Council Agenda

COUNCIL MEETING

Tuesday 5 March 2019
Commencing at 1.00pm

Waimakariri District Council Chamber
215 High Street
Rangiora

Members:

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

WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

A meeting of the WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL will be held in the COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA on TUESDAY 5 MARCH 2019 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 4 December 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 4 December 2018.
   (To be circulated separately)

   4.2. Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 5 February 2019

   RECOMMENDATION
   THAT the Council:
   (b) Confirms as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 5 February 2019.
4.3. Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 19 February 2019

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Council:

(c) Confirms as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 19 February 2019.

4.4. Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 5 February 2019

(refer to Public Excluded Agenda)

MATTERS ARISING

5. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

6. ADJOURNED BUSINESS
Nil.

7. REGENERATION REPORTS
Nil

8. REPORTS

8.1. Report on Notice of Motions of 4 December 2018 and 5 February 2019 re Fireworks and Nuisance – Geoff Meadows (Policy Manager)

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No.190226022485

(b) Notes that Council does not have the ability to ban the sale of fireworks;

(c) Notes that Council, through a bylaw, has the ability to restrict the use of fireworks in public places, but this restriction does not apply to private property and would be difficult to enforce;

(d) Notes that Council has the ability to implement a nuisance bylaw to address such matters as long grass that may potentially harbour vermin in vacant sections;

(e) Circulates this report to all Community Boards.
8.2. Murphy Park Reserve, Seasonal Alcohol Control Area – Lynley Beckingsale (Policy Analyst)

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190219019295.

(b) **Resolves** to amend the dates of the alcohol control area for Murphy Park Reserve as described in the Alcohol Control Bylaw 2018 (the Bylaw) from 1st April to 1st September to 1st April to 8th September 2019.

(c) **Notes** the Council resolution to change the dates will be publically notified.

(d) **Copies** this report to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board for its information.

8.3. Approval of draft Rural Residential Development Strategy for consultation – Shelley Milosavljevic (Policy Planner) and Heike Downie (Principal Planning Analyst)

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190218018241

(b) **Approves** the Waimakariri Rural Residential Development Strategy, draft for consultation (attachment i, 190219019201) for public consultation.

(c) **Approves** the accompanying summary document of the Waimakariri Rural Residential Development Strategy for public consultation (attachment ii, 190219019302).

(d) **Nominates** the Portfolio Holder for Communications and District Planning Development to approve any minor edits of the draft Rural Residential Development Strategy (final print ready version) as required in conjunction with staff prior to public consultation commencing.

(e) **Notes** that public consultation will be undertaken under the Special Consultative Procedure (SCP) as outlines in the Local Government Act 2002.

(f) **Notes** that submissions are invited from 8 March 2019 to 5 April 2019, followed by a hearing in late April 2019.

(g) **Appoints** Mayor Ayers and Councillors Atkinson and Meyer to the hearing panel for the draft Strategy.

(h) **Notes** that the development of the draft Rural Residential Development Strategy has been informed by the District Plan Review and District Development Strategy Technical Advisory Group (TAG), and the draft document and summary document has been endorsed by the District
Plan Review and District Development Strategy Project Control Group (PCG).

(i) **Notes** the communications and engagement actions that will be taken during consultation as set out in the Rural Residential Development Strategy - Communications and Engagement Plan (January - June 2019) (attachment vi, 190122006458).

(j) **Receives** the following supporting documents which helped to inform the contents of the draft Strategy:

i. Survey of Residential 4 Zone and San Dona Olive Groves Households – Summary of responses (attachment iii, TRIM)

ii. Waimakariri District - Rural Character Assessment (Rural Zone – Character Assessment Report) 6 June 2018 (Prepared by Boffa Miskell Ltd) (attachment iv, 180611064085)

iii. QV report ‘Rural Subdivision and Housing Analysis – Waimakariri District - December 2018’ (1902220201021)

(k) **Notes** that a final Waimakariri Rural Residential Development Strategy, based on comments received, panel deliberations, and any further information, will be presented to the Council for adoption in mid-2019.

8.4. **Request Authorisation for Additional Funding for A Water Reticulation Extension and Reallocation of Funding for Sewer Extensions – Gary Stevenson (Development Manager) and Kelly LaValley (Project Delivery Unit Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report TRIM number 190220019715.

(b) **Approves** the reallocation of the 2018/19 sewer level of service budget 101067.000.5113 of $58,748 excluding GST and 2018/19 sewer renewals budget 101067.000.5114 of $58,748 excluding GST to the growth budget 101067.000.5115 to facilitate the installation of a sewer main extensions in Topito Road and Tuahiwi Road.

(c) **Approves** a budget of $14,000 excluding GST for the current 2018/19 financial year to install a water main extension in Topito Road.

(d) **Notes** that water and sewer main extension contract for Tuahiwi and Topito Roads is currently being tendered.

(e) **Notes** that Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga will contribute $57,391.30 excluding GST toward the cost of the sewer extensions with Council funding the balance of $157,270.70 excluding GST.

(f) **Notes** that Council funding (existing and reallocated budgets) for the sewer extensions shall be recovered partly via Financial Contributions in the 2018/19 and 2019/2020 financial years, partly from Development Contributions in the 2018/19 and 2019/20 financial years and in full with Development Contributions from 2020/21.
(g) **Notes** that Council funding for the water extension shall be recovered partly via Financial Contributions in the 2018/19 and 2019/20 financial year, and then via Development Contributions in the 2020/21 financial year and future years.

(h) **Notes** that staff are completing further investigation into funding options for infrastructure upgrades in the Maori Reserve 873 to enable future cluster housing developments.

8.5. **Branding of Solid Waste Contracts and Services Information and Educational Material – Kitty Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190221020361.

(b) Confirms that the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party has delegated authority to approve the Brand and to sign-off the promotional materials.

8.6. **2019 Local Authority Elections – Order of Candidates Names on Voting Papers – Sarah Nichols (Governance Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report № 190220019931.

(b) Resolves to use the Random order for showing the names on the voting documents for the October 2019 Local Body Elections.

(c) **Notes** the Councils resolution of August 2014 to conduct the 2016 and 2019 Local Authority elections by way of the postal voting method using First Past the Post (FPP) system.
8.7. **Elected Members Remuneration and Expenses Policy Review – Sarah Nichols (Governance Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190224021130.

(b) **Acknowledges** the Remuneration Authority determination from 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019 for the Mayor of $123,068pa, Deputy Mayor $46,913pa, Councillors $42,011pa, Rangiora-Ashley Community Board Chair $22,105pa and Board members $11,052pa; Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board Chair $17,137pa and Board members $8,569pa; Woodend-Sefton Community Board Chair $14,158pa and Board members $7,080pa; Oxford-Ohoka Community Board Chair $16,145pa and Board members $8,072pa.

(c) **Confirms** the Elected Members Expenses Policy S-CP 1035, 5 March 2019 (v13) for approval by the Remuneration Authority.

(d) **Notes** the Remuneration Authority will issue a new determination for the period of 1 July 2019 to 12 October 2019 and notes Remuneration Authority communications on the changes proposed to the remuneration determination following the 2019-22 elections.

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

8.8. **Review of Elected Member Conference and Training Policy - Sarah Nichols (Governance Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190222020835.

(b) **Adopts** the Elected Member Policy for Conference and Training Course Attendance S-CP 0905 (Trim 190224021129).

9. **HEALTH AND SAFETY**


**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No 190220019443

(b) **Notes** that there are no significant Health and Safety issues at this time, and that WDC is, so far as is reasonably practicable, compliant with the PCBU duties of the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015.
10. MATTER REFERRED FROM THE REGENERATION STEERING GROUP MEETING OF 4 FEBRUARY 2019

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report no. 190124007788

(b) Circulates this report to Land Information New Zealand, as agents on behalf of the Crown, for the purposes of monitoring the implementation of the Recovery Plan.

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

11.1. Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri Youth Council held on 29 January 2019

11.2. Minutes of a meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group held on 4 February 2019

11.3. Minutes of a meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee held on 12 February 2019

11.4. Minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee held on 12 February 2018

11.5. Minutes of a meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee held on 19 February 2019

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the information in items 11.1 to 11.5 be received.

12. COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

12.1. Minutes of a meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board held on 7 February 2019

12.2. Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board held on 11 February 2019

12.3. Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board held on 13 February 2019

12.4. Minutes of a meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board held on 18 February 2019

RECOMMENDATION

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

14. MAYOR’S DIARY

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report no. 190226022809.

15. COUNCIL PORTFOLIO UPDATES
15.1. Iwi Relationships – Mayor Ayers
15.2. Canterbury Water Management Strategy – Councillor Stewart
15.3. International Relationships – Deputy Mayor Felstead
15.4. Regeneration (Kaiapoi) – Councillor Blackie

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:

<p>| Item No | Minutes/Report of General subject of each Reason for passing this Ground(s) under Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution |
|---------|------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 18.1    | Minutes of the Public Excluded portion of a Confirmation of minutes Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7 Section 48(1)(a) |
|         | meeting of the Council on 5 February 2018 | in relation to each matter | under Section 7 | of this resolution |
| 18.2    | Minutes of the Public Excluded portion of a Minutes for information Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7 Section 48(1)(a) |
|         | meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee held on 12 February 2019 | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>Report of Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager) and Kelly LaValley (Project Delivery Manager)</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>Report of Chris Brown (Manager Community and Recreation)</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>Report of Chris Brown (Manager Community and Recreation)</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>Report of Jim Palmer (Chief Executive)</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.1 - 18.6</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons. To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CLOSED MEETING

See Public Excluded Agenda (blue papers)

OPEN MEETING

19. NEXT MEETING

The next scheduled meeting of the Council is at 1.00pm on Tuesday 2 April 2019 in the Council Chambers.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA, ON TUESDAY 5 FEBRUARY 2019 COMMENCING AT 1PM.

PRESENT:
Mayor D Ayers (Chair), Deputy Mayor K Felstead, Councillors N Atkinson (arrived 1.05pm at commencement of item 3.2), K Barnett, A Blackie, R Brine, W Doody, D Gordon, J Meyer, S Stewart and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE:
J Palmer (Chief Executive), J Millward (Manager Finance & Business Support), M Kwant (Community Projects Officer), and S Nichols (Governance Manager).

The meeting adjourned at 2.47pm and reconvened at 3.03pm.

1. APOLOGIES
Nil.

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Nil.

3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

3.1 New Year’s Honours
Mayor Ayers recognised persons awarded in the New Zealand New Year’s Honours and acknowledged their contribution to the Waimakariri community.

Member of New Zealand Order of Merit (MNZM)
- Sharon Torstonson for services to the community

Queen’s Service Medal (QSM)
- Kenneth (Don) Fairbrother for services to seniors and the disabled
- Lindsay Kerr for services to sport
- Janet Pentecost for services to the community, particularly seniors.

3.2 Community Service Award
Councillor Felstead read the citation of Michael Petterson acknowledging his contribution to the Waimakariri District, in particular to the Passchendaele, Belgium relationship with Waimakariri.

M Petterson remarked he was both honoured and humbled to receive the award. M Petterson commented on the meaningful relationship with Zonnebeke and Waimakariri, which had done New Zealand proud in his view. He also commented that the relationship with the local Rangiora and Kaiapoi RSA’s was a positive bonus.

4. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

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

These minutes will be confirmed at the next ordinary Council meeting.
4.2. Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 4 December 2018
(the matter was dealt with in the Public Excluded portion of the meeting).

5. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
(the matter was dealt with in the Public Excluded portion of the meeting).

6. NOTICE OF MOTION
Councillor Dan Gordon submitted a Notice of Motion pursuant to Standing Order 26.1.

Moved Councillor Gordon seconded Councillor Williams

THAT the Council resolves to:
(a) Approve Council staff investigating a possible Property Maintenance and Nuisance Bylaw to cover instances of long grass on undeveloped sections.
(b) Request that staff report back to the Councils March 2019 meeting on options for such a Bylaw.
(c) Note that in scoping the Bylaw other instances of nuisance may be identified and that such matters be reported back for possible inclusion in the preparation of a draft Bylaw.

CARRIED

Councillor Gordon spoke to the motion, reflecting on neighbourhood long grass issues particularly prevalent in spring and autumn when higher vegetation growth occurs. He acknowledged the Council has a responsibility when vermin were involved, however matters relating to fire risk are referred to Fire Emergency NZ (FENZ). Councillor Gordon believed there were issues with enforcement and FENZ only intervene when it is deemed a direct fire risk. Councillor Gordon spoke of neighbours making the effort to keep their properties in a tidy condition, subdivision covenants, absentee landowners and neighbourhood pride; reflecting on occurrences prior to changes in legislation and the enactment of FENZ.

Councillor Gordon commented on an Auckland City Council Bylaw (Public Safety and Nuisance Bylaw 2013) outlining aspects that were similar to what he was seeking. Councillor Gordon reflected on media commentary over the past few months, and growing concern for the Port Hills area. Councillor Gordon queried whether the purpose of the proposal was more related to residential sections as he was concerned about the implications for rural properties. He asked if recommendation (a) could be amended to read “undeveloped residentially developed sections”. Councillor Gordon advised that he would prefer to leave the recommendation broad at this stage, and await staff feedback.

Councillor Williams echoed the comments made by his colleague.

Councillor Felstead queried whether the purpose of the proposal was more related to residential sections as he was concerned about the implications for rural properties. He asked if recommendation (a) could be amended to read “undeveloped residentially developed sections”. Councillor Gordon advised that he would prefer to leave the recommendation broad at this stage, and await staff feedback.
Councillor Felstead stated he was supportive of the proposal, as he believed that with the changeover of enforcement to FENZ has left a gap in responsibilities and legislation that needs to be covered.

Councillor Blackie suggested the word "sections" be changed to "property", however he would wait staff feedback.

Mayor Ayers advised matters related to overhanging trees over the footpath can, and are, dealt with already by the Council enforcement team.

Councillor Barnett enquired if there was any indication of cost or failure/success as a result of the Auckland City Council Bylaw. Councillor Gordon stated no, acknowledging some aspects of that particular bylaw would not be applicable to this District, however that could be a matter for staff to explore.

Councillor Barnett directed a question to the Chief Executive, stating that the Council has received complaints about unkempt properties for years, particularly involving undeveloped sections in Pegasus and asked why the Council had not done something earlier. J Palmer commented that prior to FENZ, the Council had legislation under the Rural Fire provisions which had a lower threshold, so the Council dealt with many issues through the previous legislation, however now with the FENZ Act the Council only have the power to persuade. J Palmer confirmed previously the Council has mowed sections and sent an account to the land owner, using legislative provisions to encourage compliance. There were not many properties where this action was undertaken, however action was undertaken.

Councillor Barnett was supportive of the motion and thought it should have come through a report from the Environmental Services Unit rather than a Notice of Motion. Councillor Barnett commented on how effective we can be and enforcement, reflecting on powers to enforce under bylaws. Councillor Barnett stated she was supportive of investigating a process but cautious on the ability to deliver for the community.

Councillor Atkinson was supportive of the motion and investigation, but cautioned that he did not want to see the Council bylaw and enforcement is the default position for FENZ.

Councillor Brine reflected on interactions with the Council using the Rural Fire Act to enforce in the past. He commented on a fire that had occurred in the Selwyn District the previous day as a consequence of a spark from a passing train, and landowner's responsibility. Councillor Brine remarked that it was unlikely FENZ would undertake any education or action on many rural properties, however he looked forward to staff bringing a practical information report back to the Council.

Councillor Felstead sought clarification on the legislation in regard to growth of non-noxious weeds. J Palmer commented on the power of persuasion in the past, and confirmed noxious weeds were a component of the issue. It was acknowledged main arterial roads are mown by the Council/NZTA up to a width of one metre, however in the wider context berms could be considered; both residential and rural.

Mayor Ayers mentioned past comments on Facebook related to Pegasus properties. In some of those instances he had approached Pegasus real estate agents to consider undertaking low grade property maintenance contracts to ensure properties were kept mown for overseas/absent landowners. Mayor Ayers commented on differences between Auckland City Council operations and Waimakariri. However on the Auckland City Council website their advice is consistent with our current advice and action; being for vermin contact the Council and for fire risk concerns to contact FENZ.

Councillor Doody commented on tussocks planted as roadside landscaping which could be considered, a fire risk if they are not tended properly as they can become a fire risk.
In his right of reply Councillor Gordon reflected on how matters were efficiently dealt with prior to the FENZ legislation. He stated that nothing has been promised to residents but he is seeking an investigation into options following much feedback from members of the community who rightly expect an elected member to bring up such matters. The motion does allow other nuisance aspects to be considered. If the council decide to take the next step then community consultation would occur and further consideration given before any bylaw is implemented.

7. ADJOINED BUSINESS

Nil.

8. REGENERATION REPORTS

Nil.

9. REPORTS

9.1 Annual Monitoring Report – Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan – V Spittal (Policy Analyst) and M Kwant (Community Projects Officer)

M Kwant spoke to a PowerPoint and provided an overview of the work that has occurred to date, highlighted occurrences where vehicles on the beach and estuary had caused damage to the environment and outlined daily staff involvement in the area.

Councillor Barnett enquired if community education related to how to report issues and general awareness to ensure compliance at the Waikuku Beach estuary end had occurred. M Kwant acknowledged there has not been a lot of specific work in that area however, staff have attended a fishermen’s meeting, and the group are keen to promote the bylaw and spread the word. It was advised there are many signs located in the area, although some are ready for a review and reposition.

Councillor Atkinson queried horses on the beach and if any improvement had occurred since the bylaw was reviewed. M Kwant commented on a beach user survey, where horses were hardly mentioned however, there were comments that people enjoyed seeing horses at the beach. Staff advised matters involving dogs and vehicles were mentioned the most in the survey. The commercial horse trainers’ agreement had recently been reviewed and ratified and the trainers continue to work with the Council on how they undertake their activity. Staff advised there is research yet to be undertaken on the impact of horses travelling over the shellfish beds.

Councillor Felstead enquired if agreement had been reached and completed with the Fenton Reserve Trustees. Staff acknowledged the matter is ongoing and the documents were currently with the Trustees, however there is no further buy-in.

Moved Councillor Atkinson seconded Councillor Barnett

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190115003407.
(b) Acknowledges the Northern Pegasus Bay Advisory Group for the progress made on achieving the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan during its nine months of operation.

CARRIED
Councillor Blackie reflected positively on the staff work occurring and was of the understanding that enforcement had improved as more ranger time was spent in the area. Councillor Blackie continued to encourage more funding for patrolling rangers to be sourced from Ecan. He acknowledged the finalisation of the agreement with the Fenton Reserve Trustees was slower than desirable. Councillor Blackie reported that work in the Rakahuri Estuary area was ongoing, and that both commercial horse trainers and kite surfers had MOU’s and were supportive of the bylaw. Overall Councillor Blackie stated the behaviour in the Northern Pegasus Bay area was better than two years ago.

Councillor Barnett appreciated the comprehensive report and remarked that it was pleasing that groups were working together, and the community were sharing information. Councillor Barnett believe messages about the Bylaw were being promoted well and some areas are seeing improvements as a result.

Councillor Atkinson was very supportive of the collaboration that has occurred through this bylaw, and believed the public contribution had been positive. Councillor Atkinson believed that the Bylaw has helped bring communities together for the wellbeing of the environment and it was a good example of the Council collaboratively working with the community in a positive way.

Councillor Gordon reflected on how far things have come from the first bylaw and the present one. He was appreciative of all the work of the community, the involvement of different recreational groups and the staff to bring about positive change to the environment enjoyed by many.


J Millward spoke to the report briefly highlighting key changes and improvements from the last review. It was advised this policy forms part of an 18 month improvement programme.

Councillor Brine queried the delegations and whether it impacts on financial delegations. J Millward explained that it did not at this time and outlined the process. The Delegation Policy is a conjunctive document.

Councillor Blackie sought clarification on how recent contractor training enhanced the process. Staff explained that the policy enables a framework and training processes. In the future consideration may be given to a procurement manager which may enable other improvements to occur in-house, rather than externally.

Councillor Williams enquired how gains are accessed. J Millward commented on the criteria around the improvement programme, acknowledging measurement was not straightforward and often anecdotal. He advised that gains will occur related to the establishment of the panel and the pre-qualification processes which will save time.

Councillor Barnett enquired what occurs when some specialist work is required and it is a struggle to attract three quotations. J Millward advised in such circumstances it would be considered by the management team and would require a staff report to be presented outlining reasons for a deviation from the policy. J Millward provided examples of when such a situation may occur such as a specialist provider. The All of Government contract and consultancy policy were also outlined when they may be used.

Moved Councillor Gordon seconded Councillor Atkinson
THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No.190117004507;
(b) **Approves** the Procurement and Contract Management Policy (Trim 19021005949), Noting a small change in section 6.1 paragraph 2 from the contract owner to the department owner.
(c) **Notes** this policy replaces the Purchasing (including tendering) Policy (Trim 15904127396).

CARRIED

Councillor Gordon reflected on previous discussions at the Audit and Risk Committee and was supportive of the policy. He acknowledged there are costs involved however, he believed this would enable improved and appropriate checks to be in place prior to purchasing goods and services.

Councillor Atkinson endorsed comments made by his colleague and stated he believed the Council was heading in the right direction with this continuous improvement processes.

HEALTH AND SAFETY


J Palmer took the report as read.

Councillor Brine had a query about staff being abused and also when two persons are required to deal with an issue. J Palmer commented on the process when visiting property that has a known issue, which could involve persons or animals. He advised there are very few instances of confrontation.

Moved Councillor Atkinson seconded Councillor Felstead

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No 190123007100.
(b) **Notes** that there are no significant Health and Safety issues at this time, and that WDC is, so far as is reasonably practicable, compliant with the PCBU duties of the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015.

CARRIED

Councillor Atkinson commented on the value of reading these reports and the efforts taken to keep staff safe.

Councillor Felstead reflected on unknown dangers and the importance of safety. J Palmer acknowledged ongoing training and risk assessment.

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

10.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri Youth Council held on 27 November 2018

10.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee held on 20 November 2018
10.3 Minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee held on 20 November 2018

Minutes of a meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group held on 3 December 2018

10.4 Minutes of a meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee held on 11 December 2018

Minutes of a meeting of the Utilities and Roading Committee held on 11 December 2018

10.5 Minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee held on 18 December 2018

Moved Councillor Doody seconded Councillor Meyer

THAT the information in items 10.1 to 10.5 be received.

CARRIED

11. COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

11.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board held on 13 November 2018

11.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board held on 19 November 2018

11.3 Minutes of a meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board held on 6 December 2018

11.4 Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board held on 10 December 2018

11.5 Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board held on 12 December 2018

11.6 Minutes of a meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board held on 17 December 2018

Moved Councillor Blackie seconded Councillor Doody

THAT the information in items 11.1 to 11.6 be received.

CARRIED

12. CORRESPONDENCE

Nil.

13. MAYOR’S DIARY

13.1 Mayor’s Diary 27 November 2018 – 28 January 2019

Moved Mayor Ayers seconded Councillor Barnett

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report no. 190124007275.

CARRIED
14. COUNCIL PORTFOLIO UPDATES

14.1. Iwi Relationships – Mayor Ayers
Waitangi Day with an event being held at Trousselot Park, Kaiapoi.

14.2. Canterbury Water Management Strategy – Councillor Stewart
Councillor Stewart advised the first Water Zone Committee meeting for the year was occurring next week and outlined key agenda items.

Councillor Stewart commented on predominant upcoming issues being drinking water and nitrate levels affecting Christchurch. It was advised that the recently endorsed Waimakariri ZIPA and upcoming Plan Change are not supported by the Christchurch City Council, as they believe the nitrate levels are set too high. Councillor Stewart cautioned that if the City Council are successful in reducing the nitrate levels lower, that it will have long term affect farming practices in the Waimakariri district.

Councillor Stewart commented on the reporting process previously from Ecan and improvements that are expected for the Water Zone meetings going forward.

14.3. International Relationships – Deputy Mayor Felstead
Councillor Felstead advised that Japan Day was being celebrated on 3 March.

14.4. Regeneration (Kaiapoi) – Councillor Blackie
Councillor Blackie provided an update from the Regeneration Steering Group meeting held the previous day.

It was advised that discussions with the Harbourmaster regarding future moorings was positive. The discussions included a familiarisation visit down the Kaiapoi River area.

It was advised The Terraces work was progressing in readiness for the River Carnival Day being held on 17 February.

