
- Attended multi-use sport stadium presentation.

11.3 **S Lewis**

- Attended Passchendaele Path opening and noted huge attendance.
- Attended Friends of Tuhaitara Trust open day with D Gordon and was impressed with the work of the group.
- Was interviewed for the Northern Outlook Woman’s Day celebration for her work in founding the Cycling and Walking Group.

11.4 **G Miller**

- Attended Passchendaele Path opening.
- Keep Rangiora Beautiful
  - Submission to the LTP regarding the Koura Creek area commenting it was a fantastic potential asset to the community.
  - Submission regarding Flaxton Road in Fernside Road and Threkhelds Road area.
- Commented on large trucks parking on road and lack of bylaw to address.

11.5 **C Prickett**

- Attended All Boards Briefing.
- Attended Cust Community Network meeting and noted their wish list for direction/action.
- Attended Rangiora Airfield noise contour evening for public.
- Attended Loburn Reserve meeting.
- Noted graffiti on Ashley Bridge.

11.6 **P Williams**

- Attended meeting with residents of Northbrook area affected by flooding, was pleased with the way staff handled the situation and provided a temporary solution.
- Attended Airport designation meeting and commented it was important for the area and long term for future of the airport. Noted it was used for Civil Defence and emergency, there were now 90 hangars and 24 full time staff.
- Attended Poyntzs Road and Garrymere water meetings.
- Attended two Civil Defence meetings and noted procedures to declare an emergency. In the absence of the Mayor or Deputy Mayor, he or J Meyer could declare an emergency.
- Attended multi-use stadium public meeting and was disappointed at the attendance.

11.7 **K Barnett**

- Attended Local Government Rural Provincial Sector Meeting and noted hot topics of – water and affordability of rates. She noted the difficulty of comparing rates across the country, however in one method of comparison Waimakariri rated the fourth best in country. In some areas 18% of household income went to rates.
- Rangiora Colour Festival – needs more volunteers.
- Noted the large number of meetings prior to Easter.
11.8 **D Gordon**
- A busy month.
- Noted number of issues raised in Garrymere drop in session and upcoming public meeting at the Loburn Domain 7pm Tuesday.
- Meeting with Spring Brook subdivision residents and agreed staff response was well managed.
- Met with resident regarding lack of footpath on Coldstream Road – railway line to Hockey Turf. Should consider a submission to the LTP for safety of access.
- Attended Rangiora Croquet Club meeting.
- Attended Salvation Army meeting.
- Attended Passchendaele Path opening.
- Attended Tuhaitara Trust open day.
- Attended Airfield meeting.
- Attended multi-use stadium drop-in session.
- Attended LTP drop in session at Pak n Save and commented staff were doing a great job in promoting. The rates calculator was very successful.
- Attended Friends of the Town Hall meeting – a defibrillator would be installed at the Town Hall this month – funds raised from Christmas Tree festival.
- Noted Pride Festival 11am Sunday 18 March.

11.9 **D Lundy**
- Attended Garrymere water supply drop-in session and received a number of calls from residents, commented that it was a hot topic in the area.
- Attended All Boards briefing.
- Attended Civil Defence meeting.
- Attended Loburn Reserve Meeting – provided background regarding the Memorial. It had been decided that the honour boards should be displayed more respectfully on the old Coronation Hall site. Acknowledged the help of Grant Stephens (Green Space Community Engagement Officer). Noted the issues with Health and Safety with work carried out on a volunteer basis and housekeeping with Council buildings. Discussed permanent light onto the road.

11.10 **K Galloway**
- Attended All Boards Briefing.
- Discussion with residents of Frazer Place regarding condition of stream.
  - Thanked staff for placement of rubbish bin at White Street bus stop.
  - Asked if copies of the minutes of the Rangiora Promotions Association meetings could be circulated to the Board.
  - Attended GreyPower meeting – J Palmer spoke and was well received.
  - Noted felling of trees at St Johns Church.
  - In discussion with roading regarding safety improvements at Arlington playground.
  - Milton Dog Park – shelters progressing over $5000 available.

*R Brine left at 8.30pm during item 11.*
12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS
E Cordwell reminded the Board of the submission workshop on Wednesday 21 March.

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

14 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE
14.1 Board Discretionary Grant
14.2 General Landscaping Fund
Balance as at 14 March 2018 $23,840.

15 MEDIA ITEMS
Nil.

16 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
Nil.

17 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
Nil.

NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Wednesday 11 April 2018 in the Council Chambers at the Rangiora Service Centre.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 8.49PM.

CONFIRMED

___________________
Chairperson

___________________
Date
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE KAIAPOI-TUAHIWI COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN MEETING ROOM 1 (UPSTAIRS), RUATANIWHA KAIAPOI CIVIC CENTRE,
176 WILLIAMS STREET, KAIAPOI ON MONDAY 19 MARCH 2018 COMMENCING
AT 4.00PM.

PRESENT
J Watson (Chair), C Greengrass (Deputy Chair), N Atkinson, R Blair, M Pinkham,
P Redmond and S Stewart.

IN ATTENDANCE
Councillors J Meyer and A Blackie,
J Palmer (Chief Executive), Mayor D Ayers, C Brown (Community Green Space Manager),
G Reburn (Parks and Recreation Operations Team Leader), Simon Hart, (Business and
Centres Manager), D Haussman (Media and Visual Communications Coordinator),
M McIlraith (Communications and Engagement Manager) and A Smith (Committee
Advisor)

1 APOLOGIES
There were no apologies.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
J Watson declared a conflict of interest relating to Item 7.3, Application for fund-
ing from the Waimakariri Arts Trust towards running the Kaiapoi Art Expo. J Watson is
Vice-Chairman of the Trust.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting – 19 February
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 19 February 2018, as a true and accurate record.
CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
Regarding Item 5.2, dredging of the river – P Redmond commented that at a recent
Council workshop held since this 19 February Board meeting, it was noted that there
is further investigation work to be carried out to determine what dredging will be most
beneficial for the river.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

5.1 Jack Clyne, Kaiapoi Community Watch, was unable to attend the meeting.
J Watson noted that she had attended the unveiling of the new Community
Watch Car and new uniforms. $32,000 had been raised through the
community to fund these.
5.2 Proposed Multi Use Sports Facility – Representatives of the North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust, Don Robertson (Chair of the Trust) and Michael Sharpe (CEO) were present to speak on the proposed Multi-Use Sports Facility. Chris Brown (Greenspace Manager) was also present and showed a short video of the proposed layout of the facility at the Coldstream Road site in Rangiora. This is a three stage plan, with Stage 1 being the Indoor Court facility, Stage 2 Tennis Courts and Stage 3 to be the development of outdoor fields. M. Sharpe then showed a PowerPoint presentation, providing background information on the community fitness centres that the Trust currently operates in the region. The Trust also provides a primary school sports coaching programme, swimming programme, school sports events, children’s gymnastics and trampoline classes, as well as running an annual mountain bike event. The benefits of a proposed multi-use indoor stadium would be centralised resources, greater flexibility of usage options and the ability to attract larger and higher level events to the district. The facility could also provide office and admin support for local sports groups, and provide opportunities for more sport options. Such a facility would provide the opportunity for wider variety of sporting codes to the district, which could include netball, basketball, volleyball, futsal, badminton, table tennis, indoor bowls, gymnastics and tumbling, korfball, dodgeball, the Olympic sport of handball and roller derby. The new sport of archery tag was also mentioned as a possible use. The proposed facility would include a fitness centre, a high performance training facility and group fitness classes. The facility could also be used by the wider community, not necessarily for sporting activities but would be large enough to accommodate cultural events, corporate events and also could be a Civil Defence post emergency shelter.

Questions

1. J Watson asked if there were any figures available on the usage of such a large facility. C Sharpe noted that currently there is only one large community facility in the district and the remainder of facilities are on Ministry of Education land. Such a facility would allow hosting of tournaments and home and away games for different sports, instead of some sporting codes local teams having to travel away for all their games. (as an example, the new hockey turf facility on Coldstream Road now means that both Rangiora and Kaiapoi Hockey Clubs can host home games).

N Atkinson asked what the economic benefit would be to the remainder of the districts areas, such as Kaiapoi and Oxford, if all the groups/teams/supporters would be going to Rangiora to use this proposed facility. M Shape said the current facilities would still be needed for some sports, as well as using this proposed four court facility. For any sporting tournaments that would run over several days, visitors to the district would be staying in local accommodation and supporting local businesses and hospitality. It is envisaged that the proposed facility would benefit the whole district. N Atkinson suggested that this facility would just take the benefits to one area. Current facilities in the district are shown to be insufficient for some sports and it was understood that a new four court facility would be well used for sport, but N Atkinson noted that the consultation video has shown that the facility could also be used for other events, such as conferences. Mr Brown and Mr Palmer noted that the proposed facility could accommodate a corporate dinner or a trade show, but dates for any events such as these would need to be arranged at least 12 months ahead. Mr Palmer said that there may be up to six such events held over a 12 month period.

Following a question from R Blair on why the decision was made to locate this facility in Coldstream Road Rangiora, it was advised that the independent consultants determined that this was the most suitable location. This decision was based on a weighting score that was also applied to a number of other sites in the district that were considered, including Kaiapoi.
M Pinkham questioned the Trusts plans if the facility didn’t progress through the LTP process. D Robertson advised that the Trust owns a facility in Edwards Street (used for gymnastics and trampolining), and a new facility to house a fitness centre is currently being built in Southbrook. This proposed indoor court facility is also definitely in the Trusts future Plans.

C Greengrass asked about parking. C Brown noted there is adequate parking being included in the plans, and with the other remaining areas still to be developed there will be overflow parking available until such time as these are developed.

It was advised that use of the current site that the Trust operates from at Rangiora High School is going to be restricted as the school has plans for development of this facility for the schools use, to accommodate the increased roll.

The Chairperson thanked the Trust representatives for attending and the presentation.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

Nil.

7 REPORTS

7.1 Mansfield Subdivision Cherry Trees – Grant Reburn (Parks and Recreation Operations Team Leader)

G Reburn and C Brown spoke to this report which seeks the approval of the Board on a removal and replacement strategy for the Mansfield Subdivision Cherry Trees. It was noted that the Kaiapoi Community Board has previously considered reports on this matter in 2015 and 2016. There has been some work undertaken to replace current trees and the proposed replacement programme is a case by case natural attrition programme, as the Council is approached by the residents to remove them.

N Atkinson noted that there was to have been a report come back to the Board on a replacement programme and the cost involved. Mr Brown said there has been consultation with the residents on this matter, and there hasn’t been significant amount of feedback from residents in the past two years.

Mr Brown confirmed that staff will act on any concerns from residents about the tree roots growing under the pavements and fences. The replacement tree that is proposed to be put in does not grow as big as the current species, and the roots are not as invasive but the blossom is the same colour. If there was a complete replacement undertaken of all the trees this would cost the Council $200,000.

Following a question on the size of the trees to be planted, C Brown said the exact size of the trees is not known, but it is proposed to get the largest possible specimen that can be used, as smaller specimens are often snapped.

N Atkinson noted that he had previously approved a recommendation for a gradual replacement of these trees over a period of time. It was noted that these trees are close to the end of their life.

P Redmond noted approval of this report, as it sets out a strategy and minimises the cost. The residents need to be informed of what the tree replacement strategy is, and P Redmond suggests that this could be a further inclusion.
THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180309024964

(b) Approves a case by case removal and replacement strategy for the Mansfield Subdivision Cherry trees.

(c) Approves staff removing trees within the Mansfield Subdivision should other root control methods not be viable.

(d) Notes that staff will report any tree removals to the Board for their information.

(e) Notes that the tree outside 89 Fairweather Crescent requires removal and that root control methods for this tree have been unsuccessful.

(f) Advises the residents of the replacement strategy to be on a case by case basis.

P Redmond believes that the Board hasn’t received the report from staff that was suggested previously but providing the residents are aware of this proposal, is in support the recommendation.

J Watson supports the motion and sees this as a positive proposal for staff to deal directly with residents who have any concerns with these trees.

J Meyer suggested that if this recommendation is adopted, then residents can be told to contact the Council with any concerns.

Amendment

Moved N Atkinson seconded S Stewart

(a) Approves that a report come back to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board with the information and cost of a cherry tree removal replacement scheme for Mansfield subdivision over the next ten years.

N Atkinson noted that there has previously been residents attend meetings of the Board voicing their concerns about these trees. Council had previously said that there had been a plan to progressively remove all the trees and replace them and this would be done on trees as they come through their life span. This had been discussed and is not what is in the report presented to the Board at this meeting. It was suggested that there would be individual tree owners coming back to the Board every year.

S Stewart said a report needs to come back to the Board, advising the cherry tree varieties that are available, and the pattern of removal. This matter should be discussed by the Board and a decision made. S Stewart believes this would be a better strategy, rather than individuals coming to the Board with their concerns.

P Redmond noted that with the proposed motion, individuals can approach Council staff on any concerns, and wouldn’t need to be coming to the Board.

The amendment was then put.
Moved N Atkinson seconded S Stewart

(a) Approves that a report come back to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board with the information and cost of a cherry tree removal replacement scheme for Mansfield subdivision over the next ten years.

LOST
2 for, 4 against

The motion was then put

Moved P Redmond seconded J Watson

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180309024964
(b) Approves a case by case removal and replacement strategy for the Mansfield Subdivision Cherry trees.
(c) Approves staff removing trees within the Mansfield Subdivision should other root control methods not be viable.
(d) Notes that staff will report any tree removals to the Board for their information.
(e) Notes that the tree outside 89 Fairweather Crescent requires removal and that root control methods for this tree have been unsuccessful.
(f) Advises the residents of the replacement strategy to be on a case by case basis.

CARRIED
N Atkinson and S Stewart voted against.

N Atkinson expressed concern that the content of the report was not what was asked for and does not support this motion. The report does have elements in it, but is not the indication in the motion that he previously moved or the assurance that he had given to the community. N Atkinson believes the matter should have been workshoped and debated in the correct manner.

S Stewart echoed the comments of N Atkinson. This is not the report that was asked for and that the community expected. S Stewart suggested this matter should have been a workshop to look at scenarios for the tree replacement programme and a report that discusses the options available.

7.2 Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group Membership – Chris Brown (Greenspace Manager)

C Brown was present for consideration of this report. J Watson noted she had previously been involved with this group and was available to continue to represent the Board.

Moved C Greengrass seconded P Redmond

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180221017835.
(b) Approves Board member J Watson to represent the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board on the Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group.

CARRIED
Board Chairperson J Watson having earlier declared a conflict of interest, moved away from the table and Deputy Chair Greengrass assumed the Chair during considering of Item 7.3.

7.3 **Application to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board's Discretionary Grant 2017-2018 – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Advisor)**

The report was taken as read and there was no discussion.

Moved P Redmond seconded C Greengrass

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180222019113.

(b) **Approves** a grant of $500.00 to Waimakariri Arts Trust-Kaiapoi Art Expo towards running costs associated with the Kaiapoi Art Expo and Schools’ Art Expo, in particular advertising in the Kaiapoi Advocate, venue hire and set up costs for the Kaiapoi Club.

CARRIED

J Watson resumed the role of Chairperson at this time

8 **CORRESPONDENCE**

Moved J Watson seconded P Redmond

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) **Receives** the summary outcome from the submission process for the draft Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw Implementation Plan (Trim 180309025187).