15. QUESTIONS
Nil.

16. URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS
Nil.

The meeting adjourned at 2.47pm and reconvened at 3.03pm.

17. MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Moved Councillor Felstead    seconded Councillor Doody

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 each matter to be considered</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 a meeting of the Council on 4 December 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>Deputation – Debbie and Rex Jeffcoat</td>
<td>Waikuku Beach Holiday Park</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>Report of Mayor David Ayers</td>
<td>Establishment of Mahi Tahi (Working Together) Development Committee with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.1 and 18.2</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons.</td>
<td>7(2)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>Maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the free and frank expression of opinions by or between or to members or officers or employees of any local authority, in the course of their duty; Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations);</td>
<td>7(2)(f)(i) 7(2) i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The public excluded portion of the meeting occurred from 3.04pm to 4.07pm.

18. **NEXT MEETING**

The next scheduled meeting of the Council is at 3.15pm on Tuesday 19 February 2019 in the Council Chambers.
There being no further business, the meeting closed at 4.08pm.

CONFIRMED

____________________________
Chairperson

____________________________
Date
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD IN
THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA, ON TUESDAY
19 FEBRUARY 2019, COMMENCING AT 3.15PM.

PRESENT:

IN ATTENDANCE:
N Harrison (Manager, Regulation/Acting CE), J Millward (Manager, Finance & Business Support), J McBride (Roading & Transport Manager), C Brown (Manager, Community & Recreation), D Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager, Regeneration), F Scales (Senior Project Engineer) and S Nichols (Governance Manager).

1. APOLOGIES
Moved: Councillor Gordon Seconded: Councillor Meyer
An apology was received and sustained from Councillor Brine for absence.
CARRIED

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Nil.

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday – Wednesday 29 - 30 January 2019
Moved: Councillor Gordon Seconded: Councillor Atkinson
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 29 January and Wednesday 30 January 2019.
CARRIED

3.2 Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 30 January 2019
(This was dealt with in the Public Excluded section of the meeting).

4. REPORTS
J Millward commented on the associated documents being the Consultation Document and the Draft Annual Plan. J Millward confirmed an average district-wide rate movement of 4.5% and advised that the rates calculator would be live on the website at the time of consultation.

There were no questions from members.
THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 190211014633;

(b) Adopts the Draft Annual Plan 2019/2020 as the principal document relied on for the content of the Consultation Document;

(c) Adopts the Consultation Document 2019/2020 as the statement of proposal for public participation in decisions on the content of the draft Annual Plan;

(d) Notes the Annual Plan Engagement Schedule with the special consultative procedure to open on 11 March 2019 and close on 11 April 2019;

(e) Notes the Draft Annual Plan and Consultation Document refers to further information and reports and this information will be provided on the Council website during the special consultative procedure from 11 March 2019 to 11 April 2019;

(f) Delegates to the Mayor and Chief Executive authority to make changes to the Consultation Document following Audit opinion and Council comments.

CARRIED

Mayor Ayers commented on the through process undertaken to date with much thought and consideration given to costs and resourcing for the district. He stated this Draft Annual Plan is largely in line with the Long Term Plan which is taking the district forward.

Councillor Atkinson remarked that he would await with interest the public views and feedback over the coming weeks.

5. MATTER REFERRED FROM THE REGENERATION STEERING GROUP MEETING OF 4 FEBRUARY 2019

5.1 Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area Road Upgrades – Fraser Scales (Senior Project Engineer)

F Scales provided an overview of the report purpose, advising Abley Consultants had contributed to the information and that Jones Street was not included in this work as that particular project had been discussed and programmed. F Scales briefly commented on the budget and reallocation of funding.

There were no questions from members.

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 181123137888.

(b) Approves the proposed concept design for Cass Street west (between Jones Street and the Kaiapoi East sport and recreation reserve) as shown in Figure 1 of this report.

(c) Approves the proposed concept design for Charles Street west (between Jones Street and Beswick Street) as shown in Figures 2 and 3 of this report.
(d) Approves the proposed concept design for Charles Street east (between Beswick Street and Jollie Street) as shown in Figures 4 and 5 of this report.

(e) Approves the proposed concept design for Jollie Street as shown in Figure 6 of this report.

(f) Approves the proposed concept design for Old Feldwick Drive (between Jollie Street and the private property at 10 Feldwick Drive) as shown in Figure 7 of this report.

(g) Approves the proposed concept design for Cass Street east (between old Feldwick Drive and Hall Street) as shown in Figure 8 of this report.

(h) Approves the proposed concept design for Hall Street as shown in Figure 9 of this report.

(i) Notes the current project estimate for the proposed concept designs is $2,652,274.

(j) Notes the estimate includes professional fees and a project contingency of 30%.

(k) Notes the current Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme and Regeneration Programme budget allocation for this work is $2,060,000.

(l) Notes Council approval is currently being sought to reallocate budget of up to $600,000 from within the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery programme activity (Project 48 for the purposes of decommissioning roads) to the District Regeneration programme activity, for the new purpose of rebuilding some of those roads within the Kaiapoi East Regeneration area.

(m) Notes if Council approves the budget reallocation, the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme and Regeneration Programme budget allocation for this work would increase to $2,660,000.

(n) Notes the current Regeneration Programme budget allocation of $2,060,000 includes a budgeted NZTA subsidy of $770,000. The current NZTA Activity List includes a scheduled subsidy total of $545,700 for both Charles Street and Jollie Street only. This discrepancy between the WDC budgeted and NZTA scheduled subsidy figures indicates a net shortfall of $224,300 (assuming Council accepts the aforementioned budget reallocation from the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme).

CARRIED

Councillor Blackie personally believed that Jones Street should have priority, however acknowledged staff expertise and endorsed another regeneration related project progressing.

Councillor Atkinson stated this project was a major step forward and would set up the neighbourhood for the future, improving community wellbeing.

Mayor Ayers stated he looked forward to the work being undertaken and finished. He commented on the potential future naming of Cass Street at the eastern end by the sports fields, however that would be a matter for the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board to consider in the future.

6. MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Moved: Councillor Barnett  seconded: Mayor Ayers
THAT the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes 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>6.</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of Council meeting of 30 January 2019</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>6.</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

CLOSED MEETING

The public excluded portion of the meeting occurred from 3.25pm to 3.27pm.

NEXT MEETING

The next scheduled meeting of the Council is on Tuesday 5 March 2019 commencing at 1pm to be held in the Council Chamber.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 3.28pm.

CONFIRMED

____________________________
Chairperson
____________________________
Date
1. SUMMARY

1.1. Legal advice on Council’s ability to ban the sale and use of fireworks in the District was obtained in December 2018. Council does not have the ability to ban the sale of fireworks because a Council bylaw cannot be inconsistent with the laws of New Zealand, and Section 6 of the Hazardous Substances (Fireworks) Regulations 2001 provides for the sale of fireworks from 2 November to 5 November each year.

1.2. Council could implement a bylaw to restrict the use of fireworks in public places, but this would be difficult to enforce as the incident is likely over before compliance people arrive, and would not apply to the nuisance caused by the discharge of fireworks on private land.

1.3. Similarly a nuisance bylaw to deal with such matters as long grass on undeveloped sections could be implemented by Council.

Attachments:

i. Legal advice from Corcoran French of December 2018

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No.190226022485

(b) Notes that Council does not have the ability to ban the sale of fireworks;

(c) Notes that Council, through a bylaw, has the ability to restrict the use of fireworks in public places, but this restriction does not apply to private property and would be difficult to enforce;

(d) Notes that Council has the ability to implement a nuisance bylaw to address such matters as long grass that may potentially harbour vermin in vacant sections;

(e) Circulates this report to all Community Boards.
3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 Council passed two notices of motion, one on 4 December 2018, and one on 5 February 2019, for Council staff to investigate options and legality to ban the sale and use of fireworks in the District, and to investigate a possible nuisance bylaw.

3.2 Legal advice from Corcoran French was obtained in December 2019, and details of Auckland Council’s nuisance bylaw provisions were obtained which include:

   a. Section (3) A person must not set off fireworks, flares or any other explosive material:
      (a) In a public place, except with the prior written approval of the council or a council
          controlled organisation; and (b) In any other place, in a way that does or is likely to
          create a nuisance or endanger any person, property, dog or other animal in a public
          place.

   b. Auckland Council’s proposed change to its Nuisance Bylaw to:
      Fireworks, flares, explosive materials (1) A person must not set off any firework, flare
      or any other explosive material in a public place, unless the relevant authority has
      given prior written approval.

   c. Firework means an object containing hazardous substances with explosive properties.

   d. On private property, fireworks are permitted provided –
      - they do not cause injury or alarm to any person in a public place under
        section 35 of the Summary Offences Act 1981, for example throwing
        fireworks at people in public places from private property, and
      - cause excessive noise under section 326-328 of the Resource
        Management Act 1991, for example fireworks set off late at night.

3.3 The Council also receives complaints about general nuisance including matters such
unkempt urban sections, keeping of stock in urban areas and tyre dumps in rural areas.
Some councils have developed a bylaw to address nuisance elements and this is a
possibility for Waimakariri District Council.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. Auckland Council are currently in the process of lobbying Central Government to amend
Section 6 of the Hazardous Substances (Fireworks) Regulations 2001 and until this is
done, local government have no ability to ban the sale of fireworks in the District.

4.2. Council needs to fulfil Section 155 (1) of the Local Government Act 2002 which states that
a local authority must, before commencing the process for making a bylaw, determine
whether a bylaw is the most appropriate way of addressing the perceived problem. In the
case of the use of fireworks, it would seem that a nation-wide approach of amending a
Central Government regulation would be the most appropriate way of addressing the
perceived problem.

4.3. The main issue with a bylaw controlling fireworks and other nuisances is that enforcement
is cumbersome. The first issue is timeliness. In the example of fireworks in public places,
it’s unlikely that the compliance officer would be present at the incident so enforcement
would be hindsight with the inherent uncertainty that comes with that. A second issue is
there is no facility to issue infringement notices to people transgressing the bylaw. Any
penalty is only achieved through a prosecution at the District Court.

4.4. One path partly around this inability to infringe could be applied to some elements of a
nuisance bylaw. In the example of an unkempt property, the Council could charge
inspection fees to cover the costs of administering the bylaw.
4.5. There is an option of developing one bylaw that includes the fireworks issue in one public safety and nuisance bylaw. This has an advantage of simplicity for process but also has a disadvantage of being less focussed to the issues at hand.

4.6. If the Council resolves to instigate a bylaw or bylaws, the likely timeline would be a minimum of six months from preparing the bylaw. This would include Council approvals for the draft bylaw and consultation documents, then calling for public submissions, collating the submissions and hearing the parties, then publishing the final document.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1 Views of the community have been obtained with the gathering of a petition calling for the ban of the sale of fireworks. If the Council proposes a bylaw approach, community views would be canvassed through the special consultative procedure of the LGA.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial Implications

6.1. Not significant, except for staff time and legal costs in enforcing a nuisance bylaw through the District Court.

Community Implications

6.2. Community have an expectation for Council action in response to nuisances. Council already has this ability in part under the Resource Management Act 1991 and other acts.

Health and Safety

6.3. Banning the sale of fireworks would reduce the health and safety risk to people and animals.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

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

7.2. Legislation

Section 145 of the Local Government Act 2002 empowers the Council to make a bylaw for its district to protect, promote and maintain public health and safety.

7.3. Community Outcomes

Governance

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

- The Council makes information about its plans and activities readily available. ¹, ³
- The Council takes account of the views across the community including mana whenua. ¹, ³
- The Council makes known its views on significant proposals by others affecting the District’s wellbeing. ³
- Opportunities for collaboration and partnerships are actively pursued. ¹, ², ³, ⁴
3 December 2018

Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440

Attention: Nick Harrison

Dear Nick

FIREWORKS BYLAW ADVICE

1. As requested, we have looked into whether the Council has the ability to ban firework sales in the WDC area and if not, whether it can ban and/or restrict the use of fireworks in public places or within private property.

Summary

2. It appears that Council do not have the ability to ban the sale of fireworks outright in the WDC area (as the sale of fireworks in general would not be classed as a nuisance). However there is provision for Council to implement a bylaw to restrict the use of fireworks in public places. The Council can possibly restrict the use of fireworks on private property (as was originally implemented by the Auckland Council by clause 6(3)(b) of the Public Safety and Nuisance Bylaw 2013 ("PSN")). However, there is the possibility that restricting the use of fireworks on private property contravenes the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act ("NZBORA"). Even if it doesn’t, the ability to restrict the use of fireworks on private property may already be covered by other legislation. There is also the argument as to whether the resources and enforcement of such a hypothetical bylaw may be best dealt with by the Police (under the Summary Offences Act 1981), as opposed to Council officers.

3. We have addressed your questions and provide reasons why a bylaw can or cannot be implemented and address each option separately:

Can Council totally ban the sale of fireworks within the WDC area?

4. Section 145 of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) (attached) provides general bylaw making powers to Council for the following purposes:
   (a) protecting the public from nuisance;
   (b) protecting, promoting, and maintaining public health and safety; and
   (c) minimising potential for offensive behaviour in public places.
5. Section 146 of the LGA does not limit section 145 and allows Council to make bylaws for the purposes of regulating (among other things) "trading in public places" (see Section 146(a)(vi)). We do not believe this section (and section 145) gives Council the power to completely ban the sale of fireworks in the WDC area.

6. We agree with Adrienne Cook's comments (as stated in Mike O'Connell's email to you dated 27 November 2018) that the sale of fireworks in general would not be classed as a 'nuisance' per se, but rather it is the use of fireworks that would be considered (or could be considered) a nuisance. A bylaw could then be introduced to restrict the use of fireworks as opposed to banning their sale outright.

7. Council also cannot introduce a bylaw that is repugnant to the general law of New Zealand. Section 6 of the Hazardous Substances (Fireworks) Regulations 2001 provides that:

   (1) Fireworks may be displayed for retail sale or sold by a retailer during the period beginning on 2 November and ending at close of 5 November in each year.

   (2) Fireworks may be sold by a retailer at other times only under written approval issued by the Authority under regulation 7.

Accordingly, unless government bans the sale of fireworks or gives Territorial Authorities the authority to regulate this, we do not believe a bylaw can be implemented for this purpose.

8. To get around this problem the Auckland Council is currently consulting the public on proposed amendments to clause 6(3)(b) of the PSN bylaws as well as seeking approval from government to ban the sale of fireworks to the public. This consultation is taking place early December and they aim to have a report available late January 2019.

Can Council ban and/or restrict the use of fireworks in public places?

9. We believe that restricting the use of fireworks in public place would come within the parameters of Section 145 of the LGA. Other district councils (such as Auckland Council and Hauraki District Council) have implemented a bylaw restricting the use of fireworks in public places.

10. Therefore it is possible for the WDC to implement a bylaw to restrict the use of fireworks in public places. However, Council would need to look into the purpose of this bylaw, what it is sought to prevent and determine whether or not this is better dealt with by other legislation and enforced by the police as opposed to Council, if the bylaw is introduced.

11. If Council decide to implement a bylaw restricting the use of fireworks, they must follow the two-stage process as outlined in Sections 155 and 156 of the LGA. You are well aware of this process.

Can Council ban and/or restrict the use of fireworks on private property?

12. The Auckland Council currently include a clause in the PSN bylaw restricting the use of fireworks "in any other place" in a way that does or is likely to create a nuisance or endanger any person, property, door or other animal and a public place (clause 6(3)(b)). However, Auckland Council are looking to remove this clause because they consider that New Zealand Police can address this issue using existing legislation (section 35 of the Summary Offences Act 1981 in respect of throwing fireworks and/or excessive noise under Sections 326-328 of the Resource Management Act 1991).
13. We have provided relevant information from Auckland Council’s evaluation of clause 6(3) of the PSN bylaw which referred to the options discussed by Auckland Council being:

1. Retain the bylaw as is;
2. amend wording to remove provisions about setting off fireworks in "other places"; or
3. revoking the bylaw entirely.

The second option is their recommended option (see attached).

14. The Auckland Council have noted that clause 6(3)(b) in their bylaw retains an inappropriate provision about fireworks in “any other place” and say this issue is better addressed under other legislation and enforced by the Police. For that reason they have recommended this clause be removed. They also say that this removal would not prevent Council advocating for a national ban on the public sale of fireworks, and they are planning to consult Government on this very issue.

15. WDC’s email dated 20 November 2018, referred to the Christchurch City Council Urban Fire Safety bylaw 2014 (section 8 relates to fireworks). This entire bylaw has been revoked as it was made redundant by the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017 (FENZ). This bylaw concerned the risk of fire as opposed to fireworks in general being a nuisance which is why this bylaw is now redundant. If Council’s reason for a bylaw is concerned with fireworks being a fire hazard, then their concerns may be covered by FENZ. However, if Council’s concerns are more focused on fireworks being a nuisance, then a bylaw can be implemented to restrict its use, at least within public places.

Additional Comments/Conclusion

16. From the information provided, WDC do not have the ability to ban the public sale of fireworks, but they do have the ability to introduce a bylaw to restrict the use of fireworks in public places (and potentially within private property – subject to it not breaching the NZBORA and noting the Auckland Council’s concerns).

17. Councils have introduced a bylaw restricting the use of fireworks in private property/in other places. However, the Auckland Council are looking to remove this from the PSN bylaw due to possible enforcement issues; they also say that adequate solutions are available within other legislation to deal with this issue. If WDC decide to introduce a fireworks bylaw, it might be prudent to only include restriction in public places as opposed to extending it to private property.

18. Finally, with the Auckland Council planning to consult Government regarding the introduction of a ban on the public sale of fireworks, the WDC may be best advised to wait until this has been considered as this may determine whether there is the need for a bylaw at all.

Yours faithfully
CORSORAN FRENCH

MARTIN BELL
Partner
Email: martin@corsoranfrench.co.nz
1518.1233 : KMC
BYLAW CLAUSE 6(3): To prohibit fireworks in a public place unless approved by council, or in any other place in a way that is a nuisance or danger to any person, property, dog or other animal in a public place.

STATUTORY OBLIGATIONS/POWERS
- Council may make a bylaw about fireworks to address public nuisance, health, safety, offensive behaviour, or use of public places under Local Government Act 2002 (s145, s146) and public health and nuisance under Health Act (s64).

ISSUES IN 2013
- Injury to persons, fire risks to private and public land (e.g. Piha), noise, litter, distress/death of animals, and fireworks outside of the Guy Fawkes period. No data available on scale or impact of issue.

OUTCOMES Sought AND BYLAW RESPONSE IN 2013
- To ensure that public places are safe and accessible, to minimise nuisances, and where appropriate, use a bylaw rather than relying on other legislation or non-regulatory approaches.
- Both Auckland Council and Auckland Transport bylaws prohibit use of fireworks in a public place unless approved by council; and where set off from any other place, to prohibit nuisance or endangerment to any person, property, dog or other animal in a public place.
- Powers to enforce the bylaw include: seizure of property (s164 to 168 LGA), cost recovery for damage (s176 LGA), ability to request names and addresses (s178 LGA).
- Penalties for bylaw breaches include a maximum $20,000 court fine (s242 LGA), a maximum $500 court fine and a further $50 court fine per day for continuing offences (s66 Health Act).

BYLAW IMPLEMENTATION SINCE 2013
- Auckland Transport delegated enforcement of its bylaw to Auckland Council.
- Council reactively responds to complaints within 2-3 hours.
- During Guy Fawkes two officers respond to complaints and two officers patrol key beaches/parks.
- Officers focus on engagement and education to achieve compliance as there are significant issues identifying perpetrators who often leave, or give false details, often not deterred by Council presence.
- Police respond to safety/property complaints. Council noise control officers respond to noise complaints.
- Public awareness through media (e.g. Our Auckland, Council website and media commentary).
- Non-regulatory initiatives include Council support for controlled public fireworks displays.
- Officers do not use the part of the bylaw about letting off fireworks from any other place (Clause 6(3)(b)).

ISSUES IN 2018
- Nature of issue is comparable with 2013. Peak times are Guy Fawkes, Chinese New Year, and Diwali.
- 447 complaints received from February 2017 to February 2018 mostly in November around Guy Fawkes.
- This is one of the biggest nuisance and safety concerns for Aucklanders (37 per cent surveyed saw the issue in the past year, and 77 per cent of those felt annoyed, angry or threatened).
- Most complaints relate to noise from private residences which are handled by noise control.

OUTCOME Sought IN 2018
- To minimise noise, damage and safety risks related to the letting off fireworks in public places.

BYLAW EVALUATION

Still an issue requiring a bylaw response?
✓ Yes, there is still an issue that regulation can help address.
✓ No feasible alternatives to bylaw identified:
  • Police powers limited to fireworks that may injure or alarm people in any place (s35 Summary Offences Act 1981). Police want Council to retain an enforcement role due to limited Police resource.
  • Reserves Act bylaws do not apply to all public places and need Minister of Conservation approval.
  • Government ban on public sale of fireworks could address issue. However, interim solution still needed.

Bylaw effective / efficient?
✓ Bylaw acts as a deterrent to most people letting off fireworks in a public place when part of a wider approach to increase public awareness about the ban, and support for public displays.
✘ Enforcement is challenging and resource-intensive. Council does not have capacity to respond to all complaints at peak times, and offenders flee, cannot be identified, or resume activity once officers leave.
✘ Bylaw may force fireworks onto private property which is a concern but has not been quantified.
✘ The part of the bylaw about letting off fireworks from any other place is not used by council officers and:
  • duplicates Police powers (s35 Summary Offences Act 1981) for which the penalty is a $200 court fine.
- creates health and safety risks for Council officers that Police are better trained to address, and for which the Police have the power of arrest (s55 Summary Offences Act 1961)
- the reference to animals in Clause 6(3)(b) is ultra vires and not enforceable. Council does not have a statutory power to protect animals from fireworks.

**Bylaw clearly written?** ✓ Yes, wording easy to understand.

**Public aware of bylaw?** ✓ High awareness due to media coverage/Council communication.

**Bylaw fit for the future?**
- ✓ Fireworks in public places likely to remain an issue until there is a national ban on public sale of fireworks.
- ✗ The part of the bylaw about fireworks from any other place is not appropriate as discussed above.

**Any bill of rights implications?**
- ✓ The current bylaw does not give rise to any unjustified implications under the New Zealand Bill of Rights 1990.

**Section 160(3) Local Government Act 2002 recommendations**
- A bylaw about the sale of fireworks in public places seems appropriate to address nuisance and safety issues. However, a bylaw about status in public places from fireworks in other places is not appropriate. It duplicates Police powers, creates health and safety risks for officers, and contains ultra vires provisions.
- The current bylaw from about fireworks in other places is not appropriate for reasons stated above.
- The current bylaw does not give rise to any unjustified implications under New Zealand Bill of Rights 1990.

### OPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1: Status quo – Retain wording and implementation</th>
<th>Option 2: Amend wording to remove provisions about fireworks set off in other places (RECOMMENDED)</th>
<th>Option 3: Revoke bylaw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Firework ban in public places.</td>
<td>• Firework ban in public places.</td>
<td>• Fireworks allowed in public places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bylaw about fireworks set off in other places not enforced</td>
<td>• Police respond to incidents of injury or alarm to people in public places from fireworks set off in any place.</td>
<td>• Police respond to incidents of injury or alarm to people in public places from fireworks set off in any place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Police respond to incidents of injury or alarm to people in public places from fireworks set off in any place.</td>
<td>• Noise control responds to noise complaints.</td>
<td>• Noise control responds to noise complaints.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Noise control responds to noise complaints. | Effectiveness and efficiency:  
✓ Will deter people from letting off fireworks in a public place.  
✗ Enforcement challenging and resource-intensive.  
✗ Retains bylaw provision about fireworks on other places that is not used by Council officers, duplicates Police powers, and contains ultra vires provisions. | Effectiveness and efficiency:  
✓ Increase in the use and issues from fireworks in public places.  
✗ May increase demands on limited Police resources to respond to safety issues in public places.  
✗ Public criticism of Council from removal of public places ban. |

**Bill of Rights implications:**
- ✓ Does not give rise to any unjustified Implications under New Zealand Bill of Rights 1990.

**Bill of Rights implications:**
- ✓ Does not give rise to any unjustified Implications under New Zealand Bill of Rights 1990.  
- N/A

**Fit for future:**
- ✓ Will deter people from letting off fireworks in a public place.  
- ✗ Retains inappropriate provision about fireworks in other public places.