CARRIED

9 **CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT**

9.1 **Chair’s Diary for February - March 2018**

Moved J Watson seconded M Pinkham

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180312025823.
10 MATTERS REFERRED FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 14 February 2018 (Trim No. 180208012097)
10.2 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 8 February 2018 (Trim No. 180201009887).
10.3 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 12 February 2018 (Trim No. 180208012087).
10.4 Youth Council meeting minutes – 28 November 2017 (Trim No. 180115002480)
10.7 Herbicide, Glyphosate use for Waimakariri District Council weed control operations Report to Council 30 January 2018 (Trim No. 180111001840).
10.8 Additional Business and Centres Unit Resource Report to Council 30 January 2018 (Trim No. 180109001129)
10.9 Community Facilities Provision Report to Council 30 January 2018 (Trim No. 171026115830)
10.10 China Sister City Visit to Enshi & Establishment of an Advisory Group Report to Council 7 February 2018 (Trim No. 180117003619)
10.11 Capital Projects Report for the period ended 31 December 2017 Report to Audit and Risk Committee 13 February 2018 (Trim No. 180117003619)
10.12 Library Update Report to Community and Recreation Committee 13 February 2018 (Trim No. 180201010087)
10.13 Lees Road and Barkers, Kaiapoi Road Speed Limit Report to Council 6 March 2018 (Trim No. 180115002738).

Moved N Atkinson seconded P Redmond

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.13.

CARRIED

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

The purpose of this exchange is to provide a short update to other members in relation to activities/meetings that have been attended or to provide general Board related information.

N Atkinson

The Council Long Term Plan LTP is being featured in the local media to encourage the public to speak up and have their say. Mr Palmer noted that there has been 40 submission received to date, which is quite high for the first week of the submission period.
R Blair
North Canterbury Neighbourhood Support has had a planning meeting, agreeing to the employment of a part-time staff member to work 7 – 10 hours per week.

C Greengrass
Attended recent Kaiapoi Museum meeting
Attended All Boards briefing on 7 March
Public Spaces Policy – the draft document is being work on.
You Me We Us – a Top Team competition is planned, but no entries have been received at this stage. The competition will involve teams of three people. Movie night is planned for 14 April.

Al Blackie
Attended a meeting with N Atkinson with the concept of the riverboat plans by Belfiore Bologna.

J Meyer
Noted that Lees Road residents are happy with the decision to decrease the speed limit to 50kph. Noted the good use of the new Passchendaele Pathway

M Pinkham
Attended the successful opening function of the Passchendaele Pathway.
Attended the All Boards briefing on 7 March which was very good
Attended the Council briefing with Ecan speaking on the salination in Kaiapoi River
Working with ENC on proposed cycleway projects.

P Redmond
Board members were invited to attend to meet Labour Party representatives. Duncan Webb is the member of this area.
Attended the Trousselot Park Children’s Day event
WHAG meeting
Attended the All boards briefing on 7 March
Attend Council briefing with Ecan speaking on the salination of Kaiapoi River.

S Stewart
Requested confirmation that the Kaiapoi River Carnival to be held in February 2019, which is to be an afternoon event to celebrate the river. This is not part of the Kaiapoi Christmas Carnival
There has been a round of Rural Drainage group meetings – all these groups have been provided with LTP rate projections.
Water Zone committee has had a workshop. Arapata Rueben joined the Waimakariri Zone Committee in March.
Stormwater Drainage Bylaw hearing is to be reconvened tomorrow, after some outstanding issues needed further work.
Attended meeting of residents of Springbrook subdivision on Northbrook Road, Rangiora, which flooded in recent 20 February rain event and there is some work to be undertaken regarding levels of floor pads being laid.
Attended Keep Rangiora Beautiful meeting. There are several plots that this group established that have been handed over to NZTA to maintain and the Group members are disappointed with the level of maintenance of these plots.

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS
Draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan –
Consultation Friday 9 March to Monday 9 April 2018.

13 REGENERATION PROJECTS
13.1 Town Centre, Kaiapoi
Updates on the Kaiapoi Town Centre projects are emailed regularly to Board members. These updates can be accessed using the link below:

13.2 Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group
The next meeting of the Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group will be held in Meeting Room 1, Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre, 4pm on Monday 9 April 2018. This meeting is open to the public.

14 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE
14.1 Board Discretionary Grant
Balance as at 19 February 2018: $2,400.

14.2 General Landscaping Budget
Balance as at 19 March 2018: $60,080.

15 MEDIA ITEMS
No media items.

16 MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED
Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987
Moved J Watson seconded R Blair

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:
### Item No | Minutes/Report of: | General subject of each matter to be considered | Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter | Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
16.1 | Simon Hart, Business and Centres Manager & Rob Hawthorne, Property Manager | FENZ Property Acquisition Proposal | 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>16.1</td>
<td>To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLOSE MEETING**

**Resolution to Resume in Open Meeting**

Moved N Atkinson seconded C Greengrass

**THAT** open meeting resumes and the business discussed and the recommendation with the public excluded remains public excluded.

**CARRIED**

**OPEN MEETING**

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 16 April 2018 at the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 5.58pm.

CONFIRMED

__________________  __________________
Chairman  Date

Workshop

1. General Landscaping Projects / Fund – Chris Brown (Community and Greenspace Manager).
2. Members’ Forum: opportunity for members to share potential new ideas and initiatives.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE RANGIORA-ASHLEY ROAD AND RESERVE NAMING COMMITTEE HELD IN THE RAKAHURI COMMITTEE ROOMS, RANGIORA SERVICE CENTRE, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON WEDNESDAY 4 APRIL 2018 AT 3PM.

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

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

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

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Nil.

3 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
Nil.

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

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

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

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

Moved K Galloway seconded J Gerard

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Road and Reserve Naming Committee:

(a) Receives report No 180314027138.

(c) Approves the following new road name for a Private Right of Way over Lot 2 DP 29824 as St Marys Lane.

CARRIED

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

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

CONFIRMED

_________________________
Chair

_________________________
Date
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE OXFORD-OHOKA COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN THE WEST EYRETON HALL, 3 EARLYS ROAD, WEST EYRETON ON
THURSDAY 5 APRIL 2018 AT 7.00PM.

PRESENT
D Nicholl (Chair), M Brown (Deputy Chair), W Doody, J Enson, S Farrell, K Felstead,
J Lynn and T Robson.

IN ATTENDANCE
S Markham (Manager, Strategy and Engagement), C Brown (Community and Greenspace
Manager), S Nichols (Governance Manager), S Morrow (Land Information Officer), Mayor
D Ayers (Mayor) and E Stubbs (Minute Secretary).

1 APOLOGIES
Nil.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Item 7.1 D Nicholl – Applicants are business clients
Item 7.2 J Lynn – Member of Ohoka School PTA
Item 7.4 M Brown – Independent member of Mandeville Sports Club Board.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board –8 March 2018
Moved S Farrell  seconded T Robson
(a) THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
Confirms the circulated minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community
Board meeting, held 8 March 2018, as a true and accurate record.
CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
Nil.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
5.1 C Brown introduced Rosie Oliver and Michael Sharpe (representing North
Canterbury Sports and Recreation Trust) who spoke to the Board about the
proposed Multi Use Sports Facility. C Brown outlined some of the consultation
that had occurred in regards to the proposed facility. C Brown showed a short
video of the proposed layout of the facility at the Coldstream Road site,
Rangiora. The three stage plan was outlined. Stage 1 being the Indoor Court
facility, Stage 2 Tennis Courts and Stage 3 to be the development of outdoor
fields.

M. Sharpe then showed a PowerPoint presentation, providing background
information on the community fitness centres that the Trust currently operates
in the region. The Trust also provides a primary school sports coaching
programme, swimming programme, school sports events, children’s
gymnastics and trampoline classes, as well as running an annual mountain
bike event. The benefits of a proposed multi-use indoor stadium would be
centralised resources, greater flexibility of usage options and the ability to
attract larger and higher level events to the district. Such a facility would
provide the opportunity for wider variety of sporting codes to the district, which
could include netball, basketball, volleyball, futsal, badminton, table tennis, indoor bowls, gymnastics and tumbling, korfbal, dodgeball, the Olympic sport of handball and roller derby. The new sport of archery tag was also mentioned as a possible use. The proposed facility would include a fitness centre, a high performance training facility and group fitness classes. The facility could also be used by the wider community, for cultural events, corporate events and also could be a Civil Defence post emergency shelter.