**Fit for future:**
- ✓ Will deter people from letting off fireworks in a public place.  
- ✗ Removes inappropriate provision about fireworks in other public places.

**Note:** None of these options prevent Council advocating for a national ban on the public sale of fireworks.

**Section 160(3) Local Government Act 2002 recommendations**
- The bylaw should be amended (Option 2) to retain the ban on fireworks in public places but remove Clause 6(3)(b) about fireworks in other public places. Clause 6(3)(b) is not used, duplicates Police powers, and contains ultra vires provisions.

---

4 Decisions or actions outside the lawful powers of a person or body
### STATUTORY OBLIGATIONS/POWERS

- Council may make a bylaw about the use of lifesaving equipment to address public nuisance, public health and safety, offensive behaviour, or use of public places under the Local Government Act 2002 (s145, s146).

### ISSUES IN 2013

- Interference with lifesaving equipment and warning devices on beaches could create risk to public safety.
- No data available on scale or impact of the problem. No data available on number or location of equipment.

### OUTCOME SOUGHT AND BYLAW RESPONSE IN 2013

- To ensure public safety, minimise nuisance, and manage the use of land, assets, or structures on parks and beaches.
- Auckland Council bylaw prohibits interference with lifesaving equipment, warning devices, or notices on a beach.
- Powers to enforce bylaw include seizure of property (s164 to 168 LGA), cost recovery for damage (s175 LGA), and ability to request name and address (s178 LGA).
- Penalties for bylaw breaches include a maximum $20,000 court fine (s242(4) LGA).

### BYLAW IMPLEMENTATION SINCE 2013

- Park rangers have not used the bylaw, in part due to a lack of training.
- Council community facility maintenance team replaces or repairs damaged lifesaving equipment.

### ISSUE IN 2018

- Council maintenance team reports rare incidents of removal of life preservers, but other related equipment such as ropes are often removed and must be replaced.
- No complaints data, but interference with lifesaving equipment witnessed by 9 per cent of Aucklanders surveyed. Of those, 95 per cent considered the issue a significant safety risk.
- No related issues reported by Harbormaster or Auckland Transport on wharves.
- No enforcement. Limited ability to identify offenders.

### OUTCOME SOUGHT IN 2018

- To help maintain quality infrastructure to make Auckland liveable and resilient by ensuring lifesaving equipment, warning devices and notices are available for appropriate use on parks and beaches.

### BYLAW EVALUATION

**Still an issue requiring a bylaw response?**

- This is an issue of low frequency but high potential impact that regulation can help address.
- Feasible regulatory alternatives exist, but require a higher threshold of behaviour:
  - The Local Government Act 2002 (s232) provides an offence to wilfully, maliciously or negligently interfere with any Council property. Penalties include a maximum $20,000 court fine (s242(1) LGA).
  - Police can address wilful damage or removal of warning devices under Summary of Offences Act 1981 which carry a maximum penalty of a three month prison term or a maximum $2,000 court fine (s11, s12).

### Bylaw effective / efficient?

- Bylaw not used. Offenders difficult to identify unless "caught in the act". Damage is instead repaired/replaced.
- Applies only to beaches, and excludes equipment, devices and notices in other public places (e.g. Hunua Falls).
- Data not available on location, but some could potentially be located on parks or roads.

### Bylaw clearly written?

- Yes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause (7)</th>
<th>Section 55 of the Summary Offences Act 1973: Exempt Fireworks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. **Fireworks** means any device containing hazardous substances with pyrotechnic effect.

2. **Pyrotechnic effect** means the pyrotechnic effect, also any other explosion.

3. A person must not set off fireworks.

4. In a public place, except with the prior written approval of the council or a council controlled organisation, a person must not cause damage to any public place by setting off fireworks.

5. A council may cause damage to any public place in order to reduce the spread of a council controlled organisational outbreak.

6. Exception: Fireworks, explosives and other explosive material not shown here to reduce table size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause (7)</th>
<th>Section 55 of the Summary Offences Act 1973: Exempt Fireworks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. **Fireworks** means any device containing hazardous substances with pyrotechnic effect.

2. **Pyrotechnic effect** means the pyrotechnic effect, also any other explosion.

3. A person must not set off fireworks.

4. In a public place, except with the prior written approval of the council or a council controlled organisation, a person must not cause damage to any public place by setting off fireworks.

5. A council may cause damage to any public place in order to reduce the spread of a council controlled organisational outbreak.

6. Exception: Fireworks, explosives and other explosive material not shown here to reduce table size.
In which places are there controls on recreational fishing/set netting activities?
The Ministry for Primary Industries has restrictions on Auckland's west coast, and
Auckland Council restrictions apply on Arkles Bay, Omaha Beach, Te Haruhi Beach,
Army Bay and on all regional parks.

Do the proposed changes to the bylaw affect stock/rural fencing?
Proposed changes to the wording in the bylaw about fencing do not affect stock fencing
so long as it is not installed on a public place and so long as any fence on private property
does not create a nuisance or risk of injury to a person on that public place. A person may
still apply to council for permission to put up a fence on or over public property, council will
consider potential nuisance and safety risks as part of its decision making.

Why is Auckland Council proposing to remove rules about fireworks on private
property?
The bylaw review found that Police and Council Noise Control have enough powers
though legislation to address issues with fireworks on private property that may harm
people in public places. Therefore, the bylaw is not required for this purpose. The bylaw
remains appropriate for prohibiting people from setting off fireworks on public property.

Why is Auckland Council asking the government to change the law to prevent the
sale of fireworks to the public?
Auckland Council is concerned about fires, damage and injury or distress, either
intentionally or unintentionally to people and animals (including wild animals, farm
animals and pets) that can be caused by setting off fireworks. The use of fireworks also
places pressure on Police, Fire Services and Council Officers who receive large
numbers of complaints around fireworks especially around Guy Fawkes. Council does
not have powers to change the law about the sale of fireworks. Only government has
powers to make this change.

How can I share my views about the Council asking government to change the law
to prevent the sale of fireworks to the public?
To share your views about the proposal, visit www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/haveyoursay
for more information.
Council will share Aucklander's views about this with government in support of this
proposal.

Will public firework displays still be allowed if government chooses to change the
law about the sale of fireworks?
Before making a change to the law to prohibit the sale of fireworks to the public,
government would seek the views of New Zealanders. Until any law change is made
Auckland Council will continue to provide permission for public displays.
Related information about fireworks, other regulations
On private property, fireworks are permitted provided –
- they do not cause injury or alarm to any person in a public place under section 35 of the Summary Offences Act 1981, for example throwing fireworks at people in public places from private property
- excessive noise under section 326-328 of the Resource Management Act 1991, for example fireworks set off late at night.
The Trading and Events in Public Places Bylaw 2015 requires approval for public firework displays on Council controlled public places.

8A Fish offal
Related information fish or fish offal
The Litter Act 1979 enables Council to address offal, carcasses, pots or other material left behind on a beach, including the issue of infringement fees.
See also ‘9J set netting’, ‘5A crab potting’.

9 Gates or doors
(1) A person must not allow a gate or door to be located on or swing out over a public place unless the relevant authority has given prior written approval.

Related information about gates or doors, other regulations
Section 22 of the Summary Offences Act 1981 enables the New Zealand Police to request a person remove a gate or door that is obstructing a public way.
The Trespass Act 1980 also enables Council to trespass a person who does not leave any gate on a park in the manner it was found.

9A Graffiti
Related information about matters addressed in other regulations
Graffiti is prohibited under section 11A of the Summary Offences Act 1981. Council’s Graffiti eradication programme (for example the Adopt-a-Spot programme) helps the New Zealand Police collect evidence to support prosecutions and eradicates graffiti.

9B Lifesaving equipment, warning notices, and warning and emergency device
Related information about matters addressed in other regulations
Section 232 of the Local Government Act 2002 enables Council to address wilful or negligent damage or interference and damage with the above property.
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REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: BYL-59/190219019295

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 5 March 2019

FROM: Lynley Beckingsale, Policy Analyst

SUBJECT: Murphy Park Reserve, Seasonal Alcohol Control Area

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

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report requests Council to resolve to extend the seasonal alcohol control area for Murphy Park Reserve from 1st April to 8th September 2019.

1.2 The Alcohol Control Bylaw 2018 has standard dates for the seasonal alcohol control area of Murphy Park Reserve (1st April to 1st September) with the provision that the dates may be adjusted, by Council resolution, in consideration of the current season.

1.3 This extension of the dates accommodates the Northern Bulldogs Rugby League Season as advised by the club secretary (Kirsten Reuben) being Saturday 6th April to Saturday 7th September 2019.

Attachments:

i. Alcohol Control Bylaw 2018 (Trim 180913106171)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190219019295.

(b) Resolves to amend the dates of the alcohol control area for Murphy Park Reserve as described in the Alcohol Control Bylaw 2018 (the Bylaw) from 1st April to 1st September to 1st April to 8th September 2019.

(c) Notes the Council resolution to change the dates will be publically notified.

(d) Copies this report to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board for its information.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1. Prior to reviewing the Liquor Ban Bylaw 2007, Council was approached by the Northern Bulldogs Rugby League Club with a request to extend the Kaiapoi Liquor Ban area to include Murphy Park Reserve during the rugby league season.

3.2. The Club indicated a number of measures they had taken to control the consumption of alcohol on the side-lines during games, explaining that on the whole these had been
unsuccessful and they wanted a more formal alcohol ban in the area. This request from the Club was supported by New Zealand Police.

3.3. During the review of the Bylaw and development of the Alcohol Control Bylaw 2018, contact was made with the Northern Bulldogs Rugby League Club and they reiterated their concerns and confirmed their request for a seasonal alcohol control area to be extended to Murphy Park Reserve. Police confirmed their support for this element in the Bylaw.

3.4. The Alcohol Control Bylaw 2018 includes Murphy Park Reserve as a seasonal alcohol control area. The seasonal control is a 24 hour control from 1st April to 1st September each year.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. Under S2.2.1 of the Bylaw, Council may alter the specified period in relation to Murphy Park reserve by resolution in accordance with Sections 147B and 151 of the *Local Government Act 2002*, and in consideration of the dates of the current year’s Rugby and Rugby League season.

4.2. The rugby league season has changed this year. Council, by resolution, can change the dates the alcohol control is in force to 1st April to 8th September 2019 to cover the full season.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

Northern Bulldogs Rugby League Club have been contacted regarding the dates of the 2019 season. A pamphlet is being prepared for their members, and will be distributed widely via the Club to advise rugby league clubs of the alcohol control in place for this venue.

New Zealand Police enforce this Bylaw. Notification will be sent to local stations and to the Area Commander advising them of the dates as indicated.

5.2. **Wider Community**

The Council resolution to change the dates will be publically notified. This notice will be available through the Council’s website and social media as will the pamphlet advising of the alcohol control area being distributed by the Club.

Signage at the Park will be installed to ensure the widest notification of the alcohol control area is achieved.

6. **IMPLIEDATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

The cost of the public notice and signage is programmed and met by current budgets and staff resources.
6.2. **Community Implications**

The extension of the alcohol control area to Murphy Park reserve will be a restriction to individual rights and freedom during the rugby league season. The bylaw provides for this restriction to be advertised prior to the beginning of each season.

6.3. **Risk Management**

The advertisement of the alcohol control area as widely as possible and with support from Police will mitigate as much risk as possible.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

The seasonal alcohol control area contributes to wider community health and safety by helping decrease the likelihood of damage to property or the creation of dangerous litter.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

*Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012*

The object of this Act is that:

(a) The sale, supply and consumption of alcohol should be undertaken safely and responsibly; and

(b) The harm caused by the excessive or inappropriate consumption of alcohol should be minimised.

*Local Government Act 2002, S147B and 151*

*Local Government (Alcohol Reform) Amendment Act 2012*

*New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990*

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

*There is a safe environment for all*

- Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised and our district has the capacity and resilience to respond to natural disasters.

- Crime, injury and harm from road accidents, gambling, and alcohol abuse are minimised.

*The distinctive character of our towns, villages and rural areas is maintained*

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

7.4. **Delegations**

NA
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Waimakariri District Alcohol Control Bylaw 2018

1 General

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 This Bylaw may be cited as the Waimakariri District Alcohol Control Bylaw 2018.

1.1.2 This Bylaw supersedes the Waimakariri District Liquor Ban Bylaw 2007 and comes into force on 1 October 2018.

1.1.3 This Bylaw is made by the Waimakariri District Council in exercise of the powers and authority vested in the Council by section 147 of the Local Government Act 2002.

1.1.4 The purpose of this Bylaw is to enhance safety and public enjoyment of public places by providing for alcohol controls in restricted public places, and for restricted periods and events.

1.1.5 Before making this Bylaw, Council was satisfied that those matters listed in section 147A(3) of the Local Government Act 2002 apply.

1.2 Objectives

The objective of the Bylaw is to prohibit the possession and/or consumption of alcohol in restricted areas, thereby:

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

1.3 Definitions

For the purposes of this Bylaw the following definitions shall apply:

Alcohol has the meaning given by section 5(1) of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012.

Alcohol ban means those restrictions outlined at clause 2.1 of this Bylaw, and as may be amended by clauses 2.2 and 2.3 of this Bylaw, which specify those public places and time periods whereby the consumption and possession of alcohol is restricted or banned, as well as those restrictions which may be imposed by Council in accordance with clause 3.1 of this Bylaw.

Council means the Waimakariri District Council.

Licensed premises has the meaning given by section 5(1) of the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012.

Public notice has the meaning given in section 5 of the Local Government Act 2002.
Public place has the same meaning provided in section 147 of the Local Government Act 2002, that is:

(a) a place that is open to or is being used by the public, whether free or on payment of a charge, and whether any owner or occupier of the place is lawfully entitled to exclude or eject any person from it; but

(b) does not include licensed premises.

For the avoidance of doubt this definition includes, but is not limited to, roads, footpaths, berms, parks, beaches and riverbanks.

Restricted public place is a public place Specified in this Bylaw at clause 2.1, and as may be amended by Council in accordance with clauses 2.2 and 2.3 of this Bylaw, or in a Council resolution passed in accordance with clause 3 of this Bylaw, and in respect of which an alcohol ban is imposed.

Restricted period is a time period designated in this Bylaw at clause 2.1, and as may be amended by Council in accordance with clauses 2.2 and 2.3 of this Bylaw, or in a Council resolution passed in accordance with clause 3 of this Bylaw, and in respect of which an alcohol ban is imposed.

Time period is a period of time, which may include days and specific dates and/or times of the day.

Ashley Gorge is as described in Schedule 1 of this Bylaw and outlined in the accompanying map of the area and marked [insert reference].

Beach Settlements is as described in Schedule 1 of this Bylaw and outlined in the accompanying map of the area and marked [insert reference].

Kaiapoi town is as described in Schedule 1 of this Bylaw and outlined in the accompanying map of the area and marked [insert reference].

Rangiora town is as described in Schedule 1 of this Bylaw and outlined in the accompanying map of the area and marked [insert reference].

Woodend town is as described in Schedule 1 of this Bylaw and outlined in the accompanying map of the area and marked [insert reference].

Oxford is as described in Schedule 1 of this Bylaw and outlined in the accompanying map of the area and marked [insert reference].

Murphy Park Reserve is as described in Schedule 1 of this Bylaw and outlined in the accompanying map of the area and marked [insert reference].
2 Designated alcohol bans

2.1 Alcohol bans specified in this Bylaw

No person shall possess or consume in, or bring alcohol into, the restricted public places and during the restricted time periods, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Days and times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Gorge</td>
<td>7:00 pm 31 December to 3:00 am 1 January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach settlements</td>
<td>7:00 pm 31 December to 3:00 am 1 January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi town</td>
<td>24 hours, 365 days a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora town</td>
<td>24 hours, 365 days a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend town</td>
<td>24 hours, 365 days a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford town</td>
<td>24 hours, 365 days a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy Park Reserve</td>
<td>24 hours, from 1st April to 1st September</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Murphy Park Reserve specified periods

2.2.1 Council may amend, alter or remove the specified period in relation to the Murphy Park Reserve by resolution in accordance with sections 147B and 151 of the Local Government Act, and in consideration of the dates of the current year’s Rugby and Rugby League season.

2.2.2 Any resolution made in accordance with clause 2.2.1 above will be publically notified.

2.3 Amendment to Bylaw

Council may remove, add to, or alter any of the listed restricted public places and may amend the restricted periods outlined at clause 2.1 of this Bylaw in accordance with section 156 of the Local Government Act 2002.

3 Designation of specified events and periods

3.1 In addition to those restrictions imposed in clause 2.1 of this Bylaw, Council may, by resolution in accordance with sections 147B and 151 of the Local Government Act 2002, restrict the bringing, consumption and possession of alcohol

3.1.1 in a public place and during a time period; and

3.1.2 for a public event, function or gathering in a public place.

3.2 Any resolution made in accordance with clause 3.1 of this Bylaw, will be notified by public notice.
4 Vehicles

4.1 No person may consume or possess alcohol in any vehicle while in any restricted public place and during any restricted time period as designated under clause 2.1 of this Bylaw or by resolution under clause 3.1 of this Bylaw, save for those exceptions outlined at clause 6 of this Bylaw.

5 Offences and penalties

A person who commits a breach of this Bylaw commits an infringement offence under section 239A of the Local Government Act 2002 and may be liable for an infringement fee.

6 Exceptions

6.1 This Bylaw does not prohibit, regulate or control, in the case of alcohol in an unopened bottle or other unopened container:

(a) the transport of the alcohol from licensed premises next to a public place, if –
   (i) it was lawfully bought on those premises for consumption on those premises; and
   (ii) it is promptly removed from the public place; or

(b) the transport of the alcohol from outside a public place for delivery to licensed premises next to the public place; or

(c) the transport of the alcohol from outside a public place to premises next to a public place by, or for delivery to, a resident of the premises or his or her bona fide visitors; or

(d) the transport of the alcohol from premises next to a public place to a place outside the public place if –
   (i) the transport is undertaken by a resident of those premises; and
   (ii) the alcohol is promptly removed from the public place.

6.2 This Bylaw does not apply to those registered campsites at the Beach Settlements and those registered camp sites at Ashley Gorge.

7 Powers of New Zealand Police

7.1 In accordance with section 199 of the Local Government Act, a constable of the New Zealand Police may, without warrant, for the purpose of ascertaining whether alcohol is present, search a container in the possession of a person who is in, or entering a restricted public place and during a restricted period, or a vehicle that is in, or entering, a restricted public place and during a restricted period.
7.2 A constable may without warrant also:

7.2.1 Seize and remove any alcohol, and its container, that is in breach of an alcohol ban;
7.2.2 Arrest any person whom the constable finds committing an offence under this Bylaw;
7.2.3 Arrest any person who has refused to comply with a request by a constable –
   (i) To leave a restricted public place;
   (ii) To surrender to a constable any alcohol that, in breach of an alcohol ban, is in
        the person’s possession.

7.3 Before exercising such power outlined at clauses 7.1 and 7.2 of this Bylaw, the
member of the New Zealand Police must –
7.3.1 inform the person in possession of the container or the vehicle, as the case may be,
    that he or she has the opportunity of removing the container or the vehicle from the
    restricted public place;
7.3.2 provide the person with a reasonable opportunity to remove the container or the
    vehicle as the case may be, from the restricted public place.

8 Signage

8.1 Where reasonable, signage will be erected within the restricted public places to
    provide information to the public on the alcohol bans.

8.2 To avoid any doubt, the absence of any signage in a restricted public place does not
    authorize breach of this Bylaw.

9 Revocation

The following Bylaw is hereby revoked: Liquor Ban Bylaw 2007 (December 2007)

10 Review of Bylaw

This Bylaw shall be reviewed by 1 October 2023.

This Bylaw can be reviewed at any other time before that date at the discretion of the
Council.
Schedule 1: Alcohol Ban Areas and Maps

ASHLEY GORGE means the public area known as the Ashley Gorge Reserve including the picnic area and camping ground from its entrance on Ashley Gorge Road and including the banks and waterways of the Ashley River/Rakahuri which adjoins the picnic area and including all roadways within the Reserve, but excludes camp sites and such buildings as may be designated by the camping ground caretaker.

BEACH SETTLEMENTS means the public areas (parks, reserves, etc) plantations, beaches, lagoons and roadways bounded by the Waimakariri River in the south, the Ashley River/Rakahuri in the north, the low water mark on all the beach frontage between those points and east from the intersection of Waikuku Beach Road with Kings Avenue and Preece Road, Waikuku, extending in a straight line to the corner of Woodend Beach Road where it intersects with Stalkers Road, Woodend Beach, and intersections of Beach Road, Featherstone Avenue and Dunns Avenue at Pines Kairaki and continuing in a straight line from there to the Waimakariri River.

The ban applies to all roadways within the motor camps of Waikuku, Woodend Beach and Pines Kairaki, but excludes the registered campsites

KIAPOI TOWN means Kaiapoi town centre from the intersection of Courtenay Drive and Williams St., north to the intersection of Williams St and Sewell St. Charles St river bank from the Mandeville Bridge east to Jones St., including Trousselot Park, Morgan Williams Reserve. Tom Ayers Reserve and that part of Corcoran Reserve that contains the skate board park. Raven Quay from Black St east including the Memorial Reserve and across Williams St. to the east end of the Cure Boating Club. Black St from Raven Quay to Hilton St. The public car park between Raven Quay and Hilton St east of Williams St. Ohoka Rd from Williams St east to Stone St. Stone St. Courtenay Drive from Williams St to Kaikanui St St. Kaikanui St. Carew St from Williams St to Hills St.


RANGIORA TOWN means Rangiora town centre from the intersection of High Street and Church Street east to the railway line, Ivory Street from High Street to Cone Street, Cone Street Alfred Street from Ivory Street to Percival Street, Victoria Street from Queen to High Street. Percival Street from Queen Street to High Street, King Street from Queen Street to Blackett Street, Church Street from Dudley Pool to High School, the car parking area behind the library and Rangiora Service Centre, Durham Street from High Street to Blackett Street, Blake Street, the Blake Street public car park. Good Street to Blackett Street to High Street, the service lane behind New World supermarket and the public carpark to the east of New World, Ashley Street from High Street to Blackett Street, Blackett Street from Ashley Street to Durham Street, Burt Street, Albert Street from High Street to Burt Street. Allen Reserve, Ashley Picnic Area, Ashgove Park. Ballarat Reserve, Bells Siding, Bridget Lane Reserve, Bush St Reserve, Chelsea Court Reserve, Dudley Park, Elephant Park, Elm St Reserve, Good St Reserve, Green St Walkway, Grove Place Reserve, Hazeldene Reserve, Janelle Place Reserve, Kowhai Ave Reserve, Kippenberger War Memorial Reserve, Lilybrook Reserve, Manchester Place Reserve, Maria Andrews Park, Mataiwi Park, Neil Aitken

**WOODEND TOWN** means Main North Rd from the junction with Te Pouapatuki Rd north to Chinnerys Rd. Rangiora Woodend Rd from the Main North Rd to School Rd. School Rd, Owen Stalker Park and the Recreation Ground. The Community Centre grounds. Grange View Reserve.

**MURPHY PARK RESERVE** means the area of reserve bounded to the north by the Kaiapoi River and west by Raven Quay and up to but not including the area south east of the reserve that contains the Kaiapoi Croquet Club and the Kaiapoi Boat Club Reserve.
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1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report relates to the draft Rural Residential Development Strategy, which has the purpose of providing for future rural residential development throughout the district. It recommends that the Council approves the draft Strategy for public consultation under a Special Consultative Procedure (consultation period 8 March 2019 - 5 April 2019) and the Summary of the draft Strategy. This report also recommends the appointment of the hearing panel suggested at the 5 February 2019 District Planning and Regulation Committee retreat/briefing. Lastly, it recommends that Council receives the package of supporting reports which helped inform the draft Strategy.

Attachments:

i. Waimakariri Rural Residential Development Strategy, draft for consultation, March 2019 (190219019201)
ii. Waimakariri Rural Residential Development Strategy, Summary (190219019302)
iii. Survey of Residential 4 Zone and San Dona Olive Groves Households – Summary of responses (190117004604)
iv. Waimakariri District - Rural Character Assessment (Rural Zone – Character Assessment Report) 6 June 2018 (Prepared by Boffa Miskell Ltd) (180611064085)
v. QV report ‘Rural Subdivision and Housing Analysis – Waimakariri District - December 2018’ (190222021021)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190218018241

(b) Approves the Waimakariri Rural Residential Development Strategy, draft for consultation (attachment i, 190219019201) for public consultation.

(c) Approves the accompanying summary document of the Waimakariri Rural Residential Development Strategy for public consultation (attachment ii, 190219019302).
(d) **Nominates** the Portfolio Holder for Communications and District Planning Development to approve any minor edits of the draft Rural Residential Development Strategy (final print ready version) as required in conjunction with staff prior to public consultation commencing.

(e) **Notes** that public consultation will be undertaken under the Special Consultative Procedure (SCP) as outlines in the Local Government Act 2002.

(f) **Notes** that submissions are invited from 8 March 2019 to 5 April 2019, followed by a hearing in late April 2019.

(g) **Appoints** Mayor Ayers and Councillors Atkinson and Meyer to the hearing panel for the draft Strategy.

(h) **Notes** that the development of the draft Rural Residential Development Strategy has been informed by the District Plan Review and District Development Strategy Technical Advisory Group (TAG), and the draft document and summary document has been endorsed by the District Plan Review and District Development Strategy Project Control Group (PCG).

(i) **Notes** the communications and engagement actions that will be taken during consultation as set out in the Rural Residential Development Strategy - Communications and Engagement Plan (January - June 2019) (attachment vi, 190122006458).

(j) **Receives** the following supporting documents which helped to inform the contents of the draft Strategy:

   i. Survey of Residential 4 Zone and San Dona Olive Groves Households – Summary of responses (attachment iii, TRIM)

   ii. Waimakariri District – Rural Character Assessment (Rural Zone – Character Assessment Report) 6 June 2018 (Prepared by Boffa Miskell Ltd) (attachment iv, 180611064085)

   iii. QV report ‘Rural Subdivision and Housing Analysis – Waimakariri District - December 2018’ (190222021021)

(k) **Notes** that a final Waimakariri Rural Residential Development Strategy, based on comments received, panel deliberations, and any further information, will be presented to the Council for adoption in mid-2019.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 The Development Planning Unit has prepared the Waimakariri Rural Residential Development Strategy, draft for consultation (draft Strategy). Rural residential development is the subdivision and use of land (to lots typically sized 2,500m\(^2\) to 1 hectare) to cater for the needs of those wishing to live within a rural or semi-rural setting, therefore enabling living choices for the people of Waimakariri District. Once finalised, the Strategy will proactively manage the use of rural land for rural residential purposes by identifying ‘clustered’ locations for development and thus also help to protect the balance of rural land for primary production and rural character purposes.

3.2 The Waimakariri District continues to grow and the number of households is set to increase over the next 30 years, based on projections. As part of this growth, we are expecting a demand of about 385 rural residential homes over the next ten years.

3.3 It is important the Council carefully plans for the growth of further rural residential development in its role as a planning authority and key service/infrastructure provider, and to ensure it continues to meet the community’s needs. In doing so, known environmental
and other constraints and strengths on a location-by-location basis need to be taken into account, to safeguard people and land, while also being consistent with the wider planning framework (e.g. requirements under the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS)) within which Councils operate.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The draft Strategy proposes a three primary areas for further rural residential development, and two secondary areas. Primary areas represent preferred development locations due to a number of advantageous factors; secondary areas generally face greater challenges, particularly in terms of natural hazard constraints. The proposed growth locations are:

**Primary:**
- Swannanoa
- Oxford
- Ashley / Loburn

**Secondary:**
- Ohoka
- Gressons Road (north of Woodend)

4.2. The draft Strategy contains three parts:

- **Part 1: Introduction** - covering the scope and drivers for a Strategy, process of development, current situation and the planning context.
- **Part 2: Directions for growth** – directions for growth with three primary areas for growth and two secondary locations for growth that the DPRC asked to include in a draft document for public comment. A discussion is provided of each growth area covering the location’s history, strengths and constraints, together with more specific proposed growth directions and reasons for these. A map showing existing zoning, flood hazard and proposed growth direction by way of indicative arrows is supplied.
- **Part 3: Making it happen** - covering strategy implementation, monitoring and review. At this stage it is intended that Strategy implementation occurs via the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan which will include a ‘Rural Residential Growth Area Overlay’ or similar that indicates the area is identified for rural residential development and subsequent rezoning. Landowners interested in developing their land should then submit on the Plan and supply more detailed assessments such as geotechnical, soil contamination, servicing, flood hazard assessments etc.
- **Appendices** - include more detailed maps of various constraints and opportunity layers that were considered through the site selection process as well as high level servicing and flood hazard assessments to provide more context.

4.3. The draft Strategy is the culmination of several process and engagement steps undertaken during 2018 – 2019. In summary these were:

- Reviewing the 2010 Rural Residential Development Plan (RRDP) in light of updating it to apply to the whole of the District.
- Ongoing close engagement with engineering colleagues to ascertain suitability / serviceability of potential sites throughout the site selection process and drafting of the document.
- Briefing to District Planning and Regulation Committee (DPRC) on 11 September 2018 outlining proposed strategy preparation process, site identification criteria, and key assumptions.
- A long list of potential locations was determined during an Inquiry by Design workshop with staff and key stakeholders (e.g. ECan) on 27 August 2018 and a DPRC Inquiry by Design workshop (9 October 2018) to identify potential locations with a set of assessment criteria, including requirements for rural residential development under the CRPS, as the key driver. Undeveloped locations identified in the original RRDP,
and areas with known landowner development interest were also added to this long list.

- This long list of locations then underwent a preliminary criteria assessment, which further excluded any locations that were:
  - within high flood hazard area;
  - within areas yet to be developed inside of the existing Infrastructure Boundary of the District’s main eastern towns;
  - on the direct edges of main towns outside of the Infrastructure Boundary thereby foreclosing more intensive long term urban development;
  - not connected to existing rural residential nodes or small settlements;
  - not able to economically connect to a Council reticulated wastewater network scheme;
  - within the Christchurch International Airport noise contour; or
  - within areas that would compromise the operation capacity of the Rangiora Airfield.

- Frequent discussions occurred with the Council’s District Plan Review and District Development Strategy Technical Advisory Group (TAG) to gain input into the overall strategy process, site selection process, shortlist of growth locations, then specifically growth directions proposed for each area.

- On 13 November 2018, staff briefed the DPRC on a shortlist of proposed locations for further rural residential development to be included in a draft Rural Residential Development Strategy to be drafted and consulted on. The shortlist included Swannanoa, Oxford, Ashley/Loburn, Mandeville, Gressons Road and Ohoka. Staff recommended Ohoka and Gressons Road be removed from the shortlist as they scored the lowest in a site selection criteria assessment, however DPRC members recommended that all six areas be included in the draft Strategy, with Ohoka and Gressons Road as secondary propositions.

- In December 2018, owners/residents of properties within Residential 4 Zones (rural residential) and residents of the San Dona olive groves were invited (via email or post) to complete the Survey of Residential 4 Zones and San Dona Olive Groves Households. The survey was designed to provide a better understanding of how people living in these locations view the area they live in and findings helped inform the content of the draft Strategy, and will more specifically help inform the District Plan Review.

- On 11 December 2018, the DPRC approved the preparation of a District-wide Rural Residential Development Strategy.

- On 14 December 2018, the DPRC received a memo outlining that Mandeville would be subsequently removed from the proposed growth areas in the draft Strategy due to engineering challenges with intensifying the San Dona olive grove area and urban sprawl issues associated with expanding Mandeville given the presence of the Mandeville Growth Boundary (which has been in place since 2012 via Council initiated Plan Change 32). This therefore left five proposed growth areas for the draft Strategy (3 primary areas - Swannanoa, Ashley/Loburn, Oxford; and 2 secondary areas – Ohoka and Gressons Road).

- Identification of more specific growth directions (i.e. indicative arrows) within each of the five growth areas were informed by examining key environmental, social and infrastructure constraints and opportunities. Factors considered include the location of any cultural sites, silent file areas, wāhi tapu and wāhi taonga sites; historic and archaeological sites; biodiversity sites and biodiversity values; versatile soils; soil drainage; intensive farms; slope of land; irrigation areas; natural hazards including fault lines, liquefaction susceptibility areas, tsunami evacuation areas, flooding risks, overland flow paths, and groundwater levels; and major electricity pylons and other infrastructure assets such as wastewater ponds.

- At the 5 February 2019 DPRC briefing (retreat), the Committee endorsed all five growth areas and associated more detailed growth directions within those areas for the draft Strategy, along with key aspects of the proposed Communications Plan. Engineering advice was provided regarding the risks associated with growing Ohoka...
given its flood risk. However, the DPRC decided Ohoka should still be included as a secondary growth area in the draft Strategy, to enable community input into decision making. Committee members also preliminarily identified hearing panel members for the draft Strategy, to be recommended for appointment to Council. Mayor David Ayers, Councillor Neville Atkinson and Councillor John Meyer were recommended.

- On 7 February 2019, the TAG reviewed the draft Strategy in its entirety.
- On 14 February 2019, the draft Strategy was put for comment to the Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga at their hui. This was arranged through Maahanui Kurataiao Ltd (MKT).
- On 15 February 2019, the District Plan Review and District Development Strategy Project Control Group (PCG) endorsed the draft Strategy and summary document.

4.4. The proposed next steps for the draft Strategy are as follows:

- Upon Council approval of the draft Strategy for public consultation, letters will be sent to landowners directly under and in proximity to the growth arrows mapped in each of the five proposed growth areas to alert them of the project and provide appropriate context.
- 6 March 2019: Presentation to All Boards advising them of the draft Strategy and encouraging submissions.
- 8 March to 5 April 2019: Public consultation via Special Consultative Procedure (SCP). This will include adverts, news stories, social media and website information, media relations, and public drop in sessions (5-7pm on 11 March in Oxford, 18 March in Loburn, 19 March in Ohoka). Key documents will also be included in the Council tent at the Oxford A&P show on 30 March 2019. Refer to attached Communication and Engagement Plan for full details (attachment vi)
- Early-mid April 2019: Phase 2 of servicing and flood hazard assessment reports based on specific properties for rural residential development.
- Early May 2019: Deliberations.
- 4 June 2019: Final Strategy, based on comments received, hearing panel deliberations, and any further information, presented to Council for adoption (following re-engagement with TAG and PCG on potential changes to content).

4.5. A project webpage (waimakariri.govt.nz/RuralResidential) has been developed and will go live when consultation commences. This will include information about the project and the consultation, as well as a range of background reports that have helped to inform the draft Strategy. These include, among other documents:

- Survey of Residential 4 Zone and San Dona Olive Groves Households – Summary of responses (attachment iii, 190117004604)
- Waimakariri District - Rural Character Assessment (Rural Zone – Character Assessment Report) 6 June 2018 (Prepared by Boffa Miskell Ltd) (attachment iv, 180611064085)
- QV report ‘Rural Subdivision and Housing Analysis – Waimakariri District - December 2018’ (190222021021)

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

Development of the draft Strategy has occurred with key Council staff. Representatives from Environment Canterbury and Maahanui Kurataiao Limited (MKT) are members of the TAG.
The views of the Kaitiaki were sought in 14 February 2019 whereby the draft Strategy was included on the Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga Hui agenda for consideration (arranged via MKT). Feedback was provided on 19 February as follows:

- The Kaitiaki have reservations about further development along / adjacent to the Ashley River / Rakahuri due to risks of flooding which may be exacerbated by climate change.
- The Kaitiaki do not support any further development at Gressons Road due to concerns relating to increased traffic, infrastructure upgrades required, potential adverse effects on waterways within the area, as well as the development encroaching further into a Silent File area.
- The Kaitiaki are generally comfortable with the other proposed locations but are particularly interested in infrastructure / servicing upgrades within the development areas and having input into these upgrades, e.g. stormwater and wastewater management.

Targeted consultation on the draft Strategy is also planned for the following groups or organisations:

- Strategic partners - Christchurch City Council, Hurunui District Council, Selwyn District Council, New Zealand Transport Agency, and Environment Canterbury
- Ohoka Residents Group
- Community Boards (presentation to All Boards 6 March 2019)
- Rangiora Airfield
- Christchurch International Airport Ltd
- Department of Conservation
- Infrastructure and service providers - Transpower, telecommunications, Ministry of Education, emergency services

5.2. **Wider Community**

The views of the wider community will be sought via the proposed Special Consultative Procedure public consultation period commencing 8 March 2019 until 5 April 2019, with hearings to follow.

Targeted consultation is planned for landowners under or within the general vicinity of any proposed growth directions, landowners and parties that have expressed an interest in rural residential development, and landowners of Residential 4 zoned properties within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary of the District’s main towns as the draft Strategy makes references to these areas being ‘up-zoned’ to urban density via the District Plan Review.

Refer to the Communications and Engagement Plan (attachment vi) for further details.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

The costs associated with the preparation of the RRDS will be met from within existing budgets for the District Plan Review.

6.2. **Community Implications**

The RRDS will provide for future rural residential development for the community and will influence provisions within the proposed District Plan scheduled for notification in mid-2020.

6.3. **Risk Management**
A qualitative approach to managing risks that may affect the next stages (communication and engagement) of this project is to be taken. The areas of risk identified to date are as follows, together with planned management controls:

### Table 1: Risk Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  | Overlap with other Council consultation (Annual Plan 2019/20) causing consultation confusion. There is cross-over with two other consultations.  
- The District Plan Review Initial Public Consultation runs from 1 April - 30 April (4 days crossover)  
- The Annual Plan Public Consultation runs from 11 March - 11 April (the draft Strategy has a 3 day head start)  
   An extended programme of communications and engagement can result in waning interest or disorientation over the status of the process. In turn, this can lead to disengagement. | Medium | Integration between teams to ensure promotional clashes are avoided; clear delineation between projects while also being mindful to clarify their interrelationship where applicable for broader context; a strategic and staggered approach to releasing information about each project to avoid bombardment. | Low |
| 2  | Unfavourable consultation outcomes | Medium | Be ready to adapt and respond to the unexpected. | Low |
| 3  | Capture of process by minority interest group(s) | Medium | Maintain robust process and reporting to Council. Ensure that the consultation process is clear to all. | Low |
| 4  | Process is challenged | Medium | Ensure that the process is consistent with the Local Government Act | Low |

Overall, the draft Strategy provides an early opportunity for the community and stakeholders to influence future locations for rural residential development. This ultimately assists with risk management in terms of the final document, but also in terms of the level of challenge to the Proposed District Plan (which will take the next step in implementing the Strategy) when notified for submissions in mid-2020.

### 6.4. Health and Safety

There are no health and safety implications associated with the preparation of the RRDS.

### 7. CONTEXT

#### 7.1. Policy

This matter is a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy in the sense that considerable infrastructure expenditure would follow.
7.2. Legislation

Section 75 of the Resource Management Act 1991 requires District Plans to give effect to any regional policy statement. Section 31 states that the function of a territorial authority includes the establishment of methods to achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land.

Sections 82 and 83 of the Local Government Act 2002 set out the principles of consultation to be followed.

The Council through its District Plan is also required to give effect to the CRPS, which sets out a number of requirements in relation to rural residential development.

7.3. Community Outcomes

The following community outcomes are relevant to this matter:

- Our rural areas retain their amenity and character.
- Communities in our District are well linked with each other and Christchurch is readily accessible by a range of transport modes.
- The Council takes account of the views across the community including mana whenua.

7.4. Delegations

Council has delegated authority to approve the draft Rural Residential Development Strategy for consultation.
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Foreword from the Mayor

The Waimakariri District Council is pleased to present this draft Rural Residential Development Strategy. This document is for the community to comment on. Your comments, and the resulting final Strategy, will provide a decision-making framework that will drive the future of our rural residential zones and help us review our current Waimakariri District Plan.

People love to live in the Waimakariri District for many reasons. One of those reasons is that we provide so many different living choices. This District offers the very best of town and country. Our rural residential areas in particular are proving to be hugely popular in offering a semi-rural, manageable lifestyle that provides space and a sense of community while also efficiently managing and protecting our rural land for productive and rural character purposes.

Our District continues to grow and the number of households is set to increase solidly over the next 30 years. As part of this growth, we are expecting a demand of about 385 rural residential homes over the next ten years. We already have many great rural residential zones around the District, some historic, some new, from the periphery of Oxford in the west, to Waikuku Beach in the east, and many well established rural residential hubs like Mandeville, Ohoka and Fernside in between.

It is important we carefully and appropriately plan for the growth of further rural residential development in our role as a planning authority and key service/infrastructure provider, and to ensure we continue to meet the community’s needs. In doing so, we need to be mindful of known environmental and other constraints and opportunities on a location-by-location basis, to safeguard our people and land, while taking into account the wider planning framework within which we operate.

With this in mind, this Strategy proposes a number of growth locations for further rural residential development that are considered suitable for rezoning.

This draft Strategy is underpinned by expert advice, technical information, and what you have told us you value about our District through a number of forums including our recent survey of Residential 4 Zones and San Dona Olive Groves households. This draft Strategy is now out for public consultation and we would love to hear your thoughts to see if we have got it right.
Part 1 - Introduction

What is the Rural Residential Development Strategy and Why is it Needed?

This Strategy provides the framework for the future provision of land zoned for rural residential purposes in the Waimakariri District. The Waimakariri District has experienced sustained growth pressures for some years and this is set to continue with growth projected over the next thirty years. This includes anticipated demand for housing choice in areas providing for rural and rural residential living.

Rural residential development is the subdivision and use of land to cater for the needs of those wishing to live within a rural or semi-rural setting, therefore enabling living choices for the people of Waimakariri District. Rural residential development also efficiently manages the demand for semi-rural living by identifying ‘clustered’ locations for development, which helps to manage the balance of rural land for primary production and rural character purposes. Rural residential development currently occurs in areas zoned ‘Residential 4A’ or ‘Residential 4B’ in the Waimakariri District Plan. It generally involves between one and two households per hectare and some higher density ‘large lot’ residential development consisting of between two and four households per hectare.

This Strategy identifies growth locations for rural residential development across the whole Waimakariri District to meet a projected demand of approximately 385 rural residential households over the next 10 years. It provides a review and update of the Council’s current Rural Residential Development Plan adopted in 2010; however the original plan only focused on rural residential development in the eastern part of the District, which accords with the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy (UDS) area. Once adopted, directions identified in this Strategy will also have a key role in informing the review of the Waimakariri District Plan.

As with other forms of development, the Council’s role as a planning authority and key service/infrastructure provider for the District
means it is necessary for it to consider and plan for rural residential development. As part of this, it is necessary to take into account regional planning initiatives and frameworks, as well as issues, strengths and constraints that determine the suitability of particular growth locations. This ensures positive and sound outcomes are achieved for the community. However, this Strategy does not rezone land in its own right. It simply proposes growth locations that are considered suitable for rezoning.

This is a draft Strategy for consultation and we look forward to your thoughts about the areas we have identified. Your feedback, along with any additional advice we receive, will help us to finalise this document, which will be considered by the Council for adoption in June 2019.

How has this Strategy been Developed?

This Strategy has not been developed from scratch. In June 2010, the Council adopted the original Waimakariri Rural Residential Development Plan. By taking into account factors such as rural and residential character and amenity, settlement and community, environment, water and wastewater provision, and the transport network, the original Rural Residential Development Plan proposed rural residential growth at:

- Fernside (not subsequently rezoned due to flooding complexities),
- Gressons Road / State Highway 1 (not rezoned yet, scheme plans have been drafted but not yet progressed),
- Mandeville (subsequently rezoned and majority developed, providing additional 167 lots),
- Ohoka (subsequently rezoned, currently partially being developed, provision for 136 additional lots),
- Southeast Rangiora (not subsequently rezoned due to poor ground conditions likely making development complicated and costly),
- North Kaiapoi (not subsequently rezoned due to Woodend Bypass designation impacting on site),
- Southeast Woodend (subsequently largely rezoned and developed, providing additional 41 lots), and
- Kaiapoi Waterways (not subsequently rezoned due to site’s vulnerability to natural hazards).

The Plan was developed to provide for an additional 1510 rural residential households in the eastern part of the District, required by proposed Plan Change 1 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS). However, only three of the eight areas identified in the Plan were progressed and rezoned, generating 344 lots.

The Plan has been a successful vehicle to providing clarity and directions for rural residential development that has occurred following its adoption.

Almost ten years on, it is timely to update the 2010 Plan to manage the next 10 years of rural residential development. The updated Rural Residential Development Strategy will apply to the whole Waimakariri District for completion and fair representation of supply, as opposed to the eastern Greater Christchurch area only.

The review is also driven by the Waimakariri District Plan Review. This is a review of the whole District Plan document, including objectives, policies and rules relating to the residential and rural areas within the District. The growth directions determined in the final Rural Residential Development Strategy will directly inform relevant chapters of the reviewed District Plan, which is intended to be notified mid-2020.

Existing relevant internal information was drawn on to help assist in understanding community values and these have informed this Strategy. As part of the District Plan Review, topic specific issues and options papers were released for public comment in October 2017. Feedback revealed a public desire to concentrate rural residential development around nodes or clusters of existing settlements and to provide smaller lots for rural residential living.

Expert external advice was also sought to provide relevant context and background information necessary to developing this Strategy and the growth directions proposed within it. This advice also ensures it is built on a sound evidence base and any decisions can be made within a robust and defendable framework.

In June 2018, Boffa Miskell Ltd completed a Rural Development Strategy 2019
Character Assessment for the Waimakariri District, to inform the management of activities and effects within and around the District’s Rural Zone, including the relationship with rural residential activities and small-lot rural development. It identifies twelve distinct rural character areas across the District and describes the landform, land cover, land use elements, and key characteristics that typify each character area. It then determines any areas capable of, and suitable for rural residential development or more intensive rural development/subdivision (in a way that is consistent with the character of each identified area).

This report concludes that there is support for future rural residential development in locations where there is a high density of small rural lots, or that lie adjacent to existing settlements and villages. It cautions that the character of existing settlements should be reflected in any new rural subdivision. Generally, the assessment recommends rural residential lot sizes of 5,000 to 10,000m² in the District, with the exception of finer grain less than 5,000m² lots in the ‘Lower Plains’ character area which broadly resembles the Greater Christchurch UDS area in the east of the District.

In December 2018, QV completed a Rural Subdivision and Lifestyle Property Analysis for the Waimakariri District to inform the demand for and supply of small holding rural lots (4-7.99ha) and rural residential (0.25-2ha) property in the District.

The average sale price of (improved) rural residential properties in the District has experienced a solid upward trend over the last 12 years to around $750,000 in 2018, an increase of more than 40%. Sale volumes of rural residential properties have also increased over this period with a peak 126 sales in 2012 (60 in 2018). These factors indicate the popularity of such living options in the District.

Relevant reports are available on the project website at waimakariri.govt.nz/RuralResidential. Internal Inquiry by Design workshops were held in late 2018 to identify and refine potential locations for further rural residential development (see page 11 for further details about these).

In order to better understand how people living in, and/or owning property in, the District’s current Rural Residential Zones (and San Dona Olive Groves area adjacent to Mandeville) view the area they live in, the Council invited all residents living in these areas to complete a survey in December 2018. The objective was to gain insight into property size preferences, character and amenity preferences and property turnover. Around 350 surveys were completed (representing a 26% response rate) and the findings have informed some of the directions signaled in this document. A full analysis report of the survey responses is available on the Council’s project website at waimakariri.govt.nz/RuralResidential.

The development of this Strategy has been informed and overseen by the Council’s District Planning and Regulation Committee (DPRC), which has responsibility, among other things, for activities relating to planning for growth and development strategies.

A Rural Residential Development Strategy project webpage was developed as an accessible and extensive public portal of material. This contains background reports and any information and dates relating to the project, particularly the consultation process.

This is a draft Strategy and we are currently seeking public feedback. Following the public consultation period, a final revised Strategy will be presented to the Council for adoption in mid-2019, after which, implementation can commence.
Figure 1 demonstrates the project development process.