J Lynn asked if the facility would have the capacity to hold tournaments. M Sharpe replied yes, with four courts it would be able to hold South Island or national tournaments. He highlighted that a major benefit was that the stadium would stop many teams having to travel to Christchurch each week to compete and ‘home’ games could be played in the district.

C Brown advised that the facility could accommodate 500 spectators in tiered seating. It would not compete with Christchurch for large tournaments, however the district was missing a facility with the 500 seat capacity. R Oliver reassured the Board that the facility would not take activities away from the communities but would enhance what was already available.

S Farrell enquired on further detail relating to seat capacity. C Brown explained around the outside on all four sides there would be permanent seating and more seating could be slid in and out as required. The permanent seating had backs and spectators would not be on court like there were at the moment.

D Nicholl referred to Stage 3 – the outdoor sports and asked what those sports would be. C Brown explained that was 10 years away and it was not known yet what sports would be required. Stage 3 had been earmarked now to ensure the multi-sports facility was in the best place for future developments of the district.

K Felstead noted there had been a number of submissions to the LTP already and asked if there was a feel of what those submissions said. C Brown advised that over 300 submissions had been received and there were more for than against at the moment, however the consultation was not over and things could change.

5.2 Chris Brown (Community and Greenspace Manager) spoke to a PowerPoint presentation to provide a General Landscaping update. He noted that that the last meeting there had been a workshop to discuss general landscaping projects for the Community and Greenspace team to investigate. He noted that a memo had been sent regarding the tidiness of the Oxford Skate Park. C Brown noted that the General Landscaping fund balance was now $11,830 due to projects coming in under budget.

S Farrell referred to the noted that the Pearson Park directional sign was completed and asked if it was up, as the Pearson Park Advisory Group (PPAG) were to have been advised in order to help with placement. C Brown had been informed that the sign was now in place.

C Brown explained that the Ohoka Gatekeepers Lodge was to be post and wire fence, 120m long with a vehicle entrance gate. The cost was $3,000. J Lynn asked if it were to be deer fenced. C Brown noted it would be the type of fence requested and would confirm.

C Brown showed a quick landscaping plan for the Swannanoa Cricket Club Pavilion. The cost proposed was $3,000. To help with ease of mowing he suggested small pavers and a concrete mow strip around the outside. There would also be planting. The club could look at paving the other side also and small modifications could be made to allow that to happen in the future.

For the Pearson Park seat and rubbish bin, staff would work with the PPAG to determine the best location. The design they had looked at with Wood’n Steel was large macrocarpa style. It would improve the visibility of teenagers
to the wider public. The project was $5,830 including rubbish bin and concrete pad.

W Doody asked if the table would have wheelchair access and C Brown advised the table could be made suitable by removing seats at one end.

C Brown noted the projects recommended under the $11,830 available in the fund were the Ohoka Gatekeepers Lodge fence, Swannanoa Cricket Club landscaping and Pearson park table and bin.

Not included was Christmas flags. There were six pairs of brackets of flags on power lines. Flags were $250 each, so $3,000 for six pairs and would last 6-12 months. K Felstead asked if they could look at flags for the following financial year.

S Farrell queried the cost of the flags as they were $97.15 from Flagmakers. C Brown advised pricing included installation of the flags.

C Brown noted that other projects discussed had been Mandeville Reserve, Oaks Reserve, Ohoka Domain – tree ring seat and Barracks Reserve Bollards.

K Felstead asked if the seat at the Ohoka Domain would be funded by the Ohoka Residents Association and J Lynn replied that funds were no longer available for the tree ring seat as the Gatekeepers Lodge group had required further funds. C Brown advised that there would be time to consider such funding in the future as that part of the development was not imminent.

J Ensor asked about the Mandeville Sports Clubs (MSC) toilets and C Brown commented if approved by Council during the Long Term Plan deliberations in May/June, that funding would be available. MSC preferred to manage that process however staff would ensure there was quality control in the design process. J Ensor asked about sewage connections and C Brown that would be part of the same process once approved.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

Nil.

Board Chairperson D Nicholl, having declared a conflict of interest, moved to the gallery whilst Deputy Chair M Brown assumed the Chair during consideration of Item 7.1.

7 REPORTS

7.1 Road Naming – Hallfield Limited – S Morrow (Land Information Officer)

S Morrow spoke briefly to the report which considered naming for roads at 474 Bradleys Road, Ohoka.

M Brown referred to Road 3, and asked if it was considered a road or a cul-de-sac. It was noted that a Way could be a cul-de-sac or pedestrian only.

J Lynn noted that Road 1 went right to the boundary and asked if it would lead into another subdivision. S Morrow advised he was not aware of another subdivision. S Nichols advised that if there was future development then there would be negotiation for current road names to be continued in any new development.

S Farrell asked if any of the sections could be further subdivided and S Morrow advised he was not aware of those details.

Moved J Lynn seconded T Robson

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
(a) **Receives** report No.180315028011.

(b) **Approves** three names for new roads on Lot 1 DP 519569 as marked as roads 1-3 on the attached plan.

1. Hallfield Drive
2. Orbiter Drive.
3. Mighty Quinn Way

**CARRIED**

J Lynn commented that the names had an intriguing, and conversation piece, backstory.

W Doody was impressed with the story behind the names. She suggested that the developer install a small plaque with the story at the subdivision entrance.

7.2 **Application for Oxford-Ohoka Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2017-2018 – E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)**

S Nichols tabled additional information on how the grant would be spent from the Ohoka PTA Plant Sale Sub-Committee (Trim No. 180404035248).

Moved W Doody  seconded T Robson

**THAT** the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No.180321030302.

(b) **Approves** a grant of $500 to Ohoka School PTA Plant Sale Sub-Committee towards the costs of ‘children size’ gloves, garden tools, wheelbarrows and other items to enable children to participate in growing plants and vegetables.

**CARRIED**

W Doody congratulated the Ohoka School PTA Plant Sale Sub-Committee on encouraging young children to assist with the planting, commenting that it was a good fundraiser.

T Robson commented that it was great to see skills being taught at school that could stay with people for the rest of their lives.

K Felstead made the comment, if close to the end of the financial year there was still money in the account then the RSA still required funding for the time capsule at the new cenotaph. He had suggested that they apply to the fund.

S Nichols noted that the Council had made clear in terms of the discretionary fund that Boards needed to ‘use it or lose it’. At the June meeting the Board could consider suitably eligible groups and allocate funds to ensure the money went into the community. J Ensor advised that the Eyreton Pony Club would be looking to complete an application.

7.3 **ANZAC Day Services 2018 – E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)**

S Nichols spoke briefly to the report advising that there were three services in the Oxford Ohoka Ward. For the Ohoka service there was an option to either lay a wreath as a Board or to lay a wreath alongside a Councillor. S Nichols advised that the Rangiora- Ashley Community Board would be laying a wreath at the Cust Service.

S Farrell asked what time the Ohoka service was and S Nichols advised it was at 11am.
THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180322030871.

(b) Appoints Board members D Nicholl and J Lynn to attend the Ohoka ANZAC Day service on Tuesday 24 April 2018 at Ohoka Hall, Mill Road and to lay a wreath.

(c) Appoints Board members S Farrell and T Robson to lay a wreath on behalf of the Board at the Oxford ANZAC Day parade at 9.30am on Wednesday 25 April 2018.

(d) Appoints Board member M Brown to attend the Cust and West Eyreton ANZAC Day service on Wednesday 25 April 2018 at 10am and to lay a wreath at West Eyreton.

CARRIED

7.4 Mandeville Sports Club facility as a venue for Community Board meetings – E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

S Nichols advised that in November 2017 the Board requested that staff have another look at using Mandeville Sports Club (MSC) as a venue for future Board meetings. The report was taken as read.

K Felstead advised that he wished to ask several questions, which may then result in a procedural motion being put forward. K Felstead asked if the MSC Board been formally been asked to allow exclusive use to the Board. S Nichols advised no formal letter had occurred.