- **Jun-Aug 2018**: Strategy inception, scoping, background reports initiation and review existing material
- **Aug – Nov 2018**: Locations options workshops and refinement
- **Dec 2018**: Rural Residential and San Dona Residents Survey
- **Jan-Feb 2019**: Draft Strategy preparation and early stakeholder engagement
- **Mar-Apr 2019**: Draft Strategy consultation including public drop-in sessions
- **Apr-May 2019**: Hearing and deliberations
- **May-Jun 2019**: Strategy confirmation and adoption
- **Mid-2019 onward**: Strategy implementation, including informing District Plan Review

Figure 1: Project development process
Figure 2: Current rural residential zones
**Current Rural Residential Areas**

Currently, there are more than fifteen zoned rural residential locations across the District, from Oxford in the west of the District, through to Waikuku Beach in the east of the District, totaling more than 1,200 individual properties (see Figure 2).

Rural residential locations vary greatly in size, from a small cluster of only eight properties north of Loburn, to some 460 addresses at Mandeville, which encompass more than 350 hectares of land.

The Waimakariri District Plan refers to rural residential development as Residential 4A or 4B Zones. These zones are intended to exhibit the following characteristics:

- Predominant activity is residential;
- Detached dwellings and associated buildings;
- Some limited farming and horticulture;
- Dwelling density is lowest for Residential Zones;
- Dwellings in generous settings;
- Average lot size of 0.25-1.0 hectare;
- Limited number of lots located in a rural environment;
- Rural style roads or accessways;
- Opportunity for a rural outlook from within the zone;
- Few vehicle movements within the zone;
- Access to zones not from arterial roads;
- Community water and/or wastewater schemes; and
- Kerb, channelling and street lighting.

In the interest of maintaining rural character, the District Plan also requires each Rural Residential Zone to have an average lot size to allow for a mix of sizes. The average is 5000m² for Residential 4A Zones and one hectare for Residential 4B Zones. The intent is to simplify rural residential zoning to a single zone and density across the District, in accordance with the CRPS which requires rural residential development in Greater Christchurch to develop at an average density of one to two households per hectare. This will be addressed in the District Plan Review.

Some of the District’s older Residential 4A and 4B Zones were created from the former ‘rural residential’ zones, developed under previous Council / District schemes. These zones generally allowed for small scale farming and living within the rural area.

During the late 1970s and 1980s, development within these zones was generally slow to moderate. Zones within the eastern District have tended to develop at a greater pace than those in the west, reflecting their proximity to employment hubs including Christchurch and the amenities of the District’s main towns. Most of the zones established later, by way of private plan changes, have developed relatively quickly.

Some of the District’s Residential 4A and 4B Zones have extended since being established as rural residential zones under previous County/ District Schemes, and/or later following the implementation of the 2010 Rural Residential Development Plan.

Some rural residential zones, such as at Chinnerys Road in Woodend, River Road / Ballarat Road in Rangiora, South Belt in Rangiora (undeveloped), and northwest Kaiapoi, are situated within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary (PIB). The PIB is identified by the CRPS and provides additional urban development capacity for the District’s main towns. The PIB was determined by the Land Use Recovery Plan (LURP) to assist rebuilding and recovery of communities in the Greater Christchurch area. The intent is to ‘up-zone’ these rural residential zones within the PIB to a residential zone so long-term urban growth of these main towns can be accommodated. This will be subject to a separate process through the District Plan Review.

The San Dona subdivision, north of Tram Road at Mandeville, was established in the 1990s, comprising small lots for olive production. Today, San Dona comprises around 115 households, and is similar to rural residential in nature and scale with lot sizes ranging from approximately 1.2 hectares to 2.2 hectares, however it is zoned rural. Rezoning this area to rural residential was considered, but deemed impractical, due to servicing constraints,
flooding and access issues.

The existing rural residential zones have a mix of infrastructure including Council maintained and operated wastewater and water reticulations, private water supplies or wells, and collectively run private wastewater schemes. Some households have individual on-site septic tanks and disposal fields. There are also rated drainage areas in parts of the District for stormwater.

Since the year 2000, the Council has issued 465 building consents for new dwellings in a rural residential zone. Figure 3 shows slower housing development in the early 2000s, followed by an upturn from 2012 and a noticeable spike in 2013 (97 new consents). This was a result of displacement effects caused by the Canterbury earthquakes which saw the District become home to many new residents and existing District residents relocating within the District.

There is a current capacity of around 260 lots within the existing rural residential zones that are either vacant or could be subdivided to rural residential zone size. The Waimakariri District requires approximately 385 further rural residential lots/households to meet demand over the ten year life of this Strategy. This figure takes into consideration both data from Statistics New Zealand Population Estimates to determine the historical level of development in existing rural residential areas and the assumption that demand for rural residential properties over the next ten years remains broadly similar to that of the most recent ten years. Current capacity of around 260 lots suggests an additional 120 lots/households could be required to meet this demand. This draft Strategy proposes a number of locations to meet this need. A general range is adopted for the purpose of this Strategy as the concept of demand is fluid. Demand could be affected by a number of factors including a potential offset in current supply by way of ‘up-zoning’ existing rural residential zones within the PIB to an urban residential zone; introducing a single rural residential zone; and a potential downturn in availability of small holding lots sizes in the Rural Zone.

Planning Context

This Strategy is set within a wider strategic planning context to ensure that it contributes to coordinated and sustainable development, responds to community needs, and ultimately meets the purpose of the Resource Management Act (RMA) of promoting sustainable management of natural and physical resources.

Where provided for, District Plans are required to adopt an appropriate and comprehensive zoned approach to new rural residential development to manage effects arising from this based on the demands, constraints and opportunities within respective districts. New rural residential development within the Greater Christchurch UDS area (which applies to the eastern part of the Waimakariri District, see Figure 2) must be provided for only in accordance with an adopted rural residential strategy, at a density of 1 to 2 households per hectare, and be located in areas zoned for such development, maintaining and
improving the functioning and qualities of the existing urban area.

The CRPS sets out a number of locational and design matters, including that all rural residential subdivision and development must be located so that it can be economically provided with a reticulated sewer and water supply integrated with a publicly owned system, and appropriate stormwater treatment and disposal. Individual property access must be provided to a sealed road, but not directly to a Strategic Road, Arterial Road or State Highway. An Outline Development Plan (ODP) must be prepared which sets out an integrated design for subdivision and land use, and provides for the long-term maintenance of rural residential character. A rural residential development area shall not be regarded as in transition to full urban development. Furthermore, the location and design of any proposed rural residential development shall:

- Avoid noise sensitive activities occurring within the 50 dBA Ldn air noise contour surrounding Christchurch International Airport;
- Not compromise the operational capacity of the Rangiora Airfield;
- Support existing or upgraded community infrastructure and provide good access to emergency services;
- Avoid significant reverse sensitivity effects with adjacent rural activities, including quarrying and agricultural research farms, or strategic infrastructure;
- Avoid significant natural hazard areas;
- Avoid significant adverse ecological effects, and support the protection and enhancement of ecological values;
- Support the protection and enhancement of ancestral land, water sites, wāhi tapu and wāhi taonga of Ngāi Tahu;
- Where adjacent to or in close proximity to an existing urban or rural residential area, be able to be integrated into or consolidated with the existing settlement; and
- Avoid adverse effects on existing surface water quality.

The Greater Christchurch Partnership review of the strategic land use planning framework, Our Space 2018-2048, includes land use and development proposals to ensure sufficient development capacity for housing and business growth across Greater Christchurch to 2048. The Review, required under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPSUDC), provides for additional growth in urban areas and efficient infrastructure; balances future demands of housing and business growth while still achieving good urban form; identifies locations for housing growth to 2048 and reinforces the role of key centres for retail/office floor space while confirming sufficient industrial land provision. Overall, it provides an allocation of future households in a Greater Christchurch context, with 1,500 to 2,000 additional households provisionally allocated to Waimakariri District over the next ten years. This allocation includes a portion in a rural residential setting.

The Waimakariri District Council adopted a District Development Strategy (DDS) in July 2018, which provides direction for growth and development over the next 30 years. This document considers the natural environment, growing communities, the rural area and small settlements, connections, the economy and centres, and community spaces and places. In planning for the provision of rural residential development, the DDS confirms the Council will initially focus on creating new rural residential areas and have a secondary focus on enabling large lot intensification within existing rural residential areas where there is sufficient community support and servicing available.

The DDS directs the Council to review its existing Rural Residential Development Plan for the whole District. It also confirms the intent to explore an increase in the minimum rural lot sizes in parts of the District, to reduce the subdivision of land into small holdings.

Lastly, the updated Waimakariri District Plan, by way of revised chapters, objectives, policies and rules relating to rural residential development, will become the vehicle to implement growth directions set within the final adopted Rural Residential Development Strategy 2019.
Development Strategy. The reviewed District Plan is intended to be notified in mid-2020.

**Identifying New Rural Residential Areas**

The growth directions for further rural residential development proposed in Part 2 of this draft Strategy were informed by examining key environmental, social and infrastructure constraints and opportunities at a District level. Factors considered include the location of any historic and archaeological sites; biodiversity sites and biodiversity values; versatile soils; soil drainage; intensive farms; slope of land; irrigation areas; natural hazards including fault lines, liquefaction susceptibility areas, tsunami evacuation areas, flooding risks, overland flow paths, and groundwater levels; and major electricity pylons and other infrastructure assets such as wastewater ponds.

The location of any cultural sites, silent file areas, wāhi tapu and wāhi taonga sites were considered with particular reference to the significance of Ngāi Tahu objectives, issues and policies for natural resources and environments management in the region, as set out in the Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan (IMP).

The constraints and opportunities maps are provided in Appendix 1.

Two internal Inquiry by Design workshops were held to identify potential District-wide locations for future rural residential development, in the context of known environmental constraints and opportunities. Workshops were held with Council staff in August 2018 and the Council’s DPRC in October 2019. Proposed locations, including those identified in the 2010 Rural Residential Development Plan but that had not yet been developed, were then considered and shortlisted by assessing them against seven key criteria. Proposed locations were excluded from further consideration if they were:

1. Within high flood hazard areas
2. Within undeveloped areas inside of the existing PIB of the District’s main eastern towns
3. On the direct edges of main towns outside of the Infrastructure Boundary thereby foreclosing more intensive long-term urban development
4. Not connected to existing rural residential nodes or small settlements
5. Not able to economically connect to the network scheme for wastewater
6. Within the Christchurch International Airport noise contour
7. Within areas that would compromise the operational capacity of the Rangiora Airfield

In additional to these criteria, three suggested areas were excluded from further consideration due to their ‘special circumstances’ status. These include Fernside (already tested via private plan change and withdrawn due to flood hazard challenges); Mandeville (a Mandeville Growth Boundary has been in place since 2012 to limit further sprawl, which will be carried over into the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan, in addition to undercurrents / groundwater resurgence, high groundwater levels and overland flows issues); and Tuahiwi (comprises Māori Reserve land with historical agreements that influence ongoing use and development).

Five remaining growth areas were further tested by an internal technical advisory group as well as the DPRC. Individual proposed growth directions, based on a location-by-location assessment of local constraints and strengths, were then determined and are discussed in more detail in Part 2.

**How to Make a Submission**

This is a draft Strategy for public feedback. Your input is important to let us know if we got it right and, if not, what needs to be changed and why. To help continue this conversation with our community and key stakeholders, please read this document and fill out the feedback form, or provide your feedback by any of the other means available.

*We would like your comments by 5pm, Friday 5 April 2019.*

After the close-off for receiving comments, there will be an opportunity for people to present their comments to a Council panel. A final Rural Residential Development Strategy, based on comments received and any further information, will be considered by Council for adoption in mid-2019.
Write to us: Rural Residential Development Strategy
Waimakariri District Council
Freepost 1667
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440

Email us: records@wmk.govt.nz

Do it online: waimakariri.govt.nz/letstalk

Deliver it: Drop off a feedback form or a letter with your thoughts and ideas to any District library or Service Centre

Bring it along: Bring your completed feedback form to one of our Rural Residential Development consultation events (keep an eye on waimakariri.govt.nz/letstalk for details)

Follow us on Facebook: WaimakaririDistrictCouncil
Part 2- Directions for Growth

This draft Rural Residential Development Strategy proposes five areas for growth of rural residential development growth across the District, identified through an assessment process outlined on page 11.

There are three primary proposed areas, which represent preferred development locations due to a number of advantageous factors outlined in the following pages, and two secondary areas for potential rural residential growth. The secondary areas generally face greater challenges, particularly in terms of natural hazard constraints. While they have development potential, these constraints mean the secondary areas are less favoured than the primary areas.

This draft Strategy includes all five areas for consideration and the Council is interested in your thoughts. It is possible that a final Strategy, based on community feedback and other updated expert information, does not include all of these areas.

The proposed areas for rural residential growth are:

Primary Growth Areas
1. Swannanoa
2. Oxford
3. Ashley / Loburn

Secondary Growth Areas
4. Ohoka
5. Gressons Road (north of Woodend)

The following pages provide an overview of each of the proposed areas for rural residential growth, including their strengths and constraints relating to further rural residential development, more defined proposed individual directions for growth, and an area map.

A glossary of terms is provided on page 28.
Primary Growth Areas

1. Swannanoa

Swannanoa is located approximately 14km west of Kaiapoi. The existing Residential 4B Zone was developed in 1995 and comprises 30 lots on approximately 30 hectares. It is bounded by Two Chain Road to the west and Tram Road to the north.

The area is surrounded by Rural Zone lots ranging from 4 hectares to 20 hectares. Swannanoa School is located on Tram Road, immediately east of the rural residential area, and north of Tram Road is the Swannanoa Domain Reserve. It is connected to the Council’s reticulated water supply and wastewater scheme (Eastern District Sewer Scheme) and is not within a rated drainage area.

Strengths

Overall, the Swannanoa area enjoys the following strengths relevant to further rural residential development:

- Potential connectivity to reticulated water and wastewater services; existing capacity in both networks
- Close proximity to local school and domain
- Outside of identified active fault lines and not subject to liquefaction risk or coastal hazards
- Not near high voltage transmission lines infrastructure
- No mapped notable/protected trees, vegetation and habitat sites, heritage sites, wāhi tapu sites, wāhi taonga sites or silent file areas nearby

- Good transport connections via Tram Road
- Clear from flood hazard shown in Environment Canterbury’s Ashley River breakout modelling.

Constraints

In general, the Swannanoa area faces a number of environmental and other constraints relevant to further rural residential development:

- Council Localised Flood Hazard Modelling shows some low to medium flood hazard, particularly to the south and east
- High groundwater conditions and possible groundwater resurgence issues
- Medium soil drainage
- A local airfield located further to the east
- Versatile soils to south and east that should be protected for productive rural activities
- An intensive poultry farm operating further to the south
- Outside of rated drainage scheme
- Reasonably far from main towns and associated existing social infrastructure (apart from the local school)
- Extending the existing Residential 4B Zone could affect Swannanoa’s character given it is currently relatively small in size

- Potential for traffic congestion issues on Tram Road.

Proposed Growth Directions

Taking into account identified local strengths and constraints, further rural residential development is proposed to the north and west of the existing Rural Residential Zone, as shown in Figure 4.

These directions largely avoid versatile soils and flood hazard areas more prevalent to the south. Appropriate connectivity, particularly to the school, across Tram Road and Two Chain Road would need to be considered in any development proposal.
Figure 4: Swannanoa proposed rural residential growth direction

Figure 5: Swannanoa area aerial map 2016
2. Oxford

Oxford is a town located approximately 33km west of Rangiora, at the base of the foothills. Five rural residential areas (Residential 4A Zone) surround the town to the north, east, southeast, west and southwest comprising a total of 159 lots.

The town has a reticulated water supply (Oxford Urban Water Supply and Oxford Rural No 2 Supply), and a reticulated wastewater network. Oxford has the Oxford Urban and Oxford Rural East rated drainage areas.

As an established town, Oxford is home to many facilities and services including an area school, town hall, library and service centre, parks and reserves, as well as a range of shops in the Oxford town centre. Industrial land is also provided in the southeast of the town.

Strengths

Overall, the Oxford area offers a number of strengths that support further rural residential development:

- Oxford is well served by community and social infrastructure including a library, area school, town hall, sports fields
- Close proximity to retail and services available in the Oxford town centre, and other business activities in the southeastern business area
- Proximity to local employment opportunities available in the established Oxford town

- Extension of rural residential areas would not have a major impact on the character of existing areas, or the town, given the established scale of Oxford
- Medium soil drainage to the south, high to the southwest, east, north and northwest
- Potential connectivity to reticulated wastewater network and drainage rated area
- No mapped notable plants/protected trees, vegetation and habitat sites, heritage sites nearby
- No mapped wāhi tapu site, wāhi taonga sites or silent file areas nearby
- Oxford Road provides good transport network connections
- No issues with liquefaction or coastal hazards
- Clear from flood hazard shown in Environment Canterbury’s Ashley River breakout modelling.

Constraints

The Oxford area also faces a number of environmental and other constraints that need to be taken into account when considering further rural residential development:

- Council Localised Flood Hazard Modelling shows some areas of low to medium localised flooding to the east, west and north
- Oxford has some drainage challenges due to the absence of a well-developed stormwater pipe network
- Versatile soils to north and northwest should be protected for productive rural activities
- Some distance from the District’s main eastern towns thus potentially creating a larger community reliant on commuting
- Proximity to identified active fault line
- Some pockets of low soil drainage to the north and northwest
- High voltage transmission lines infrastructure situated to the south
- Some existing capacity in Oxford Rural No 2 water supply; planned upgrades would be required to be brought forward thereafter
- Areas identified for future urban expansion should be avoided where possible.

Proposed Growth Directions

In light of these local constraints and opportunities, two rural residential growth directions are proposed to the north and southeast of Oxford, as shown in Figure 6.

These areas largely avoid flood hazard areas particularly prevalent to the southwest and northeast. They also avoid areas directly adjacent to the existing urban Residential Zone of Oxford protected for long-term residential growth and signalled in the Council’s DDS, for example the area to the immediate east of the Residential 2 Zone towards the current Rural Residential Zone. The proposed southern growth direction has the potential to create improved urban form by joining
two existing but fragmented rural residential zoned areas. Caution will need to be applied to avoid any potential reverse sensitivity issues that could arise from proximity to the Wastewater Treatment Plant and established business activities on Harewood Road.

Figure 6: Oxford proposed rural residential growth directions

Figure 7: Oxford area aerial map 2017
3. Ashley / Loburn

The Ashley area borders the northern banks of the Ashley River. The Residential 3 Zone village area (approximately 16 hectares) comprises 107 lots and the Residential 4B Zone (approximately 43 hectares) area comprises 35 lots. The Loburn Lea Residential 4B Zone area is located north of the Ashley area (approximately 40 hectares) and contains 44 lots. These areas are surrounded by Rural Zone lots.

The Loburn Domain Pavilion and Loburn School are located northwest of Loburn Lea and Ashley School is located in Ashley Village. Rangiora is located on the south banks of the Ashley River and provides a wide range of community facilities, social infrastructure, retail and service offerings, as well as employment opportunities.

The area is not part of a reticulated wastewater network so wastewater disposal occurs via on-site septic tanks and disposal fields. The area is serviced by the Hurunui District Water Supply. Loburn Lea is within a rated drainage area while the Ashley area is not.

Strengths

Overall, the Ashley / Loburn area offers a number of strengths that support further rural residential development:

- No issues relating to liquefaction or coastal hazards
- Well connected to Rangiora via upgraded Ashley Bridge
- Existing local community hall and very close to Rangiora's abundant community facilities and social infrastructure
- Close proximity to retail, services and industrial activities available in Rangiora
- Proximity to local employment opportunities available in Rangiora
- No nearby intensive farms
- No nearby mapped protected trees/notable plants, vegetation and habitat sites, heritage sites, wāhi tapu sites, wāhi taonga sites or silent file areas
- Rated drainage area for Loburn Lea area therefore potential to connect to this
- Ability to connect to reticulated wastewater, provided a sufficient number of new lots is proposed to make it viable, with existing capacity in the network
- Clear from flood hazard shown in Environment Canterbury’s Ashley River breakout modelling.

Constraints

The Ashley / Loburn area also faces a number of environmental and other constraints that need to be taken into account when considering further rural residential development:

- Under Hurunui District Council water supply which has minimal existing capacity; pipe upgrades would be required once this capacity has been met
- Council Localised Flood Hazard Modelling shows some low to medium flood hazard
- Near an identified active fault line
- Widespread areas of versatile soils that should be protected for productive rural activities
- Low soil drainage
- High voltage drainage infrastructure nearby
- No existing rated drainage area for Ashley area
- Extending the existing Residential 4B areas could affect their character given they are currently relatively small in size. Similarly, extending Ashley Village with rural residential development could have a notable impact on the existing village scale and character
- Daiken MDF plant located further to the east.

Proposed Growth Directions

Taking into account these local constraints and opportunities, two rural residential growth directions are proposed to the east and west of Loburn Lea and three to the north, east and west of Ashley village, as shown in Figure 8.

These areas are relatively free from localised flood hazard and many of the underlying lots are large in size and in single ownership, which may make potential development more practicable. However, it is acknowledged that some of the proposed growth directions do impact on land with versatile soils.
Figure 8: Ashley / Loburn proposed rural residential growth directions

Figure 9: Ashley / Loburn area aerial map 2016
Secondary Growth Areas

4. Ohoka

Ohoka is located at the junction of Mill Road and Whites Road, approximately 4km from Mandeville and 8km from Kaiapoi. Ohoka was founded in the late 1800s as a mill town and rural service centre. The Ohoka area is made up of a Residential 3 Zone, Residential 4B Zone and Residential 4A Zone surrounded by Rural Zone. The Ohoka village Residential 3 Zone comprises approximately 14 hectares and 34 lots. The Residential 4B Zone (Keetly Place and Wilson Drive), developed in the 1990s, comprises approximately 50 hectares and 49 lots.

Two areas to the northeast of Ohoka, comprising 91 hectares and 37 lots in total, were rezoned rural residential (Residential 4A Zone) in 2013 and 2014. One of these areas has not yet developed while the other, Hallfield, is currently in Stage 1 of its subdivision development.

Ohoka has a community hall, domain, primary school and petrol station. It is connected to a reticulated water supply, reticulated wastewater network, and is within a rated drainage scheme area.

Strengths

Overall, the Ohoka area offers a number of strengths that support further rural residential development:

• No issues relating to liquefaction or coastal hazards
• Potential connectivity to reticulated water and wastewater services. Some existing capacity in water supply; once this is met, planned future upgrades would need to be brought forward. Sufficient existing capacity in wastewater network
• Potential to connect to rated drainage area
• Outside of identified active fault lines
• Local community hall and domain
• Well connected via various transport routes
• Close to Rangiora and Kaiapoi which have abundant community facilities and social infrastructure in place
• Close proximity to retail, services and industrial activities available in Rangiora and Kaiapoi
• No nearby mapped protected trees/notable plants, vegetation and habitat sites, wāhi tapu sites or wāhi taonga sites or silent file areas; there are three heritage sites nearby, however these are within existing developed areas
• Clear from flood hazard shown in Environment Canterbury’s Ashley River breakout modelling.

Constraints

The Ohoka area also faces a number of environmental and other constraints that need to be taken into account when considering further rural residential development:

• High groundwater conditions
• Low soil drainage
• Council Localised Flood Hazard Modelling shows low flood hazard throughout Ohoka; with areas of medium flood hazard north of Mill Road and south of Main Drain Road
• Versatile soils north of Mill Road that should be protected for productive rural activities
• Extending Ohoka could potentially affect Ohoka’s ‘English village’ character which is currently relatively small in size
• Intensive poultry farm operating further to the north
• High voltage transmission lines infrastructure nearby to west.

Proposed Growth Direction

Taking into account identified local strengths and constraints, further rural residential development is proposed to the southwest of the existing Ohoka village Residential 3 Zone, as shown in Figure 10.

This direction largely avoids versatile soils and flood hazard areas.
Figure 10: Ohoka proposed rural residential growth direction

Figure 11: Ohoka area aerial map 2016
5. Gressons Road

The Gressons Road Residential 4B area comprises approximately 53 hectares and 56 lots. It is located 3km north of Woodend and Pegasus, and 3km west of Waikuku Beach. The area is bounded by State Highway 1 / Main North Road to the east, Gressons Road to the south, and the Waikuku Stream to the north and west.

The area does not contain any community facilities or amenities, however, it is in close proximity to Woodend and Pegasus and their associated community facilities and social infrastructure.

The area is not currently connected to a reticulated wastewater network so wastewater disposal occurs via individual septic tanks. Similarly, the area is not connected to a reticulated water supply, which means water is sourced via individual bores. However, given the area’s relatively close proximity to Woodend, Pegasus and Waikuku, connecting to these reticulated networks would be possible if there was sufficient growth to require it. The area is within a rated drainage area.