K Felstead noted there were three members of the Community Board on the MSC Board (Independent, Council appointed and Community Board appointed) and commented that it was difficult to vote on the issue as members were providing conflicting advice. S Nichols commented it was not time sensitive to make a decision tonight as October was a potential timeframe for use (subject to availability). To this point, there had been informal discussion. Staff could write a formal letter seeking clarification of the Board’s requirements and report back to the Board once a response had been received from the Club.

K Felstead asked if MSC could be written to formally and with any conditions the Community Board and the Club may have outlined clearly including around exclusivity and opening of the bar. S Nichols confirmed that could be done.

S Farrell asked W Doody and M Brown, who their discussions with the MSC had been with. W Doody explained that there was a MSC Board and the Sports Club. She was a member of the MSC Board and even that Board had not been successful in holding exclusive meetings in the Club facility and had met elsewhere. She agreed the Community Board should write to the MSC Board.

M Brown advised he had been at a MSC Board meeting where exclusivity was discussed and noted there were commercial considerations such as the contract with the bar/catering company. J Ensor commented he had checked with catering staff and that there was nothing booked for the October night. He suggested the Community needed to seriously consider MSC as a venue, however would accept feedback from the MSC Board.
Moved K Felstead seconded J Lynn

**THAT** the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Lay the report on the table until a written response from the Mandeville Sports Club Board was available.

CARRIED

8 **CORRESPONDENCE**

Nil.

9 **CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT**

9.1 **Chairperson’s Report for March 2018**

Moved K Felstead seconded W Doody

**THAT** the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 180327032689.

CARRIED

D Nicholl commented he was disappointed only three members attended the LTP submission meeting. He commented on foot traffic to the WDC tent at the Oxford A&P show was down and it was noted that attendance was down in general, with Easter weekend being a likely factor.

10 **MATTERS FOR INFORMATION**

10.1 **Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 12 March 2018** (Trim No. 180306023479).

10.2 **Woodend-Sefton Community Board Extraordinary meeting minutes 26 February 2018** (Trim No. 180301021894).

10.3 **Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 14 March 2018** (Trim No. 180307023947).

10.4 **Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 19 February 2018** (Trim No. 180214015060).

10.5 **Youth Council meeting minutes – 27 February 2018**

10.6 **Lees Road and Barkers, Kaiapoi Road Speed Limit** Report to Council 6 March 2018 (Trim No. 180115002738).

10.7 **Poyntzs Road Source Upgrade Project – Consultation** Report to Utilities and Roading Committee 20 March 2018 (Trim No. 180305022630).

10.8 **Libraries Update** Report to Community and Recreation Committee 27 March 2018 (Trim No. 180316028214).

Moved W Doody seconded T Robson

**THAT** the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.8.

CARRIED

11 **MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

11.1 **J Ensor**

- Advised that the new commercial complex had started at Mandeville, the hair salon was open. Cheaper fuel would be available at the fuel station and the supermarket would open on 17 April.
• Attended Waimakariri Health Advisory Group meeting.

K Felstead asked for an update on the 80km/hr speed restriction for Tram Road. S Nichols advised she would follow up.

11.2 **J Lynn**

• Gatekeepers Lodge – building to be moved Tuesday 10 April. $4,500 had been contributed to the move from the Ohoka Residents Association.
• Ohoka Residents Association had submitted to the LTP.
• Neighbourhood Watch – looking to employ another person to assist the manager in a part time role.
• Public Spaces Policy working party – attended meeting.
• Attended Oxford A&P Show.

11.3 **M Brown**

• Attended All Boards briefing and found to be informative.
• Attended Oxford A&P Show.
• MSC – assisting with funding application to RATA Foundation for new tractor.
• Attended Oxford Rural Drainage meeting.

11.4 **T Robson**

• Youth Council – attended his final meeting. There was a presentation on the Local Alcohol Bylaw. The YC were currently finalising a survey to coincide with the Youth Development Strategy.
• OPAC – Easter giveaway promotion went well with good feedback. Looking to run a similar promotion for Mothers Day and Fathers Day.
• Attended Oxford A&P Show.
• Attended Youth scholarship meeting with D Nicholl.
• Attended LTP submission meeting.

11.5 **S Farrell**

• Attended LTP submission meeting.
• Attended Audit and Risk Committee meeting.
• Attended Enshi photographic exhibition opening evening.

11.6 **K Felstead**

**Council Update**

• Considered appointing a representative of Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga to the District Planning and Regulation Committee for the purpose of contributing to decision making in formulation on the new District Plan. There was an issue around voting rights and the matter was lost.
• Submission to ECan LTP.
• Set up review panel for Liquor Ban Bylaw and Local Alcohol Policy.
• Adopted Waimakariri District Development Strategy – an important document as the corner stone for the District Plan process.
• Brought funding forward to progress reticulation extension in the Tuahiwi area and match Runanga contribution.
• Oxford Rural No.1 Scheme – sunk well and new good source found. Submit to ECan for the water take, it was a notified application with four submissions, two for and two against. One local farmer will oppose. In the process of discussion with ECan and objector to try and prevent need for hearing. In the meantime, tenders have been opened for the required pipework of 5km. Council dilemma – whether to wait for the hearing outcome or to accept tender and start pipework and run the risk of spending money for redundant pipework. Currently there is a permanent boil water notice. In the argument of cost verse health risk – Council
erred on the health side and approved opening the tender for the pipework.

J Lynn asked if putting in the pipework first was a risk that ECan would see it as a presumptive move. K Felstead commented it was a perceptive thing, there was pressure with health issues to push on. D Nicholl asked the cost of the pipework and K Felstead replied $800,000, half of which was renewing pipe so $400,000 was at risk. J Ensor asked about the temporary measure that had been proposed and K Felstead advised the cost was $125,000 for a one month solution.

- Report from the 3 Waters Manager on the 20 February storm event. Houses in the new Springbrook subdivision were threatened by flooding and Kings Mowers was badly flooded.
- Allocated ANZAC services.
- Local Government New Zealand Annual Conference – Christchurch in July. Normally Mayor and one Councillor attend. This year it was open to any Councillor who wanted to attend as there would be no travel or accommodation costs.
- Money allocated to Regeneration area.
- Poyntz Road source upgrade – put on hold.
- ENC half year report accepted.
- Report from CE regarding risk management.

11.7 W Doody

- Tabled her Councillor’s Report for April 2018 (Trim 180412039624). Which included information on:
  - LTP consultation including Oxford A&P show.
  - Pensioner Housing Road Show held in Oxford, Rangiora and Kaiapoi.
  - Confident driving course for the mature driver.
  - Big Brother, Big Sister fundraising breakfast.

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

Draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan
Consultation Friday 9 March to Monday 9 April 2018.

The Board noted the consultation.

13 REGENERATION PROJECTS

13.1 Town Centre, Oxford

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

The Board acknowledged the updates.

14 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

14.1 Board Discretionary Grant
Balance as at 5 April 2018: $2,776.19

The Board noted the balance and timeframe to utilise it by the June meeting.
14.2 **General Landscaping Fund**
Balance as at 5 April 2018 $10,790.
C Brown advised there would be a report the following month, the balance was slightly more.

15 **MEDIA ITEMS**
Road naming, move of the Gatekeepers Lodge and Ohoka School children gardening project.

16 **QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**
Nil.

17 **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**
Nil.

**NEXT MEETING**
The next meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board is scheduled for Thursday 3 May 2018 commencing at 7.00pm, at the Oxford Town Hall.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 8.46pm.

CONFIRMED

__________________________
Chairman

__________________________
Date

**Workshop from 8.50pm to 9.30pm**
- *Update on the Public Spaces Policy (Business Zones) Advisory Group – John Lynn*
- *Draft Long Term Plan Submission, discussed and finalised.*
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WOODEND-SEFTON COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN THE PEGASUS COMMUNITY CENTRE, MAIN STREET, PEGASUS ON
MONDAY 9 APRIL 2018 AT 7.00PM.

PRESENT
S Powell (Chairperson), A Thompson (Deputy Chair), A Allen, J Archer and J Meyer.

IN ATTENDANCE
C Sargison (Community and Recreation Manager), K Simpson (3 Waters Manager),
K Straw (Civil Projects Team Leader), A Klos (Project Engineer), Mayor D Ayers and
E Stubbs (Minutes Secretary).