Strengths

Overall, the Gressons Road area offers a number of strengths that support further rural residential development:

- Close proximity to Woodend and Pegasus which have abundant community facilities and social infrastructure in place
- Close proximity to State Highway 1 providing good transport connections
- Medium soil drainage to the south and east, high soil drainage to the north
- Council Localised Flood Hazard Modelling shows only some small areas of low flood hazard surrounding the existing Residential 4B area. Areas to the south and east of the existing Residential 4B area are clear from medium to high flood hazard under Environment Canterbury’s Ashley River Breakout Flood Modelling.
- Outside of identified active fault lines
- Within a rated drainage area
- No high voltage transmission lines infrastructure nearby
- No nearby mapped notable plants, vegetation and habitat sites or heritage sites.

Constraints

The Gressons Road area also faces a number of environmental and other constraints that need to be taken into account when considering further rural residential development:

- Silent File Area SF017 Pekapeka to the south
- Within a Liquefaction Susceptibility Area
- Potential for coastal hazard issues including groundwater level rise associated with sea level rise
- Potential connectivity to wastewater and water reticulated network, however, significant costs would likely be involved in reaching current networks
- Largely surrounded by versatile soils, except for a small portion to the northeast
- Low soil drainage to the west
- Council Localised Flood Hazard Modelling and Environment Canterbury’s Ashley River Breakout Flood Modelling shows some medium to high flood hazard to the north and northwest of the existing Residential 4B area
- Expansion of the existing Rural Residential 4B area could potentially impact on the area’s character given it is relatively small

Proposed Growth Direction

Taking into account these various constraints and opportunities, further rural residential growth is proposed to the south of the existing Residential 4B settlement, as shown in Figure 12.

This area is relatively free from localised flood hazard and avoids the potential community severance associated with State Highway 1. It also allows a greater level of integration with the existing settlement via Gressons Road.

It is acknowledged the proposed growth direction is within a Silent File Area indicating the presence of significant wāhi tapu or wāhi taonga somewhere in the area. Therefore, consultation with Ngāi Tūāhuriri is particularly important in order to identify effects of the activity and to avoid, remedy or mitigate
those effects. It is also acknowledged that the proposed growth direction does impact land with versatile soils.

Figure 12: Gressons Road proposed rural residential growth direction

Figure 13: Gressons Road area aerial map 2017
Part 3- Making it Happen

Strategy Implementation

The purpose of the Rural Residential Development Strategy is to determine indicative directions for rural residential growth. While this draft Strategy proposes a number of growth directions, the final Strategy will provide a more refined number of indicative growth areas informed by the draft Strategy process, comments received during public consultation, and any further expert advice received.

The Waimakariri District Plan Review process will then be the key vehicle through which the final Rural Residential Development Strategy will be implemented. The Proposed Waimakariri District Plan, with revised objectives, policies and rules relating to rural residential development, is intended to be publicly notified in mid-2020.

The most suitable method of implementation via the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan will be determined when it is clear to what extent the landowners within the identified growth areas are interested in developing their land.

There is an option that the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan applies a ‘Rural Residential Growth Area Overlay’ (or similar) which indicates that the area is identified for rural residential development and subsequent rezoning. This would be accompanied by District Plan provisions to enable this approach. Options will be outlined as part of the notification of the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan. Upon notification of the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan, landowners interested in developing their land have the opportunity to submit on the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan, requesting that the land be rezoned rural residential.

The Rural Residential Development Strategy site selection process involved determination of constraints at a relatively high level. Therefore, landowners interested in having their land rezoned would need to provide more detailed assessments to support their submission (or as part of a separate private plan change application) that demonstrate their land is suitable for rezoning for rural residential use. These investigations typically address flood hazard; stormwater, water and
wastewater servicing; transportation; geotechnical; and soil contamination. Council has a regulatory role to review such investigations with a high level of scrutiny. District Plan Review decision makers (or in the case of a private plan change application, the decision makers assigned to that private plan change) will then decide, based on the evidence provided, whether the land should be rezoned for rural residential use.

The design of growth areas and / or individual sites is outside the scope of this draft Strategy. However, the use of sustainable and ‘green’ designs and innovations are encouraged to create sustainable communities.

**Monitoring and Review**

The reviewed Waimakariri District Plan is anticipated to be operative after 2022, following the notification process from 2020. Therefore, to align with the Waimakariri District Plan, this Strategy will have a ten year life from approximately 2022 to 2032, once it is adopted.

The Council’s DPRC will have an ongoing role in overseeing the implementation of this Strategy, by way of its responsibility for district development matters and the rezoning of any rural land to rural residential.

Change in household numbers in the rural residential zones will be continually monitored via the Council’s records of building consents for new residential dwellings. In addition, the Council is responsible for producing quarterly reporting on indicators relating to housing and business development capacity under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC) and the associated Our Space 2018-48 regional partnership framework for household allocation.

A formal Strategy review will occur in 2025.
Links to Further Information

**Background Reports**
This Strategy has been informed by a number of background and technical reports and community surveys. These are available on the Rural Residential Development Strategy project webpage.

waimakariri.govt.nz/ruralresidential

**Waimakariri District Development Strategy (DDS)**
The Waimakariri District Development Strategy, which was adopted in 2018, guides the District’s anticipated residential and business growth over the next 30 years.

waimakariri.govt.nz/your-council/district-development

**Waimakariri District Plan (WDP)**
The Waimakariri District Plan manages land use and subdivision activities within the District.

waimakariri.govt.nz/property-and-building/planning/district-plan

**Land Use Recovery Plan (LURP)**
The Land Use Recovery Plan sets out a policy and planning framework necessary for metropolitan greater Christchurch to rebuild existing communities; develop new communities; meet the land use needs of businesses; rebuild and develop the infrastructure needed to support these activities; and take account of natural hazards and environmental constraints that may affect rebuilding and recovery.

ecan.govt.nz/your-region/plans-strategies-and-bylaws/land-use-recovery-plan

**Canterbury Regional Policy Statement 2013 (CRPS)**
The Canterbury Regional Policy Statement 2013 provides an overview of the resource management issues in the Canterbury region, and the objectives, policies and methods to achieve integrated management of natural and physical resources. The methods include directions for provisions in district and regional plans.


**National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016 (NPS-UDC)**
The NPS-UDC sets out the objectives and policies for providing for development capacity under the Resource management Act 1991.


**Our Space 2018-48, Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update**
The Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update was out for consultation in November 2018. It outlines land use and development proposals to ensure there is sufficient development capacity for housing and business growth across Greater Christchurch to 2048.

greaterchristchurch.org.nz/ourspace/

**Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan (IMP)**
The IMP provides a values-based policy framework for the protection and enhancement of Ngāi Tahu values, and for achieving the relationship of Ngāi Tahu with local natural resources.

mkt.co.nz/iwi-management-plan
# Glossary of Terms

**Council Localised Flood Hazard Modelling**
Rain on grid flood modelling based on 0.5% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP).

**Environment Canterbury Ashley River Breakout Flood Modelling**
Flood modelling undertaken by Environment Canterbury which combines Ashley River breakout and localised flooding. Note, this was modelled on a 1%, 0.5% and 0.2% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) for the Ashley River Breakout scenarios.

**Intensive Farm Buffer**
Area potentially affected by odour associated with intensive farming activity (poultry, piggery or cattle).

**Wāhi taonga**
Places treasured due to their high intrinsic values and critical role they have in maintaining a balanced and robust ecosystem (eg. Spawning grounds for fish, nesting areas for birds and freshwater springs).

**Wāhi tapu**
An area indicating the presence of significant wāhi tapu or wāhi taonga somewhere in the area. Consultation with Ngāi Tūāhuriri is particularly important when considering development within these areas in order to identify effects of the activity and to avoid, remedy or mitigate those effects.

**Silent File Area**
Places of significance that have been imbued with an element of sacredness or restriction (tapu) following a certain event or circumstance.

**Versatile Soils**
Land classified as Land Use Capability I or II in the New Zealand Land Resource Inventory. Versatile soils are part of the soil resource that will support the widest range of productive uses with the least inputs.

# Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRPS</td>
<td>Canterbury Regional Policy Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDS</td>
<td>Waimakariri District Development Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPRC</td>
<td>District Planning and Regulation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>Iwi Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LURP</td>
<td>Land Use Recovery Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODP</td>
<td>Outline Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIB</td>
<td>Projected Infrastructure Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS-UDC</td>
<td>National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMA</td>
<td>Resource Management Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRDP</td>
<td>Rural Residential Development Plan 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP</td>
<td>Septic tank effluent pump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDS</td>
<td>Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDP</td>
<td>Waimakariri District Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendices

Appendix 1: Constraints and Opportunities Maps
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Fault Areas in Waimakariri District

Information has been derived from various organisations, including Environment Canterbury and the Canterbury Maps partners. Boundary information is derived under licence from LINZ Digital Cadastral Database (Crown Copyright Reserved). Environment Canterbury and the Canterbury Maps partners do not give and expressly disclaim any warranty as to the accuracy or completeness of the information or its fitness for any purpose.

Information from this map may not be used for the purposes of any legal disputes. The user should independently verify the accuracy of any information before taking any action in reliance upon it.

Disclaimer:
Copyright Environment Canterbury 2019
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Information from this map may not be used for the purposes of any legal disputes. The user should independently verify the accuracy of any information before taking any action in reliance upon it.
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Legend note: if you have a large number of layers on the map, they may not all be visible in the legend.
Swannanoa Soil Drainage (1 = lowest to 5 = highest)

Oxford Soil Drainage (1 = lowest to 5 = highest)

Ashley Loburn Soil Drainage (1 = lowest to 5 = highest)

Ohoka Soil Drainage (1 = lowest to 5 = highest)
Gressons Road Soil Drainage (1 = lowest to 5 = highest)

Transmission Lines and Airport Noise Contour - Eastern District

Transmission Lines and Airport Noise Contour - Oxford Area

DISCLAIMER:
Information on this map may not be used for the purposes of any legal disputes.

Boundary information is derived under licence from LINZ Digital Cadastral Database (Crown Copyright Reserved) for re-use under licence. Land and property information is based on/includes LINZ's data which is licensed by Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) for re-use under the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 New Zealand licence.

The location of Council services are shown indicatively only and no guarantee is given as to the accuracy of the information. Council does not guarantee the exact location of the service prior to commencing any construction, including potholing and protecting existing services. Contractors will be held responsible for all damage to Council services that may occur as a result of such activities.

The Waimakariri District Council does not give and expressly disclaims any warranty as to the accuracy or completeness of the information or its fitness for any purpose.

Flood information on this map is based on modelling outputs and the accuracy of this data is limited by the assumptions inherent in the model. The Council reserves the right to update this information and cannot guarantee that the information is accurate and up to date at all times. An experienced practitioner should be consulted if this information is to be used for Building Code purposes. Please refer to the District Plan and the Council’s Planning Unit if you wish to use this information for planning purposes. Anyone who acts on any of this information does so at their own risk.
Green shaded circles indicate the presence of significant wāhi tapu or wāhi taonga somewhere in the area. Therefore, consultation with Ngāi Tūāhuriri is particularly important in order to identify effects of the activity and to avoid, remedy or mitigate those effects.

Blue shaded areas indicate land classified as land use capability I or II in the New Zealand Land Resource Inventory.
Target sub regions in the Central Canterbury Plains and Christchurch area where gravel sediments are the most likely to be geologically suitable for aggregate and the groundwater table is generally more than 6m below the ground surface.
Appendix 2: High Level Servicing and Flood Hazard Assessments

The following is a summary of the high level servicing capacity and flood hazard assessments provided by the Council’s 3 Waters Unit to inform the Rural Residential Development Strategy site selection process. The primary purpose of these assessments was to identify any areas with significant flaws with respect to infrastructure services and flood hazard. This was done by considering the capacity of existing infrastructure to service a hypothetical 50 lot and 100 lot rural residential density development, including some comment regarding flood hazard risks.

The Following Points were also Considered:
- Planned infrastructure upgrades;
- Key assumptions;
- Development Contributions;
- Critical mass (e.g. 50 lots or 100 lots would make the surrounding area connecting to reticulated wastewater feasible); and
- Any other matters relevant in identifying the high level flaws or opportunities for an area.

Key Assumptions were:
- Water supplied will only be a restricted supply, and that wastewater connections would be pressure systems, which require homeowners to install a small tank and pump system on their property
- Standard Council policy with respect to management of flood risk applies, including that any development is required to mitigate the effects of increased runoff, with on-site works to retain and treat runoff
- The time span for the assessments is 10-15 years to match the life of the reviewed Waimakariri District Plan which is anticipated to be operative around 2022. Therefore, its next review, 10 years later, would be in 2032
- Development Contributions are calculated from the published Development Contributions for the 2018/2019 year. It is noted these Development Contributions are subject to change as part of the 2019/2020 Annual Plan, which is currently being consulted on and includes updated 2019/2020 Development Contributions. Development Contributions are not applicable for drainage as developers are required to carry out any works necessary to mitigate the effects of increased runoff.

The Areas Assessed were:
- Swannanoa
- Ashley / Loburn
- Oxford
- Ohoka
- Gressons Road
- Mandeville
- Sefton
- West Eyreton
- Cust
- Woodend

However, the following summary only covers the assessment undertaken for the five growth areas listed in this Strategy. The website contains the First Cut Criteria Assessment which outlines why Mandeville, Sefton, West Eyreton, Cust and Woodend were removed from consideration as growth areas, along with many other areas.

Swannanoa

Water supply - The current water supply network has capacity to accommodate the hypothetical 50 and 100 additional lots. Upgrades are needed to meet Council’s capacity standard and a new well is planned for 2024/2025 to address this. Additional storage will be required, which is planned for within the Long Term Plan. Depending on the location of a new development, additional reticulation may be required, at the developers cost. Refer to Table 1 for costs associated with connecting to the reticulated network.

Wastewater - The reticulated wastewater network delivers wastewater to the Rangiora treatment plant (Eastern District Sewer Scheme) and has capacity to accommodate the hypothetical 50 and 100 lots. There would likely be a need for new local reticulation, at the developers cost. Refer to Table 1 for costs associated with connecting to the reticulated network.
Drainage and flood hazard - Swannanoa is outside any rated drainage scheme. It is part of a wider area that suffers from high groundwater and drainage problems during storm events. While good drainage is available when groundwater levels are low, soak pits cannot be relied upon to manage stormwater for any new developments and secondary flow paths would need to be considered. Any stormwater management capital works that were put in by the developer, would need to be maintained, so a new drainage scheme rated area may need to be set up, or the nearby Ohoka rated drainage area extended. Any proposed development should avoid any significant overland flow paths shown on Council’s Localised Flood Hazard Modelling for the 0.5% Annual Exceedance Probability event.

Ashley / Loburn

Water supply - The water supply network to the north of the Ashley River supplies both Waimakariri District and Hurunui District residents and is managed by Hurunui District Council. The existing reticulation would only be able to support 50 new lots, with a pipe upgrade required to service more than this. A new hydraulic model is being developed which will allow for more accurate assessments of the network capacity. The primary source for the southern end of this network, although it should be noted that the supply does not currently fully meet the New Zealand Drinking Water Standards. Refer to Table 1 for costs associated with connecting to the reticulated network.

Wastewater – The area could connect to the Eastern District Sewer Scheme, which has capacity, via the Rangiora reticulated wastewater network. Refer to Table 1 for costs associated with connecting to the reticulated network. If Loburn and Ashley residents also connected, the cost per lot would come down.

Drainage and flood hazard - There is no drainage rated area in this area. A drainage rated area would need to be set up to maintain any flood mitigation works built during any development. Any development would be required to mitigate stormwater effects. Flooding has occurred around Cones Road, Fawcett’s Road and Max Wallace Drive, and minor overland flow has occurred south of Carrs Road. Any proposed zoned areas for rural residential should avoid any significant overland flow paths shown on Council’s Localised Flood Hazard Modelling for the 0.5% Annual Exceedance Probability event.

Oxford

Water supply – It is assumed that any development would be connected to the Oxford Rural No. 2 network. The current network could service an additional 50 lots however any more than this would necessitate bringing forward construction of the new reservoir, which is currently planned and budgeted for 2025/2026. Refer to Table 1 for costs associated with connecting to the reticulated network.

Wastewater – The current Oxford reticulated wastewater network has capacity to accommodate the hypothetical 50 and 100 lots. Depending on the location, and assuming the new development was a pumped pressure scheme, it is likely that any new development would be able to discharge into this scheme. Refer to Table 1 for costs associated with connecting to the reticulated network.

Drainage and flood hazard - Oxford has some drainage challenges due to the absence of a well-developed stormwater pipe network. However any new development would be required to mitigate its stormwater effects, and extend the drainage rated area to include it. Any proposed zoned areas for rural residential should avoid any significant overland flow paths shown on Council’s Localised Flood Hazard Modelling for the 0.5% Annual Exceedance Probability event.

Ohoka

Water supply - The current infrastructure has some spare capacity and an additional 50 lots could be accommodated in the short-term. However, servicing 100 lots would require bringing forward planned storage upgrades, and possibly
require an additional well. New reticulation from the developer would be required, at the developer’s cost. Refer to Table 1 for costs associated with connecting to the reticulated network.

**Wastewater** - The reticulated wastewater network delivers wastewater to the Rangiora treatment plant and has capacity to accommodate the hypothetical 50 and 100 lots. There would likely be a need for new local reticulation, at the developer’s cost. Refer to Table 1 for costs associated with connecting to the reticulated network.

**Drainage and flood hazard** - The Ohoka area is within a rated drainage area. It is part of a wider area that suffers from high groundwater, and drainage problems during storm events. It has a number of existing drainage deficiencies below the current development areas, particularly around Mill Road and Threlkelds Road. Any development should avoid significant overland flow paths shown on Council’s Localised Flood Hazard Modelling for the 0.5% Annual Exceedance Probability event.

**Gressons Road**

**Water supply** - The area is not connected to a reticulated water supply, with water currently sourced from individual bores. However, if there was sufficient growth to require it and make it viable, the area could connect to either the Pegasus or Waikuku schemes which have capacity for the 50 to 100 hypothetical lots. Refer to Table 1 for costs associated with connecting to the reticulated network.

**Wastewater** – The area is not currently connected to a reticulated wastewater network so wastewater disposal is via individual septic tanks and disposal fields. However, if there was sufficient growth to require it and make it viable, the area could connect to the Eastern District Sewer Scheme, which has capacity for the 50 to 100 hypothetical lots (via either the Pegasus or Waikuku reticulated wastewater networks). Refer to Table 1 for costs associated with connecting to the reticulated network.

**Drainage and flood hazard** – The area is within a rated drainage area. The area is subject to some medium to high flood hazard to the north and north-west of the existing Residential 4B area. It should be noted the area could also be subject to coastal influences on groundwater associated with sea level rise. Any new development should avoid any significant overland flow paths shown on Council’s Localised Flood Hazard Modelling for the 0.5% Annual Exceedance Probability event.
Table 1: Anticipated Development Contributions and other additional servicing costs per lot based on a hypothetical 100 lot rural residential development

Note: Development Contributions provided are based on the 2018/2019 Development Contributions which are subject to change as part of the 2019/2020 Annual Plan, which is currently being consulted on and includes updated 2019/2020 Development Contributions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Water Development Contributions per lot</th>
<th>Water additional costs per lot</th>
<th>Wastewater Development Contributions per lot</th>
<th>Wastewater additional costs per lot</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swannanoa</td>
<td>$2,852</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$18,598</td>
<td>$16,000 for onsite reticulation, pump and chamber</td>
<td>$37,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley / Loburn</td>
<td>$3,970</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$5,434</td>
<td>$16,000 for onsite reticulation, pump and chamber $8,000 for wastewater network connection works</td>
<td>$33,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>$13,390</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$2,054</td>
<td>$16,000 for onsite reticulation, pump and chamber</td>
<td>$31,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka</td>
<td>$8,416</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$18,598</td>
<td>$16,000 for onsite reticulation, pump and chamber</td>
<td>$43,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku</td>
<td>$4,136</td>
<td>$15,000 for water network connection works</td>
<td>$5,434</td>
<td>$15,000 for wastewater network connection works $16,000 for onsite reticulation, pump and chamber</td>
<td>$55,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where to from here?

Pull off the feedback form, fill it in, fold it and post it back to us for free. Or fill in a submission form online at waimakariri.govt.nz/letstalk. We need your comments by 5pm, Friday 5 April 2019. To speak with one of the team, phone 0800 965 468 (0800 WMKGOV).
Feedback Form

Draft Waimakariri Rural Residential Development Strategy

What do you think about the growth direction(s) we have identified for additional rural residential development at:

- **Swannanoa**
- **Ashley / Loburn**
- **Ohoka**
- **Gressons Road**

Have we missed anything or do you have any other comments relating to rural residential development in the Waimakariri District? (please use extra paper if necessary)

Please provide your details so we can keep you up to date as the project progresses:

Name: ................................................................. Business (if any): .................................................................
Address: .................................................................................................................................
Daytime phone: ................................................................. Mobile: .................................................................
Email: .................................................................................................................................

☐ Yes, I’d like to speak to my submission

Tell us what you think in person

We will hold informal hearings to allow submitters to speak to their written feedback to a Council hearing panel. If you’d like to speak to your feedback, please tick the box and we will contact you to arrange a time.
We want to know what you think of the Rural Residential Development Strategy.

Have your say using one of the following options:
- Follow us on Facebook: WaimakaririDistrictCouncil
- For dates and details come to a drop-in session in March - check WaimakaririGovt.nz/Esttak
- Online - WaimakaririGovt.nz/Esttak
- Email to records@wmgovt.nz
- Complete this form and return freepost (please fold and staple closed)

Tell us what you think by 5pm, Friday 5 April 2019

Rural Residential Development Strategy
Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440

190219019271

Fold along line.
Waimakariri Rural Residential Development Strategy

Summary of the Draft Strategy for Consultation, 8 March to 5 April 2019

The Waimakariri District Council would like to hear your views on the future of rural residential development in the District. This brochure summarises the full draft Waimakariri Rural Residential Development Strategy and we are inviting submissions on its content.

Rural residential development is the subdivision and use of land (to lots typically sized 2,500m² to 1 hectare) to cater for the needs of those wishing to live within a rural or semi-rural setting, enabling diverse living choices for the people of Waimakariri District. A Rural Residential Development Strategy proactively manages rural land for rural residential use by identifying ‘clustered’ locations for development. In this way it helps to protect the balance of rural land for primary production and rural character purposes.

Our District continues to grow and the number of households is set to increase over the next 30 years. As part of this growth, we are expecting a demand of about 385 rural residential homes over the next ten years.

In our role as a planning authority and key service/infrastructure provider, it is important to carefully plan for the growth of rural residential development to meet the community’s needs. In doing so, we take into account known environmental and other constraints and opportunities on a location-by-location basis, to safeguard people and land. We also need to be consistent with the wider planning framework within which Councils operate.

This draft Strategy proposes a number of growth locations for further rural residential development that are considered suitable for rezoning. These were determined by undertaking location assessments and have been guided by planning instruments such as the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS).

Three primary areas are proposed, which represent preferred development locations due to a number of advantageous factors. Two secondary areas are also included, which generally face greater challenges, particularly in terms of natural hazard constraints. The proposed growth locations are:

**Primary:**
- Swannanoa
- Oxford
- Ashley / Loburn

**Secondary:**
- Ohoka
- Gressons Road (north of Woodend)

Your input is important to let us know if we got it right and if not, what needs to be changed and why. Please read this brochure and tell us what you think by 5pm, Friday 5 April 2019.

Copies of the full draft Strategy are available at Council service centres and libraries, or online at waimakariri.govt.nz/letstalk.
Primary Rural Residential Development Growth Areas

**Swannanoa**

**Key Strengths**
- Potential connectivity to reticulated water and wastewater services
- Close proximity to local school and domain
- Good transport connections via Tram Road.

**Key Constraints**
- Some low to medium flood hazard, particularly to the south and east
- High groundwater conditions and possible groundwater resurgence
- Medium soil drainage
- Versatile soils to south and east should be protected for productive rural activities
- Intensive poultry farm further to the south
- Outside rated drainage scheme.