The meeting adjourned for a workshop from 8.01pm to 8.03pm.

1  APOLOGIES
Moved S Powell seconded A Allen
Apologies were received and sustained from R Mather and A Blackie.  
CARRIED

2  CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Nil.

3  CONFIRMATION MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board – 12 March 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 12 March 2018, as a true and accurate record.
CARRIED

4  MATTERS ARISING
Nil.

5  DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS FROM THE COMMUNITY
5.1 Carville Stewart, Sefton resident, spoke to the Board about concerns
regarding the Pembertons Road, Railway Street and Vaughan Street
intersection in Sefton. Of major concern was the lack of speed control at the
intersection. C Stewart commented that many children and dog walkers
crossed through the intersection to go to the domain. Sightlines were
obscured due to the hill and a hedge. C Stewart suggested a rumble strip
across the road so drivers realised they needed to slow down and moving the
speed limit sign further from the town. He had asked the police to look at the
intersection however they had viewed it at a time when there was light traffic.
He concluded by saying he wished to bring the intersection to the attention of
the board in order there be some sort of change to make it safer.

S Powell asked if Railway Street and Vaughan Street were marked as 50km/hr
and if so what type of marking. C Stewart advised that there were marked
with the ordinary 50km/hr circle signage.

J Meyer introduced himself as Chair of the Road Safety Coordinating
Committee and asked if C Stewart knew of any speed counts in the area.
C Stewart advised he was not aware. J Meyer asked when was the worst time? C Stewart replied that it was late afternoon traffic going up the hill. During school holidays and weekends any traffic was also of concern.

J Meyer asked if there was a footpath on Vaughan or Railway Streets and C Stewart advised no footpath, and there were grass verges on Pembertons Road.

S Powell asked if there were any trees and bushes on Pembertons Road that might limit visibility and C Stewart confirmed there were.

J Archer asked if C Stewart would like the 50km/hr sign moved and C Stewart replied yes.

S Powell noted it was useful to have the Chair of the Road Safety Coordinating Committee on the board and J Meyer advised he would raise the matter at the next meeting. S Powell suggested there could a report on the matter requested and C Sargison commented that a quick solution was to also paint a sign on the road.

6 **ADJOURNED BUSINESS**

Nil.

7 **REPORTS**

7.1 *Gladstone Road Cycleway – K Straw (Civil Project Team Leader)*

K Straw introduced the report regarding the Gladstone Road shared footpath and cycleway. He advised that NZTA had designation over most of the site. There was an option for a reduced level of service path.

J Archer raised the option of lobbying NZTA for a motorway flyover to keep local landscape and character intact.

S Powell referred to Option 2 which was a narrower, unsealed path and asked if it would be the same standard as what was between Waikuku and Pegasus. K Straw advised it would be closer to the service currently between Kaiapoi and Pines Beach.

S Powell asked if there was the option of deferring the decision until the Government announced its intention on the Woodend Bypass. K Straw commented that was an option, when he had spoken to NZTA there had been no timeline as when there would be an announcement.

S Powell asked if the Board did nothing, was it possible to look at speed limits instead such as to go from 70km/hr to 50km/hr. K Straw said there would be a speed limit review at some stage anyway. J Meyer asked if that speed limit review could be brought forward. Staff noted the suggestion.

C Sargison reminded the Board of the background. The issue arose many years ago with several residents raising concerns regarding accessing Gladstone Park safely and had approached the Council several times on the matter.

A Thompson asked if staff perceived the narrower unsealed path a significant impediment. K Straw commented it would be significantly more difficult for a pram or wheelchair so some members of the community would find more difficulty.

A Thompson asked in terms of a priority path, where did it rate compared to the two paths mentioned between townships. C Sargison replied that Gladstone Park was a major sports field that many children went to.

A Allen acknowledged the use of the potential path and asked if was unlikely the bypass would be constructed within 10 years. K Straw advised of a
meeting with NZTA and roading staff several weeks ago regarding land designation over 145 Gladstone Road and a new fence. They had not given a timeframe, but it was not in the 10 year plan. National had indicated they would bring it forward but the new government had not committed to that. J Meyer commented that he had not been advised of that officially.

S Powell asked some of the history of 145 Gladstone Road referring to the Poplar trees on the Road Reserve. K Straw commented that the poplars were historical and the fence was very old. New poplars would be planted inside the property boundary.

A Thompson expressed concern at the perception of new asphalt eventually getting ripped up. He believed it was not a good signal to send unless it was considered necessary.

S Powell asked if there would be any community consultation. C Sargison responded.

J Archer commented that as a long term Woodend Resident he had played at Gladstone Park and believed the access to be dangerous.

Moved J Archer

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board recommends:

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 180308023458.

(b) Approves Option One, the high level of service path, 2.3m wide surfaced with asphalt.

(c) Notes that 750m of the 950m length of the path will become redundant at the time the future Woodend Bypass is constructed.

(d) Notes that the Bypass is unlikely to be constructed for at least ten years.

LOST

Moved: J Meyer Seconded: A Allen

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board recommends:

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 180308023458.

(b) Approves Option Two, the reduced level of service path, 2.0m wide unsealed path.

(c) Notes that 750m of the 950m length of the path will become redundant at the time the future Woodend Bypass is constructed.

(d) Notes that the Bypass is unlikely to be constructed for at least ten years.

CARRIED

J Meyer noted from the comments round the table safety was a key issue. He believed if the crusher dust option was undertaken it was sending the right message to the community. They would continue to try and hurry the bypass and retain a temporary pathway in the meantime which was a win / win.

A Allen reaffirmed the comments of J Meyer.

S Powell commented on having received mixed feedback from residents. The path was required for safety, however there was a perception it would be a waste of money with the upcoming bypass. S Powell commented that the motion was a good compromise.
A Thompson commented Option 2 was still a properly formed path to the same safety standard as Option 1. He endorsed there being a pathway.

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

K Simpson spoke to the report and provided an update on investigations into the feasibility of connecting the Bramleys Road well to the Woodend - Pegasus water supply scheme.

Based on 2008/2009 testing it was originally assumed that the well had a 20-30 l/s yield. More recent testing showed that, to draw that volume of water it would affect surrounding wells. It had been previously thought that the water would not require treatment however further testing had shown elevated levels of Iron and Manganese, which would require treatment. Following the Havelock North incident UV disinfection would also be required.

Based on these findings K Simpson advised that the Bramleys Road well was no longer a viable source for the Pegasus water supply. When initially the Council had consulted with the community there was feedback regarding cultural concerns and the potential future connection of the Bramleys Road well was seen as mitigating this issue. K Simpson advised that the result of the viability assessment would be raised with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Rūnanga.

A Allen asked who would go to the Rūnanga. K Simpson advised that in May there was a meeting with the Rūnanga, which the CE and Mayor attended. Staff would also write formally to the chair of the Rūnanga prior to the meeting and Mahaanui Kurataiao Limited would submit any questions in writing. C Sargison advised that at the May meeting key staff including K Simpson would attend to answer any questions.

S Powell asked if there had been any testing on the Equestrian 4 (EQ4) well. K Simpson advised that the well had been drilled but not connected to the supply. He would expect the water quality to be similar to those others within the Pegasus well field. Four wells had been drilled by the developer within the field with EQ4 not initially brought online.

A Thompson asked about the name Equestrian and C Sargison advised that within the original plan for the whole area that location had been earmarked for an equestrian facility. J Archer asked where the well was and C Sargison noted he could advise.

J Archer asked if EQ4 had iron and manganese content and K Simpson replied yes, which was the reason there was a filter at the Pegasus Water Treatment plant.

S Powell asked if EQ4 had the required capacity and K Simpson confirmed that information.

A Thompson asked where the Ravenswood water supply would fit in, and whether it would have its own supply or be treated at Woodend. K Simpson said that effectively it would connect into the Woodend – Pegasus supply and had been included in calculations. By joining the water supplies it was more resilient for the future.

A Thompson asked if the cultural issues came into play at Ravenswood. K Simpson advised that it was related to the perception associated with the Pegasus Development. Effectively the water either side of Gladstone Road was the same source.

Moved A Thompson seconded A Allen

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board recommends:
THAT the Council:

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

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

(c) **Notes** that the Bramleys Road well is no longer considered to be a viable future source for the scheme, as the water source would likely require significant treatment and gaining consent to abstract water from the well would be very difficult.

(d) **Notes** that some Tuahiwi residents opposed the joining of the scheme with Pegasus for cultural reasons, and that the future connection of the Bramleys Road well would have potentially mitigated these concerns.

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

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

**CARRIED**

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

A Klos spoke to the report noting that its purpose was to seek the Board's endorsement of the recommended alignment of the new supply pipe from Gladstone Road to the Pegasus water treatment plant.

A Klos advised that following assessment there were two viable options for the Gladstone Park section:

Option 1 – alignment through the trees (within the road reserve).

Option 2 – alignment through Gladstone Park (within greenspace reserve).

A Klos noted the key points for Option 1. Long term it was generally preferred to construct pipe within road reserve. The option required the removal of large trees. As all roots were interlocked when the large trees were removed it would weaken those adjacent requiring the removal of all trees except the small macrocarpas. The estimated cost was $61,000 more than Option 2.

Key points for Option 2 – it would require an easement through the park. Greenspace had taken the two options to the Gladstone Park Advisory Group (GPAG) to ask their preferred option. They would prefer Option 1 and Council staff supported that view.

C Sargison advised that there had been discussion previously regarding the removal of the large trees which was the reason the small macrocarpas had been planted; to replace those likely to be removed. Growth rates would be improved once the large pines had been removed and there would be some maintenance on the small macrocarpas.

S Powell noted that part of the small macrocarpa area had not grown and asked if it was part of the budget to have replaced. C Sargison confirmed it was another Greenspace project, separate to this one. The line would be reinstated.
J Archer asked how the trees would be felled. A Klos advised that the resident on the western side did not want the trees felled onto their property. After consideration the plan was to section down those first felled and eventually a gap would be created to fell those remaining.

S Powell asked if all options had been considered. K Simpson replied that they had looked at drilling and that option would double the cost of the project. It was considered too risky to put the pipe between water and sewer.

Moved J Archer seconded A Thompson

**THAT** the Woodend-Sefton Community Board recommends:

**THAT** the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180322031093.

(b) **Notes** that this project to install a new raw water pipe is part of the wider project to join the Woodend and Pegasus water schemes.

(c) **Notes** that design work is scheduled to be undertaken this financial year, 2017/18, and construction is scheduled to be completed next financial year, 2018/19.

(d) **Endorses** that the section of pipe immediately north of Gladstone Road be installed in the road reserve land, rather than through Gladstone Park.

(e) **Approves** the removal of the trees along the preferred route, in road reserve land.

(f) **Notes** that the recommended route is supported by the Gladstone Park Advisory Group.

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

**CARRIED**

J Archer commented that the trees to be removed had lost viability, had a limited life and would be a hazard soon.

A Thompson commented that it was a comprehensive report.

A Allen noted that communication was important. The budget was increasing and it was important that ratepayers understood in plain speak what that increase was for.

S Powell referred to Item 1.6 regarding the section of land most likely to be converted into a connector road, noting that had not yet been decided. Prior to that decision there needed to be community consultation. S Powell advised she had spoken to G Stephens (Greenspace) regarding a white cross on one of the large trees to be removed. She wanted to bring it to staff attention to ensure the family be notified and treated with empathy prior to the felling.

### 7.4 ANZAC Day Services 2018 – E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

C Sargison spoke briefly to the report. He noted option in the recommendation allowed the board to decide whether or not they wanted to lay a wreath at the new Woodend Community Centre service in conjunction with the Council representative or lay a separate wreath.

S Powell advised that Mayor Ayers and Councillors D Gordon, J Meyer, P Williams were laying a wreath on behalf of the Council at the Sefton Domain Service and A Blackie and S Stewart at the Woodend service.
The meeting adjourned for a workshop from 8.01pm to 8.03pm.

Moved S Powell seconded J Archer

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180326032222.

(b) Appoints Board members S Powell, A Allen and R Mather to lay a wreath on behalf of the Board at the Sefton Cenotaph at the ANZAC Day service on Tuesday 24 April 2018 in the Sefton Domain.

(c) Appoints Board member J Archer to attend the ANZAC Day service on Tuesday 24 April 2018 at the Woodend Community Centre, in conjunction with the Council representative.

CARRIED

8 CORRESPONDENCE

Nil.

9 CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT

9.1 Chairperson’s Report for March- 2018

S Powell advised she had been in contact with those involved in the Safer Roads Project. A reply regarding questions around timeframe had been drafted and was waiting approval. She noted that the Government Policy Statement had safety as a high priority.

Moved S Powell seconded J Meyer

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180329034371.

CARRIED

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 8 March 2018 (Trim No. 180301021620).

10.2 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes –14 March 2018 (Trim No. 180307023947).

10.3 Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes –19 February 2018 (Trim No. 180214015060).

10.4 Youth Council meeting minutes – 27 February 2018

10.5 Lees Road and Barkers, Kaiapoi Road Speed Limit Report to Council 6 March 2018 (Trim No. 180115002738).

10.6 Update on the Management of Council Wastewater Treatment Plants Report to Council 20 March 2018 (Trim No. 180301021693)

10.7 Library Update Report to Community and Recreation Committee 27 March 2018 (Trim No. 180316028214).

10.8 ANZAC Day Services 2018 Report to Council 3 April 2018 (Trim No. 180321030283).

Moved J Archer seconded A Allen

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.8.

CARRIED
11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

11.1 March Diary for R Mather
S Powell noted R Mather’s report, including that she attended an event at Pegasus Bay School and coffee morning for LTP consultation. It was pleasing that Councillor Williams had attended the Easter extravaganza in the Board’s area.

11.2 A Allen
- Neighbourhood Support – interviewing new administration support position.
- Noted algae signs knocked over by the lake, C Sargison advised that a service request could be put into the Council for those maintenance matters. Although in this instance, Toddy Properties are responsible for the lake.

11.3 A Thompson
- Taranaki Stream; meeting with Mike Kwant (Green Space Community Engagement Officer).
- Attended Waikuku Pot Luck dinner organised by the Council Community Development Advisor.
- Drafted a Facebook post regarding logging. Commented it was important for local people to get information out soon. S Powell advised that she had been promised an update from Council staff later in the week. There had been a delay around tendering. She agreed that updates were needed for the community.

11.4 J Meyer
- Attended Waimakariri Access Group meeting and was pleased to see new Community Board members in the group.
- Commented that the LTP consultation worked well and there were many submissions coming in.
- There was progress with roading including the roundabout at Smith Street and Williams Street.

11.5 J Archer
- Attend Woodend Community Association meeting.
- Attended Annual Hui which he found very interesting.
- Attended LTP consultation.
- Lions Dinner Meeting; good contact with other parts of the community.

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

Draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan –
Consultation Friday 9 March to Monday 9 April 2018.

It was noted that the LTP consultation closed today.

It was noted that the government Policy Statement of Land Transport closed 2 May 2018. It was suggested that there be a community Board submission around the Woodend Bypass. The Strategic priorities around safety, access, environment and value for money had been set. S Powell would make a start and circulate by email.

13 FOSTERING COMMUNITIES

Nil.
14 REGENERATION PROJECTS

14.1 **Town Centres, Woodend-Pegasus**

Updates on the Woodend-Pegasus area projects are emailed regularly to Board members. These updates can be located using the link below:


S Powell advised that she would like to revisit the Woodend Pegasus Area Strategy at the next meeting.

15 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

15.1 **Board Discretionary Grant**

Balance as at 9 April 2018: $1,635.97.

15.2 **General Landscaping Fund**

Balance as at 9 April 2018 $10,533.

16 MEDIA ITEMS

Cycle path and update on project to join Woodend and Pegasus water supplies.