**Proposed Growth Directions**
- To the north and west of existing Rural Residential Zone
- Directions largely avoid versatile soils and flood hazard areas
- Need to consider appropriate connectivity across Tram road and Two Chain Road.
**Oxford**

**Key Strengths**
- Well served by Oxford’s community and social infrastructure
- Close proximity to retail and services in Oxford and local employment opportunities
- Can connect to reticulated wastewater network and drainage rated area
- Good transport network connections via Oxford Road.

**Key Constraints**
- Low to medium localised flooding to east, west and north
- Versatile soils to north and northwest should be protected for productive rural activities
- Distance from District’s main eastern towns with the likelihood of creating a larger community reliant on commuting
- High voltage transmission lines to south.

**Proposed Growth Directions**
- To the north and southeast of existing Rural Residential Zone
- Directions largely avoid flood hazard areas to southwest and northeast
- Directions avoid areas adjacent to existing urban Residential Zone of Oxford protected for long-term residential growth of the township
- Potential to improve urban form by joining fragmented rural residential zones
- Need to be mindful of potential reverse sensitivity issues from proximity to Wastewater Treatment Plant and business activities on Harewood Road.
**Ashley / Loburn**

**Key Strengths**
- Well connected to Rangiora via upgraded Ashley Bridge
- Existing local community hall and close to Rangiora’s community facilities and social infrastructure
- Close to Rangiora’s retail, services, industrial activities and employment opportunities
- Can connect to rated drainage area for Loburn Lea
- Can connect to reticulated wastewater (if enough lots).

**Key Constraints**
- Under Hurunui District Council water supply with minimal existing capacity
- Versatile soils in majority of this area that should be protected for productive rural activities
- Low soil drainage
- No existing rated drainage area.

**Proposed Growth Directions**
- To the east and west of Loburn Lea
- To the north, east and west of Ashley village
- Directions are relatively free from localised flood hazard
- Many underlying lots are large and in single ownership
- Directions do impact on land with versatile soils.
Ohoka

Key Strengths
• Potential connectivity to reticulated water and wastewater services
• Can connect to rated drainage area
• Local community hall and domain
• Well connected via transport routes
• Close to Rangiora and Kaiapoi with abundant community facilities, social infrastructure, retail and employment.

Key Constraints
• High groundwater conditions
• Low soil drainage

Proposed Growth Direction
• Subject to localised flooding
• Potential to affect Ohoka ‘English village’ character
• High voltage transmission lines nearby to west.

Proposed Growth Direction
• To the southwest of existing Residential 3 Zone
• Direction largely avoids versatile soils and flood hazard area.
**Gressons Road** (north of Woodend)

**Key Strengths**
- Within rated drainage area
- Close to Woodend and Pegasus with abundant community facilities and social infrastructure
- Fairly free from flood hazard.

**Key Constraints**
- Within Silent File Area to the south (indicating presence of significant wāhi tapu or wāhi taonga somewhere in this area and consultation with Ngāi Tūāhuriri is particularly important)
- Within Liquefaction Susceptibility Area
- Potential for coastal hazard issues such as groundwater level rise
- Higher relative costs to connect to wastewater and water reticulated network
- Low soil drainage to west
- Largely surrounded by versatile soils.

**Proposed Growth Direction**
- To the south of existing Rural Residential Zone
- Direction largely avoids flood hazard areas though does impact on versatile soils
- Direction is within Silent File Area.

---

**Where to from here?**

Pull off the feedback form, fill it in, fold it and post it back to us for free. Or fill in a submission form online at waimakariri.govt.nz/letstalk. We need your comments by 5pm, Friday 5 April 2019.

To speak with one of the team, phone 0800 965 468 (0800 WMKGOV).
Feedback Form

Draft Waimakariri Rural Residential Development Strategy

What do you think about the growth direction(s) we have identified for additional rural residential development at:

- Swannanoa
- Ashley / Loburn
- Oxford
- Ohoka
- Gressons Road

Have we missed anything or do you have any other comments relating to rural residential development in the Waimakariri District? (please use extra paper if necessary)

Please provide your details so we can keep you up to date as the project progresses:

Name: ................................................................. Business (if any): .................................................................
Address: ..................................................................................................................................................
Daytime phone: ............................................................. Mobile: .................................................................
Email: ..................................................................................................................................................

☐ Yes, I’d like to speak to my submission

Tell us what you think in person

We will hold informal hearings to allow submitters to speak to their written feedback to a Council hearing panel. If you’d like to speak to your feedback, please tick the box and we will contact you to arrange a time.
We want to know what you think of the Rural Residential Development Strategy.

Have your say using one of the following options:
- Complete this form and return freepost (please fold and staple closed)
- Email to records@wmk.govt.nz
- Online – waimakariri.govt.nz/letstalk
- Come to a drop-in session in March – check waimakariri.govt.nz/letstalk for dates and details
- Follow us on Facebook: WaimakaririDistrictCouncil

TELL US WHAT YOU THINK BY 5PM, FRIDAY 5 APRIL 2019
Survey of Residential 4 Zones and San Dona Olive Groves Households 2018

Summary of Responses – February 2019

Introduction
In December 2018, the Waimakariri District Council invited all households living / owning property in the District’s Residential Zone 4A or 4B (rural residential) and within the San Dona Olive Grove settlements north of Mandeville to complete a survey. Lots in the San Dona Olive Grove subdivisions were included because, although zoned Rural in the Waimakariri District Plan, the majority of these lots are in the same size range of less than 2.0 ha as lots in the District’s Residential 4 Zones.

While currently reviewing the Waimakariri District Plan as well as the Rural Residential Development Plan, the Council is interested in better understanding how people living in the District’s Residential 4 Zones and the San Dona Olive Grove area view the area they live in, which will help the Council plan for the future of rural and rural residential areas. Information gathered by this survey provides insight into property size preferences, character and amenity preferences, and property turnover.

Survey Methodology
The Waimakariri District Council undertook a similar survey in 2006 (‘2006 Residential 4 Rural Residential Zone Household Survey’), upon which this survey is based. Some of the questions were kept identical; however many of the original questions posed in the 2006 survey were considered less relevant now and were hence excluded, with new questions added.

The survey was sent to households via email where Council records held a contact email address which allowed residents to fill in the survey electronically on the Council’s website. The remaining residents received a hard copy survey together with a freepost return envelope. The survey form, cover letter and cover email are included as Appendices. The survey went out at the beginning of December and remained open until 23 December, providing around three to four weeks within which to return the completed surveys. The electronic survey was taken off the Council’s ‘Let’s Talk’ webpage on the closing day; however, completed hard copy surveys were still being accepted until mid-January.

Ahead of dissemination, the different areas of Residential Zone 4A and 4B were allocated an area number, which allowed the identification of responses by general area. The information provided in individual surveys remains confidential and any reports based on the answers cannot be traced to any individual or household.

Response Rate
A total of 1353 surveys were released, of which 347 were completed, representing a 26% response rate. This compares to a 45% response rate achieved in the 2006 Residential 4 Zone Household Survey. While the returned surveys provide a useful snapshot of perceptions and preferences prevalent among property owners/residents of the District’s rural residential (and San Dona) areas, the relatively low response rate may mean that there is a significant non-response error in the findings reported. Caution should be applied when considering these findings.

The highest proportionate response rate came from the collection of households located in the San Dona Olive Grove area north of Mandeville, with 50% of households completing the survey. Those living or owning property in the Residential 4A and 4B Zones at Waikuku and Gressons Road returned
the lowest proportionate responses at just 13%. The following table provides an overview of response rate by area of distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed surveys by area</th>
<th>Area No.</th>
<th>Area description</th>
<th>No. distributed</th>
<th>No. completed</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>West Eyreton</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Swannanoa</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>San Dona Olive Grove area</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ohoka</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fernside</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Loburn</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Woodend / West Woodend</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Waikuku</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Woodend Beach Road</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>North Kaiapoi</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Responses
The following pages provide a summary of the responses received from the Survey of Residential Zones and San Dona Olive Groves Households 2018.

How long lived at present property & purchase of present property
The highest proportion of respondent households have lived at their current address for only 1 to 5 years (33%); the lowest proportion of respondent households have lived at their current address for more than 20 years (11%).

More than half of all respondents purchased their property with a house on it (57%), as opposed to as bare land (43%).

When asked whether they considered buying a larger ‘lifestyle block’ (e.g. around 4-5 hectares) instead of their current property, most respondents (70%) did not (11 respondents skipped this question altogether). The remaining 30% did consider buying a larger ‘lifestyle block’ instead, but did not, mostly because a larger block would have been too large for their purposes (39% of those who indicated they considered buying a larger block), because their current property was more affordable
(32%) or because of servicing requirements related to a larger block (11%). 28% of respondents who indicated they did consider buying a larger ‘lifestyle block’ instead provided ‘other’ reasons for not doing so, including that they ended up preferring their current property (5), that the location of a larger property did not suit them as much as the location of their current property (5), and that market drivers were such at the time that they could not find the ‘right’ larger property to buy (5).

Prior to moving to their current address, most respondent households lived in Christchurch (44%), or elsewhere within in the Waimakariri District (31%). Of those who lived elsewhere within the District, one in four moved from Rangiora (25%), one in five from Kaiapoi (19%) and one in six from Oxford (14%).

Reasons, likes and dislikes of present property
When asked what the main reasons were for choosing to live on their present property, the top eight general reasons given by respondents were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of property</td>
<td>Both a large property for large garden, sheds and garages etc, but also smaller property for downsizing</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Proximity to larger centres, commutable, close to family, desire to be north of Christchurch, close to beaches and mountains etc</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>From neighbours, sense of space, views, privacy etc</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>Desire for (semi-)rural lifestyle, retired lifestyle</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character of area</td>
<td>Country atmosphere, quiet, peaceful, rural character, lack of traffic etc</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Good price point, affordable</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake displacement</td>
<td>Often red-zoned, relocated</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>Attractiveness / suitability of house</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note, the percentages when added together total more than 100 as many respondents provided multiple reasons
When asked what they like most about living on their present property, the responses could generally be grouped into the following 6 key categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects liked most about living on present property</th>
<th>Most liked</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>From neighbours, sense of spaces, views, privacy etc.</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>Rural character and lifestyle, country life, peace and quiet</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property &amp; area aspects</td>
<td>Attractiveness of house and (established) gardens, low density character of area, quality of other houses</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Proximity to larger centres, commutable, close to nearby community facilities / schools</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of property</td>
<td>Large enough for animals, gardens, children, but small enough to manage easily</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of community</td>
<td>Friendly neighbourhood, great sense of community, feeling safe</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note, the percentages when added together total more than 100 as many respondents provided multiple aspects they like most about living on their present property

When asked what they dislike most about living on their present property, the ten most frequent aspects identified by respondents were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects most disliked about living on present property</th>
<th>Most disliked</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road issues</td>
<td>Speed of vehicles travelling on adjacent/nearby road, dust produced by unsealed roads, noise from traffic e.g. trucks, congestion</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servicing</td>
<td>Lack of or issues with provision of services e.g. lack of rubbish/recycling collection, issues with water and wastewater services, water quality, lack of services generally, poor internet connection</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property maintenance</td>
<td>Maintenance of property being too high / unmanageable / costly</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>Far distance / commute to employment, school, facilities, services and other destinations; cost of travel</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>Recent growth of rural residential area compromising character, spaciousness, rural atmosphere etc</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbours</td>
<td>Issues with neighbours e.g. noise, cars, activities such as burning, dogs, farming operation effects e.g. spreading fertiliser</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates</td>
<td>Council rates considered too high for services provided</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transport</td>
<td>Lack of public transport provision</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooding</td>
<td>Issues related to flooding e.g. overflowing undercurrents, flooded swales and roads, poor drainage, mosquitoes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public maintenance</td>
<td>Council not appropriately maintaining public assets e.g. berms, roads</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note, the percentages when added together total more than 100 as many respondents provided multiple aspects they dislike most about living on their present property
It should be noted that 21 respondents did not answer this question and another 37 answered it by stating “nothing”. Together this represents around 17% of all respondents.

When asked what changes they would most like to see occur in their local area, the most common themes of changes identified by respondents were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes would most like to see occur in local area</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roading improvements</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public services</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to subdivide</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halt further development</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More amenities</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transport</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note, the percentages when added together total more than 100 as many respondents provided multiple changes they would like to see occur in their local area.

When asked what changes they would least like to see occur in their local area, the themes of changes were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes would least like to see occur in local area</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential development</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial development</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council services</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roading</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural activities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note, the percentages when added together total more than 100 as many respondents provided multiple changes they would least like to see occur in their local area.
Relocating from their property

When asked how likely it is that their household will move away from their current property in the next 5 years, 58% indicated it is quite or very unlikely.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood household will relocate</th>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite likely</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite unlikely</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered 338
Skipped 9

Some of the comments provided relate to respondents’ health, for example they will remain as long as their health allows it. Others suggest they will downsize as they near retirement and the maintenance of a large property is becoming too onerous. Some are considering relocating now that their children have left home.

Among those who are likely to move, the largest proportion (28%) would move to one of the main urban towns within the Waimakariri District; around 10% each would move to a larger area of land, a smaller area of land in the rural zone, or a property in a rural residential zone in the Waimakariri District. Thirteen percent would be lost to Christchurch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If relocating, where likely move to</th>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A larger area of land, either in the Waimakariri District or elsewhere</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A smaller area of land in the rural area, either in the Waimakariri District or elsewhere</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A property in a rural residential zone in the Waimakariri District (e.g. Fernside or Mandeville)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A small settlement in the Waimakariri District (e.g. Cust or Waikuku)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the main urban towns in the Waimakariri District (i.e. Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, Pegasus or Oxford)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered 316
Skipped 31

Respondents’ current property

The largest proportion of respondents (28%) currently live on land sized 0.5-0.99ha, 24% on land less than 0.5ha, and 21% on land sized between 1 and 1.49ha. Overall most respondents (77%) think their land is ‘about the right size’. Seven percent find it too small and 15% too large. The vast majority (86%) consider the distance between their house and their neighbour’s house sufficient.
In response to a question asking how many hectares of land they would prefer if they find their current property size too small or too large, most of those who responded would prefer 0.4 to 0.5 hectares (30). Fifteen respondents would prefer smaller sections up to 0.3 hectares. Ten would prefer 1 hectare and 13 would prefer 2 hectares. Reasons for wanting smaller properties include less work maintaining the section. Reasons for wanting a larger property include more space for animals and farming, and more privacy from neighbours.

Most respondents (62%) are not interested in subdividing their property. Thirty-one percent would like the opportunity to subdivide. Reasons for wishing to subdivide include, among other things, the opportunity for capital gain and preferring the lifestyle of owning a smaller section requiring less maintenance, particularly in older age.

Around half of all respondents (51%) would prefer to see a mixture of smaller and larger properties within the area they live, and one third (31%) would prefer uniformity in property sizes.

Drivers for preferring a mixture of property sizes include enabling a diverse community that caters for different living choices and allows households to remain near each other (e.g. family in different stages of life, for example, older residents preferring a smaller property with lower maintenance requirements). A mixture of property sizes is also seen to add character and interest to the area aesthetically. It means more flexibility for potential buyers with diverse needs who might not otherwise be able to purchase a property in such locations.

Reasons for preferring uniformity in property sizes include a fondness for a community that is demographically similar and such, has a similar lifestyle that is considered ‘harmonious’. There is a concern that allowing smaller properties to develop in rural residential areas may lead to a loss in peaceful rural character and space, more pressure for further subdivision and a decrease in property values. It is thought that people have deliberately purchased properties in low density communities and would not like to see it change to an ‘urban’ character with a higher population.
The most popular style for fencing identified by respondents is post and rail/wire at the boundary (34%), followed by solid fencing at the boundary (19%). Around one in four respondents have no opinion on the matter. ‘Other’ options provided include, among other things, hedging or ‘green’ boundaries, boundary trees / shelterbelts, gates, and farming / stock fences.

### Fencing style preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post and rail/wire at boundary</td>
<td>34% 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid fencing at boundary</td>
<td>19% 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid fencing nearer house</td>
<td>4% 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>23% 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>20% 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answered</strong></td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skipped</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Boundary definition is considered the most common function of fencing by respondents (71%), followed by containing pets and children (63%) and privacy (53%). ‘Other’ functions identified include keeping wandering dogs/stock out and security.

### Fencing function(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>53% 178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Containing pets / children</td>
<td>63% 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind shelter</td>
<td>46% 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary definition</td>
<td>71% 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16% 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answered</strong></td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skipped</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note, the percentages when added together total more than 100 as many respondents ticked multiple responses*

### Rural residential area characteristics

The vast majority of respondents (83%) find the area within which they live (e.g. Mandeville, Ohoka etc) ‘about the right size’. Ten respondents think their area is ‘too small’ (5 from Mandeville), and 14 think it’s ‘too large’ (5 from Mandeville, 3 from Oxford). Having a rural outlook from the area they live and having trees within their area are both considered very important. Trees in particular are seen to add amenity and a sense of freshness, peace and serenity to the area, while also attracting bird life and providing wind protection.
Respondents were asked how important it is for Residential 4 Zones (rural residential) to have amenities including kerbing and channelling, footpaths, street lighting, a neighbourhood reserve, a community hall and a local domain/sports field, on a scale from ‘very important’ to ‘not at all important’. The following table provides the percentage of responses. The graph groups together ‘very important’ and ‘quite important’, then ‘not very important’ and ‘not at all important’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of amenities for Residential 4 Zones</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Quite important</th>
<th>Not very important</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kerbing &amp; channelling</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street lighting</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood reserve</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community hall</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local domain/sports field</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Generally, amenities including kerbing and channelling, and footpaths are not considered particularly important for rural residential areas (61% thought kerbing and channelling was not very or not at all important; 55% thought footpaths were not very or not at all important). Considered the most important amenities in a rural residential area are a local domain/sports field (71% thought this is very important or quite important) and a community hall (56% thought this is very important or quite important).

‘Other’ suggestions include a bus service, additional flood management, local shops, playgrounds, community swimming pool, cycle/walking tracks, high speed broadband, library, medical services, rubbish collection, and road safety infrastructure.

About the respondents
The majority of respondents (73%) consider Rangiora their local service centre, followed by Oxford (9), then Kaiapoi (8%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents’ local service centre</th>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pegasus</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Answered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skipped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most common place of work for those in paid employment is Christchurch (61%), or at home (24%).
Most respondents (63%) ticked ‘not applicable’ to a question asking where students or children in their household attend an educational institution. Forty-three of those who ticked ‘other’ identified a local primary or preschool in a rural residential area, such as Swannanoa School, Tuahiwi Preschool and School, Ohoka Preschool, Mandeville Preschool, or Fernside School.

Further Comments
More than 140 respondents provided further comments relating to living in the rural residential/San Dona area at the end of the survey. Responses can loosely be grouped into the following categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any further comments</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Love it</td>
<td>Praise for the area within which they live or their property / lifestyle</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halt further subdivision</td>
<td>Plea for not allowing further residential development as this is changing the rural character of the area too much</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roading issues</td>
<td>Including road safety, street lighting, congestion, truck movements, lack of public transport etc</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville shops</td>
<td>Praise for the recent commercial development at Mandeville</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water infrastructure</td>
<td>Desire for provision of public water / wastewater infrastructure</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow subdivision</td>
<td>Plea to allow property owners to subdivide to provide more diversity of properties in the area and opportunities for land owners</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse collection</td>
<td>Desire for Council to provide kerbside refuse collection</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No more commercial development</td>
<td>As this compromises the rural character of the area</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues with neighbours</td>
<td>Including noise, smell, fires etc</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooding</td>
<td>Comments relating to local flooding and drainage issues</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council maintenance</td>
<td>Seeking Council to better maintain public spaces such as verges, roadside, parks etc</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of services</td>
<td>Desire for local provision of post services, medical services, eateries, employment etc as current distance is too far</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Relating to rates, internet, zoning</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **How long have you lived** at your present property?

- Less than 1 year
- 1-5 years
- 6-10 years
- 11-20 years
- 20+ years

2. **Did you purchase this property** as bare land or with a house on it?

- Bare Land
- With a house

3. **Did you consider buying a larger “lifestyle block”** (e.g. around 4-5 hectares) instead of your current property? If yes, what were your main reasons for not buying a larger “lifestyle block” of around 4-5 hectares?

- NO: we did not consider buying a larger “lifestyle block” (e.g. around 4-5 hectares) instead
- YES: we did consider buying a larger “lifestyle block” (e.g. around 4-5 hectares) instead. However we decided not to because (tick as many as apply):
  - Our current property was more affordable
  - A larger “lifestyle block” would have been too large for our purposes
  - Servicing requirements
  - Other, please specify

4. **Where did you live prior to moving** to your current property? (Please name the rural area, city or town but disregard any location(s) at which you temporarily lived while transferring to your present property.)

5. **What were your main reasons** for choosing to live on your present property?

6. **What do you like most** about living on your present property?
What do you **dislike most** about living on your present property?

What **changes would you most like to see** occur in your local area?

What **changes, if any, would you least like to see** in your local area?

How likely is it that your household will **move away from your current property in the next 5 years**?

- Very likely
- Quite likely
- Quite unlikely
- Very unlikely
- Don’t know

Comment:

If your household moves away from your current property, which of the following would you be **most likely to move to**?

- A larger area of land, either in the Waimakariri District or elsewhere
- A smaller area of land in the rural area, either in the Waimakariri District or elsewhere
- A property in a rural residential zone in the Waimakariri District, e.g. Fernside or Mandeville
- A small settlement in the Waimakariri District (e.g. Cust or Waikuku)
- One of the main urban towns in the Waimakariri District (i.e. Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, Pegasus or Oxford)
- Christchurch
- Elsewhere (please specify) .................................................................

Comment:
What size is your current property?

- [ ] Less than 0.50 hectares
- [ ] 0.50 – 0.99 hectares
- [ ] 1.00 – 1.49 hectares
- [ ] 1.50 – 1.99 hectares
- [ ] 2.00 – 3.99 hectares
- [ ] 4.00 – 4.99 hectares
- [ ] 5.00 hectares or more

Do you find your property size too small, too large, or about the right size for your purposes / lifestyle?
- [ ] Too small
- [ ] Too large
- [ ] About the right size
- [ ] No opinion

If you find your property size is too small or too large, how many hectares of land would you prefer to have instead and why?

Reason:

Would you prefer to see a mixture of smaller and larger properties within the area you live or uniformity in property sizes (e.g. all relatively the same size)? Why?
- [ ] Prefer a mixture of smaller and larger properties
- [ ] Prefer properties to all be relatively the same size
- [ ] No opinion

Reason:

Would you be interested in subdividing your property? Why?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] No opinion

Reason:

Do you consider the distance between your house and your neighbours' house sufficient?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] No opinion

Comment:
18. Do you have a preference for fencing style?
   - Post and rail/wire at boundary
   - Solid fencing at boundary
   - Solid fencing nearer house
   - Other (please specify) .................................................................
   - No opinion

19. What do you consider the function(s) of fencing to be at your property? (tick as many as apply)
   - Privacy
   - Containing pets and children
   - Wind shelter
   - Boundary definition
   - Other (please specify) .................................................................

20. Do you find the area within which you live (e.g. Mandeville, Ohoka etc) too small, too large, or about the right size?
   - Too small
   - Too large
   - About the right size
   - No opinion
   Comment:

21. How important to you is having a rural outlook from the area you live and why?
   - Very important
   - Quite important
   - Not very important
   - Not at all important
   - No opinion
   Reason:
How important to you is having trees within your area and why?

- [ ] Very important
- [ ] Quite important
- [ ] Not very important
- [ ] Not at all important
- [ ] No opinion

Reason:

How important is it for Residential 4 Zones (rural residential e.g. properties outside of towns that are typically sized 2,500-10,000m²) to have each of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Quite important</th>
<th>Not very important</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kerbing &amp; channelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local domain / sports field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which town do you consider your local service centre?

- [ ] Rangiora
- [ ] Kaiapoi
- [ ] Woodend
- [ ] Pegasus
- [ ] Oxford
- [ ] Christchurch
- [ ] Other (please specify)
25. If you or other members of your household are in **paid employment or self employed**, where do they work? *(please tick all locations that apply)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Ticked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work from home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. If there are tertiary students, school aged or pre-school children in your household, where do they go to **preschool, school or tertiary institution**? *(please tick all locations that apply)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Ticked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. Please provide **any further comments** you would like to about living in the rural residential / San Dona area in the Waimakariri District.