A Allen raised concerns regarding unconstructive comments on the Pegasus Facebook page.

17 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

Nil.

18 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

Nil.

**NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Monday 14 May 2018 at the Woodend Community Centre.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 8.21pm

CONFIRMED

___________________________
Chairperson

___________________________
Date

**Workshop held from – 8.21pm – 8.54pm.**

1. **Feedback on the Public Spaces Policy (Business Zones) Advisory Group – Andrea Allen**
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE RANGIORA-ASHLEY COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL CHAMBERS, RANGIORA SERVICE CENTRE, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON WEDNESDAY 11 APRIL 2018 AT 7PM.

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

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

1 APOLOGIES
Nil.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Item 7.2 D Gordon

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

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
Nil.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
Nil.

7 REPORTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Moved J Gerard seconded D Gordon

THAT the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180327032604.
(b) Approves

i. The retention of the Monterey Pine situated on the north-east side of the container.
ii. The removal of the two Monterey Pines situated on the south-west side of the container.

(c) Notes

i. That the tree removal is the responsibility of the Riding for the Disabled.
ii. That Riding for the Disabled is to remove the two stumps at the same time as they remove the two trees.

CARRIED

G Miller abstain

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

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

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

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

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

Moved G Miller seconded K Barnett

THAT the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180327032777.

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

CARRIED

K Galloway against

G Miller believed it was money well spent.

K Barnett was pleased to support a district wide event.

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

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

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

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

Moved J Gerard seconded D Lundy

THAT the Rangiora–Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 180326032235.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8 CORRESPONDENCE

Nil.

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chair’s Diary for March 2018

Moved J Gerard seconded R Brine

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 18040435207.

CARRIED

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 8 March 2018 (Trim No. 180301021620).

10.2 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 12 March 2018 (Trim No. 180306023479).

10.3 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting Extraordinary meeting minutes – 26 February 2018 (Trim No. 180301021894).

10.4 Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 19 February 2018 (Trim No. 180214015060).

10.5 Youth Council meeting minutes – 27 February 2018

10.6 Library Update Report to Community and Recreation Committee 27 March 2018 (Trim No. 180316028214)

10.7 Lees Road and Barkers, Kaiapoi Road Speed Limit Report to Council 6 March 2018 (Trim No. 180115002738).


10.9 Poyntzs Road Source Upgrade Project – Consultation Report to Utilities and Roading Committee 20 March 2018 (Trim No. 180305022630).

10.10 ANZAC Day Services 2018 Report to Council 3 April 2018 (Trim No. 180321030283).

Moved G Miller seconded J Hoult

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board receives the information in items 11.1-11.10.

CARRIED

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

11.1 P Williams

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

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

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

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

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

11.6 M Clarke
- Had been busy with family arrangements.

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

11.8 K Galloway
- Attended Standing Orders training.
- Attended Friends of the Dog Park meeting. McAlpines offered to donate shelters. Looking at parking area to relieve pressure on the croquet parking area.

- Attended Public Spaces Policy meeting.

- Attended Road Naming Committee meeting.

11.9 **D Lundy**

- Thanked the Board for sympathy card.

- Had a number of calls from Garrymere residents regarding water supply project. Noted there was a 4% average rate rise and asked what was the range in. J Millward commented it was 2.3% up to 25%. A large range was always the case, and noted the increase for Garrymere was considerable.

- Asked if skateboards were an issue in Conway Lane. J Gerard did not believe they were an issue. R Brine advised that a few years ago there was a bylaw that fixed the problem. There were no prosecutions but it was widely advertised. The issue was re-emerging. There was uncertainty if the bylaw was revoked or lapsed.

11.10 **D Gordon**

- Met with town promotion chair and coordinator with Simon Hart regarding service level agreements across the Promotions Associations for the purpose of greater accountability. It would go back to the Audit Committee.

- There was currently a scoping project around electric vehicle charging stations in Rangiora.

- Assisting with concerns regarding high grass in sections. If not improved Council would undertake the work.

- RSA AGM – President Ian Thompson was made a life member of the NZRSA. A letter of congratulations would be written on behalf of the board.

- Attended a meeting with Mainpower CE and Chair regarding trees on Kippenberger Avenue and at Southbrook. It was a positive discussion and the Mainpower CE was open to looking at ways they could work together. If trees were to be removed there could be a significant contribution to a memorial or planting. There was no intention for underground wiring.

- There was still concern for residents of Ashley Street due to nuisance road noise. Staff were looking at options to improve.

- Attended Festival of Colour, Pride picnic and ‘Easts and Beats’.

- Noted the 60th Anniversary of Tractor Club held in Rangiora.

- Youth Council – considering submission to LTP regarding creation of youth space /outdoor area possibly adjacent to skatepark based on an idea that was successful in Westport.

11.11 **K Barnett**

- Noted the Rangiora Lions Club was in good heart and fundraising supported the Festival of Colour.

- Council passed resolution recommending re-accreditation of Safer Communities which would happen over the next 12 months.

12 **CONSULTATION PROJECTS**

There are no current consultation projects.

13 **REGENERATION PROJECTS**

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

14.1 Board Discretionary Grant
Balance as at 11 April 2018: $6,764.04.

14.2 General Landscaping Fund
Balance as at 11 April 2018: $1,840.

15 MEDIA ITEMS

16 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

17 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

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

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

CONFIRMED

___________________
Chairperson

___________________
Date
Workshop


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

2. Members Forum: 9.30pm – 9.45pm

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

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

## REPORT

**FILE NO:** GOV-18 / 180418042246  
**REPORT TO:** Council  
**DATE OF MEETING:** 1 May 2018  
**FROM:** David Ayers, Mayor  
**SUBJECT:** Mayor's Diary 27 March - 23 April 2018

## 1. SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 27 March</td>
<td>Interview with Compass FM Radio Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WDC/ECan Leadership Team and Councillors Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 28 March</td>
<td>ENC Board meeting and strategic planning session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Royal New Zealand Air Force Reception, Wigram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 29 March</td>
<td>Interview for the Waimakariri Irrigation Limited Director role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury Museum presentation to Hurunui District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citizenship Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 31 March</td>
<td>Oxford A&amp;P Show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 3 April</td>
<td>Interview with Compass FM Radio Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 4 April</td>
<td>Meeting with property owners regarding Pentecost Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waimakariri Passchendaele Trust meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 5 April</td>
<td>Long Term Plan engagement at Kaiapoi New World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solid &amp; Hazardous Waste Working Party Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxford-Ohoka Community Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 6 April</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill (North Canterbury News)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended retirement of Colin Pullen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unveiling of mural at Kip McGrath Education Centre, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 7 April</td>
<td>St John - North Canterbury District Awards Function, Hawarden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visited “Eats and Beats”, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 9 April</td>
<td>Attended Road Safety Summit and participated in panel, Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting (briefly!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 10 April</td>
<td>Interview with Compass FM Radio Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Met Bev Moore, Rangiora High School Commissioner ending her term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended meeting with Kaiapoi Promotions Association, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 11 April</td>
<td>Waimakariri Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WDC / Rūnanga Catch up, Tuahiwi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talk to Rangiora District Lionesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 12 April</td>
<td>Citizenship Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 13 April</td>
<td>Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee - workshop with Ministers Phil Twyford and Megan Woods, followed by formal meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with David Hill (North Canterbury News)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 14 April</td>
<td>You Me We Us outdoor movie, Trousselot Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 16 April</td>
<td>Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS) Summit in Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 17 April</td>
<td>Interview with Compass FM Radio Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 18 April</td>
<td>Quarterly meeting with 4 Community Board Chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 19 April</td>
<td>Freedom Camping Symposium and Zones 5 and 6 Meeting, Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 20 April</td>
<td>Woodend Pre-School 20th Anniversary attended by Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 22 April</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Brass Band ANZAC Concert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 23 April</td>
<td>Critical Issues Update, including Immigration – Minister Ian Lees Galloway, Canterbury Employers’ Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regeneration Steering Group Briefing, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THAT** the Council:

a) **Receives** report No. 180418042246

David Ayers  
**MAYOR**