Thank you for completing this questionnaire
Dear Sir/Madam

Survey of Residential 4 Zones and San Dona Olive Groves Households

We are inviting you to complete a survey as the owner/resident of a property located in the Waimakariri District’s Residential 4 (Rural Residential) Zones, or within the San Dona Olive Grove area near Mandeville.

While currently reviewing the Waimakariri District Plan, the Council is interested in better understanding how people living in the District’s Residential 4 Zones and the San Dona Olive Grove area view the area they live in, which will help the Council plan for the future of rural and rural residential areas. If your property is currently undeveloped (i.e. doesn’t have a house on it), we are still interested in your views. Information gathered by this survey will provide insight into property size preferences, character and amenity preferences and property turnover.

Participation is voluntary, but the Council would like members of your household to answer this survey and return it in the freepost envelope provided. We have designed the survey to find out what members of your household think, so it is fine if more than one person in your household is involved with answering the questions. Many of the questions ask you to choose one response from a set of responses. For these questions, please choose the response you believe most accurately reflects the opinion of your household members.

Although a paper copy of the survey is included with this letter, you are most welcome to complete this survey online through the Council’s website waimakariri.govt.nz/letstalk. If you complete the survey online, to avoid duplicate entries, please do not return the paper copy enclosed with this letter nor fill out the online survey more than once.

We have allocated the general area of your property a code “4” and you will be asked to enter this number at the beginning of the survey if you complete it electronically. This code is already at the top of the hard copy survey enclosed if you return it to us in hard copy. The information you provide will remain confidential and any reports based on the answers you give will not be able to be traced to any individual or household. Your survey is identified only by the area you live in.

If you have any questions about this survey, please contact Audrey Benbrook at the Council’s Development Planning Unit on 0800 965 468 (0800WMKGOV), or email Audrey at developmentplanning@wmk.govt.nz.

We look forward to your assistance with this survey and would appreciate you completing it by 23 December 2018. Thank you in advance for your co-operation.

Yours sincerely

Trevor Ellis
Development Planning Manager
Dear Sir/Madam

Survey of Residential 4 Zones and San Dona Olive Groves Households

We are inviting you to complete a survey as the owner/resident of a property located in the Waimakariri District’s Residential 4 (Rural Residential) Zones, or within the San Dona Olive Grove area near Mandeville.

While currently reviewing the Waimakariri District Plan, the Council is interested in better understanding how people living in the District’s Residential 4 Zones and the San Dona Olive Grove area view the area they live in, which will help the Council plan for the future of rural and rural residential areas. If your property is currently undeveloped (i.e. doesn’t have a house on it), we are still interested in your views. Information gathered by this survey will provide insight into property size preferences, character and amenity preferences and property turnover.

Participation is voluntary, but the Council would like members of your household to answer this survey on the Council’s website by clicking on this link. We have designed the survey to find out what members of your household think, so it is fine if more than one person in your household is involved with answering the questions. Many of the questions ask you to choose one response from a set of responses. For these questions, please choose the response you believe most accurately reflects the opinion of your household members.

To avoid duplicate entries and skewing results, please only fill in the survey once. If you would prefer to fill out a paper copy of the survey, please reply to this email indicating this preference and we will post you a hard copy with a freepost return envelope.

We have allocated the general area of your property a code “1” and you will be asked to enter this number at the beginning of the survey. The information you provide will remain confidential and any reports based on the answers you give will not be able to be traced to any individual or household. Your survey is identified only by the area you live in.

If you have any questions about this survey please contact Audrey Benbrook at the Council’s Development Planning Unit on 0800 965 468 (0800WMKGOV), or by reply email.

We look forward to your assistance with this survey and would appreciate you completing it by 23 December 2018. Thank you in advance for your co-operation.

Yours sincerely
Development Planning Unit
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1.0 Introduction & Background

Waimakariri District Council (WDC) has engaged Boffa Miskell Ltd (with assistance from Beca) to undertake an assessment of the rural character of the rural zone to support its review of the operative District Plan which includes a review of the zoning and associated provisions for the rural area of the District. The assessment will inform the management of activities and effects within and around the Rural Zone, including the relationship with rural residential activities and existing small-lot rural development.

The District’s rural environment contains a range of landscapes and land uses including extensive and intensive farming, lifestyle farming, rural residential, settlements, forestry, non-primary production businesses and natural areas.

Feedback from the community has indicated that some activities and forms of development occurring in the rural zone are not considered to be compatible with adjacent land uses. (e.g. manufacturing and other businesses, and fencing associated with rural residential development).

Small lot semi-rural land use has emerged through subdivision at or close to the current minimum standard of four hectares (as a permitted activity), as well as through the creation of Residential 4A and 4B Zones (5000m² and one hectare size average) that adjoin rural zoned land. This popularity of small-lot subdivision has been a noticeable feature of rural development during the last ten years, and has been identified as a concern for some during community consultation on the Draft District Development Strategy in 2017.

1.1 Scope

The scope of this assessment is to:

- Identify character areas that make up the rural zone and describe the landform, land cover and land use elements, and key characteristics that typify each character area.
- Determine any areas that are capable of, and suitable for, rural residential development or more intensive rural development/subdivision (that is consistent with the character of each identified area).

This landscape characterisation work will be used to inform the development of recommended objectives and policies, activity based rules, and standards for the Rural Zone.

1.2 Study Approach

This Rural Character Assessment was undertaken as an independent technical assessment. The study approach involved:

- Initial desktop review of existing information available on the District’s landscapes, such as aerial photos, GIS data sets, analysis of existing residential densities and land typing information, and identification of draft character areas;

---

1 2017, Waimakariri District Council, Draft Our District, Our Future – Waimakariri 2048
• Field survey and site visits to assess existing topography, land use patterns, rural activities and rural residential development. Identification of the rural elements and character of the draft areas, review and refinement of the draft character area boundaries. A comprehensive photographic record was established.

• Collation and documentation of rural character descriptions for each area and refinement of boundary delineations.

• Analysis of the rural landscape’s capacity for further/more intense rural residential development, more intensive rural development and non-rural activities.

1.3 Rural Character in the Waimakariri District

Landscape, as defined by the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects (NZILA), is the “cumulative expression of natural and cultural features, patterns and processes in a geographical area, including perceptions and associations” (NZILA, 2010). While all landscapes are dynamic and continually change, the rate of change varies under different physical, social and economic conditions.

Rural landscapes are inhabited landscapes, not to be confused with “wilderness” or “natural” landscapes where human presence is minimally present or absent.

Rural landscapes are, by their nature, strongly influenced by the type of rural activity and the intensity of associated settlement. Natural elements generally remain strongly evident but are overlaid by patterns and processes of human activity. Natural systems operate but, in places, are manipulated to enhance productivity. Human induced patterns and processes are related predominantly to productive land uses such as agriculture, horticulture and forestry, typically including paddocks, shelterbelts, woodlot and forest blocks, and cropping regimes. In more recent times some rural areas have seen a proliferation of residential activity typified by smaller land holdings, residences, buildings, structures, and enclosing shelter and amenity plantings.

This assessment has included an analysis of the combined result of the landform, established landuse and settlements patterns including vegetation and buildings. It does not consider in detail associated infrastructure such as transport and traffic, or factors that contribute to rural amenity such as noise or air quality.

When considered at a finer scale there are distinctly different types of rural character within the Waimakariri rural zone. The rural character varies along a continuum from the denser settlement patterns where rural residential activities dominate (e.g. Ohoka/Mandeville) to open farmland areas where large scale primary production dominates (e.g. Eyrewell dairy farms). Although both landscapes have a rural character, the nature of the patterns and elements that combine to make that character are quite different; one type of rural character is not better or worse than another.

This assessment describes the current rural character areas within the rural zone; the subsequent development of policy needs to consider what type of rural character is being managed and/or protected.

The existing planning provisions also influence the type of rural character that defines an area, primarily through lot size provisions. Currently the District Plan allows for subdivision of lots (and building of a house) at a density of no less than 4ha anywhere in the rural zone, resulting in approximately 1300 4-4.99ha ‘lifestyle blocks’ within the District. Activity on these smaller rural lots is typically focused on rural residential use with the balance land simply maintained as ancillary or used for small scale primary production. Allowing small lot subdivision in the rural zone can also attract non-primary production commercial activities not typical of rural
landscapes. This can in turn affect the rural character and create reverse sensitivity situations. In addition, allowing subdivision of rural land down to 4ha lots can have the effect of fragmenting productive farmland into uneconomic units. This too can change the rural character of the productive rural landscape.

The rural character of some parts of the District has changed considerably over the past 10-15 years as a result of small lot subdivision. The greatest proportion of rural subdivisions over the last 10 years has been for lots between 4 and 4.99ha. While the proliferation of small lot subdivision in the southeastern part of the District (Ohoka/Mandeville) is recognised by many residents, the number of new lots created by subdivision in the rural areas of Oxford, Loburn, Rangiora and West Eyreton in the 10 years between 2006 and 2016 is also significant. This suggests the potential for ongoing subdivision to occur in all parts of the rural zone based on a number of underlying factors, bringing with it a change in rural character.

1.4 Determining Areas Capable of and Suitable for Rural Residential / Intensified Rural Development

Study Objective; Determine any areas that are capable of and suitable for rural residential development or more intensive rural development, (that is consistent with the character of the identified area and surrounding areas)

In order to consider the potential capacity for rural residential development or intensified rural development, a clear understanding of the community and Council aspirations for the rural zone in the future is required. The Council is considering that a single approach to subdivision across the whole rural zone is not appropriate for the future development and sustainable land use of the District. In particular, the proliferation of small lot rural subdivision throughout the District may not be desired due to effects relating to: increasing density of lifestyle blocks to the point of changing rural areas to semi urban in character, the fragmentation of productive land, the establishment of non-rural businesses, and the geographically dispersed requirement for supporting infrastructure such as roads, water supply, sewage disposal, and rubbish collection where rural residential density increases.

Statutory Guidance

The Canterbury Regional Policy Statement 2013 (RPS) includes a range of provisions that provide long-term guidance relevant to the consideration of potential intensification of land use in the rural zone (Chapter 5 Land-use and Infrastructure and Chapter 6 Recovery and Rebuilding of Greater Christchurch).

Figure 1 below shows the location of the Greater Christchurch boundary in the Waimakariri District as it relates to the identified rural character areas. The Greater Christchurch area

---

2 Impacts of newer uses on prior activities occurring in mixed-use areas. Some activities tend to have the effect of limiting the ability of established ones to continue.
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includes the urban areas and most densely settled rural areas in the southeast corner of the District south of the Ashley River/Rakahuri.

For the area within Greater Christchurch, the focus is on recovery and rebuilding under Chapter 6 of the RPS. This chapter places an emphasis on the ability to ensure adequate land for residential and business redevelopment following the 2010/2011 Christchurch earthquakes and particularly focuses on the scale of recovery necessary. There is a requirement for land to be rezoned for residential and business development to enable growth to occur in the right places, through the use of greenfield priority areas. Within the rural parts of the Greater Christchurch area, there is recognition that rural residential development can impact on rural character and reverse sensitivity issues can arise.

The focus in RPS Chapter 6 is on urban activity and delineation of urban activities within urban areas. There is no specific guidance for density of residential development (other than for rural residential development) within the rural area of the Greater Christchurch area, except by application of the definition of urban activity. That definition includes residential units at a density of more than one household unit per 4ha of site area, and thus policy 6.3.1 is directive that development at a higher density should not generally occur within the rural zones. There is however no guidance on what scale of residential density is appropriate in the wider rural areas.
Chapter 5 of the RPS deals with land use and infrastructure across the region generally. Within this chapter there is acknowledgement that the rural areas are intended mainly for primary production activities.

The following points (summarised from Chapter 6 of the RPS) provides direction to the future shaping of the Waimakariri District rural zone. They have been used as the basis for considering what locations in the rural zone may be capable of, and suitable for, further rural residential development/intensification of rural development with respect to the management/protection of rural character.

- The primary focus for rural areas is on rural activities and particularly rural primary production.
- The majority of growth of urban activities (including any residential activity on lots less than 4ha) is to be located in urban areas, including sufficient housing choice to meet the region’s housing needs, and there is a focus on urban consolidation.
- There is a need to ensure that adequate land is zoned and available for urban activities (residential and business development) generally within the District and specifically within the Greater Christchurch area to ensure recovery and growth.
- Activities in rural areas must avoid development, fragmentation or intensification that:
  - forecloses the ability to make appropriate use of that land for primary production
  - results in reverse sensitivity effects that limit or precludes primary production
  - contributes to significant cumulative adverse effects on water quality and quantity.
- There is a need to preclude incompatible activities within rural areas to avoid conflict between activities and reverse sensitivity effects.
- Urban activities include residential units at a density of more than one household unit per 4ha of site area and thus lot sizes less than 4ha are not anticipated to occur in the rural zones.
- District plans must identify areas to be used for primary production, and control the adverse effects of subdivision and land use in rural areas, including by:
  - ensuring subdivision and development does not foreclose the ability to utilise natural resources for rural productive purposes.
  - ensuring appropriate separation between activities to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on rural productive activities.
  - managing the interface between environments sensitive to the effects of rural production activities and areas in productive use.

Terminology Used in This Report

Lot Size

The terms relating to rural lot size used in this report are defined below for clarity. It is noted that these terms / lot sizes do not align with those in the RPS or other statutory documents. Given there is a range of definitions and associated lot sizes used in various planning documents, the terms set out below have been used for the purpose of describing rural character in this report. The lot sizes referred to below are not hard and fast bands, but intended to be indicative and representative of the understanding applied to this analysis.
Rural Residential – Refers to lots generally between about 5000m² and 4ha, with the primary purpose being residential rather than productive use.\(^5\)

Small rural lots – 4ha to 10ha. Combination of residential and small scale primary production operations, woodlots, horticulture, livestock etc. In locations with a high density of small rural lots, the resulting rural character can be at the ‘residential’ end of the rural character scale rather than ‘productive’ rural end due to the relatively high density of buildings, fences, shelterbelts and small enclosed paddocks.

Productive Rural – 10ha+. Large lots/land parcels that support large scale or extensive primary production. Productive rural landscapes are associated with a low density of dwellings and buildings, large paddocks and farming equipment/buildings, lower density of shelterbelts, and plantation forestry.

Settlement

The term ‘settlement’ has been used in this report as a generic term referring to locations where communities, dwellings, schools, halls etc. are clustered or focused. Generally these have originated from the historic settlement pattern of small community centres throughout the rural area, but some may be more recent. Settlements referred to in this report include recognised townships or villages such as Cust, as well as the very small clusters of small lots that identify with a known location such as Bennetts. Use of the term settlement does not infer an urban character.

2.0 Rural Character Assessment

This section of the report describes the elements and patterns of the landform, land cover and land use that combine to define the rural character of an area that make it distinctive from the other character areas in the District. The District consists of three broad character typologies, largely based primarily on their contrasting topography: the Plains, Downlands, and Hill Country. These character types can be further subdivided into rural character areas when the land use, vegetation patterns and settlement patterns influence the overall character. Inevitably the subdivision pattern (lot size, lot density, extent of subdivision) has a strong influence on the land use activities and landcover patterns and therefore the subsequent rural character of an area. For example, an area dominated by small rural lots is typified by small paddocks, fenced and vegetated boundaries and road frontages, entranceway features and gates, long driveways, dwellings and out buildings. In contrast, larger lots associated with productive farmland are typified by large paddocks, with a lower frequency of boundary planting, fences, buildings and dwellings.

12 Rural Character Areas have been identified (refer Figure 2). Figure 3 shows the character areas with the parcel size analysis provided by WDC.

\(^5\) Residential 4A zone lot size minimum 2500m², average 5000m². Residential 4B zone lot size minimum 5000m², average 1ha. The Mapleham 4B Rural zone has a minimum lot size of 1ha, and average lot size of 1.5ha. The RPS considers lots less than 4ha are not rural i.e. Urban and this would apply to the rural residential areas.
The 12 Rural Character Areas are described in the following section of the report.

**Plains**
- Coastal Plains
- Lower Plains
- Waimakariri River Plains
- Waimakariri River
- View Hill - Eyrewell Plains
- Okuku - Ashley Plains

**Downlands**
- Oxford Downlands
- Mt Thomas Downlands
- Loburn - Sefton Downlands
- Summer Hill Downlands

**Hill Country**
- Lees Valley Basin
- Oxford - Puketeraki Hill Country

### 2.1 Coastal Plains

The Coastal Plains rural character area encompasses approximately 15km of coast between the mouth of the Waimakariri River and the Ashley River/Rakahuri lagoon, and the coastal margin seaward of urban and residential areas of Kaiapoi, Woodend, Pegasus, and Waikuku. It also includes the lower river plains of the Ashley River/Rakahuri. Much of this low-lying area is close to sea level, rising to 20m asl inland towards Rangiora. (Figure 4)

The area is characterised by its proximity to the coastal environment and lower reaches of the rivers and their estuaries, the presence of sandy beaches and dunes, the Ashley River/Rakahuri and Saltwater Creek lagoon and other coastal wetlands, extensive pine plantations along the dunes, and farmed low-lying plains which extend inland along the Ashley River/Rakahuri. Settlement is focussed in small coastal villages and towns so there is a sense of wilderness and remoteness in the undeveloped areas between them.
Dairy farms near Waikuku Beach

Landform

The land type in this area is made up of Coastal Fringe and Low Plains (Appendix 2). The character is heavily influenced by the sea and the braided rivers that helped to build it. Coastal features include a long sweep of open sandy and pebbly beaches and an active dune system including a string of ponds, wetlands and remnant lagoons in the hollows and low-lying sandflats along the back dunes. The low-lying hinterland included in this character area comprises flat river floodplains of gravel, sand, silt and clay. Many of the low-lying areas, including those between the north bank of the Ashley River/Rakahuri and Sefton, are prone to surface flooding.

River mouths and estuaries are also key coastal landforms. The lower reaches of the Waimakariri River that mark the southern boundary of the unit are highly modified. The final 2km of the Waimakariri River that borders this character area from the Kaiapoi River confluence to the mouth, is a single channel, having been realigned upstream to flow through Wrights Cut.

The northern extent of the Ashley River/Rakahuri lagoon marks the northern boundary of the District. Where the Ashley River/Rakahuri reaches the sea, it spreads out into a large, generally unmodified estuary, which includes the Saltwater Creek mouth and estuary. While smaller than the Waimakariri River, the Ashley River/Rakahuri is also braided and has high biodiversity values including indigenous river bird habitat. The river is relatively steep compared with others in New Zealand and moves a substantial amount of sediment. The position of the estuary has varied considerably over time, resulting in a complex river mouth including a recurring process of migrating barrier-spits. The lower river reaches and estuary are also part of the Ashley Rakahuri Regional Park and are well recognised and used by the community for recreational activities (fishing, whitebaiting, walking, and biking).

Land cover

The sandy and pebbly beaches are a complex natural environment with river mouths, estuaries and sand dunes comprising a range of important habitats, particularly for birdlife. The indigenous
coastal vegetation along the back dunes provides a significant corridor for native biodiversity, including the Tūtaepatu lagoon, and associated wetland areas and vegetation remnants.

The landcover is characterised particularly by the presence of pine plantations dominating the fore dunes as well as some large tracts further inland. The pines have a stabilising influence and provide some shelter from the easterly wind. Also present are shelterbelts, pasture, willows, gorse and broom.

The Ashley River/Rakahuri lagoon is ranked as an internationally important wetland with a host of birdlife and is also significant for its saltmarsh vegetation, of which there is little left in Canterbury.

**Land use**

The coastal fringes and hinterland within this character area remain lightly developed. Behind the forested dunes, are the small coastal settlements of Waikuku Beach, Woodend Beach and Pines Beach/Kairaki strung along the coastline, backed by sparsely developed coastal plains and low-lying farmed river floodplains in the coastal hinterland.

There are three main roads providing access to the area, connecting and extending development from the larger towns along State Highway 1 to their beachside counterparts.

Other forms of built development include the Kaiapoi oxidation ponds, located on the north bank of the Waimakariri River, and the stopbanks and flood protection works created alongside the Ashley/Rakahuri and Waimakariri Rivers.

Much of the area is used for pastoral farming and there is some small scale horticulture and market gardens. Along the both banks of the Ashley River/Rakahuri the character area extends up to 10km inland, as the open farmed flats provide a coherent character in this area. The potential for flooding in these low-lying areas is reflected in the low density of development and the predominance of agricultural land uses.

The wider coastal area has a lengthy history of settlement. Coastal wetlands have long been of importance to tangata whenua and Māori settlement and travel were commonplace along this coastal character area, reflected in the numerous archaeological sites spanning its length. Evidence of past Māori occupation includes groves of karaka, rock drawings, middens, and pa site remains. Kaiapoi Pā was the principal settlement in the District; the major capital, trading centre and genealogical centre for Ngāi Tahu descendants. Today, the beaches, dunes and wetlands are enjoyed for a wide range of recreational activities, including fishing, swimming, bird watching, camping, walking, cycling and horseriding.

The coastal part of the Ashley River/Rakahuri lagoon and estuarine area comprises the Pacific Ocean Foreshore Conservation Area, a stewardship area managed by DOC. The natural character values of the coastal environment are outlined in detail in a separate report (currently being prepared for WDC).

**Built form character and patterns**

While the small coastal villages of Waikuku Beach, Woodend Beach and Pines Beach/Kairaki retain their own identity, they share a coastal holiday settlement character, incorporating holiday parks/ campgrounds and a low density of building. Dwellings are typically small to medium in size. The layout generally hugs the dunes, reflecting the character of the coastal dune system. Both Pines Beach and Waikuku Beach have a village common. Roads through these settlements
are narrow and rural in character, with seal merging into grassed verges. Areas of Residential 4a and 4b at Waikuku and Waikuku Beach have a rural residential character.

The coastal hinterland west of State Highway 1 is sparsely settled with a rural farming character reflected in the layout and form of the houses. Many of the dwellings are of a medium size and set back just 20m or so from the road, some forming part of a wider compound of sheds and yard space. Stopbanks are a noticeable modified feature in this otherwise flat landscape.

Boundary/edges (relationship with rural residential/small lot development)

The landward boundary delineates where the coastal influences and river floodplains have resulted in a lower density of settlement, namely sandy dunelands, interdunal wetlands, and low-lying flood prone land. It excludes the Pegasus Rural Zone and associated Rural 4B zone.

In the southern part of the District the character area extends approximately 3km inland. Along the Ashley River/Rakahuri banks, the character of the low-lying floodplains and flood prone land on the north bank with predominantly agricultural uses was considered similar up to 10km inland.

Key characteristics

- Coastal influences and elements, sandy beaches, dunes, interdunal lagoons and streams, river mouths and flood plains, and estuaries are present in the immediate coastal environment/hinterland.
- Low-lying flood prone land is found behind the foredunes and near river mouths.
- Exotic forestry and small scale pastoral farming with larger agricultural lots along the banks of the lower Ashley River/Rakahuri.
- Small discrete settlements Waikuku, Woodend Beach and Kairaki.
- Medium to small pockets of pastoral farmland and primary production.

Potential for rural residential development / intensification of rural development

The southern part of this area (as far north as the Ashley River/Rakahuri) lies within the Greater Christchurch boundary which anticipates more intense future development.

Notwithstanding the above, further intensification of rural land along the coastal hinterland will change the existing character of the area. In the long term, the rural character of the coastal margin should be retained as open rural land to provide a buffer between the existing (and growing) urban development to the west and the coast. Dense rural residential development can not be absorbed in this coastal area and would better retained as open farmland/future open space for the community. Much of the land beyond the dunes is prone to localised flooding, which may restrict the type of future development that can occur.

2.2 Lower Plains

The Lower Plains are the gateway to the District from the main access route along SH1. The boundaries are defined by the physical landscape features of Waimakariri River to the south, the Ashley River/Rakahuri to the north, and by changes in settlement and development patterns to the west and east. Figure 5)

This rural landscape is characterised by its changing character in relation to recent small lot development. Once predominantly rural, characterised by productive land uses, low density
settlement and a sense of spaciousness, this area is now defined by its increasingly finer grained settlement patterns and human induced characteristics that overlay the rural environment.

Landform

This character area consists of a series of gently sloping fans, comprising mainly greywacke glacial outwash gravels, and alluvial deposits. Rapid tectonic uplift in the mountains and glacial action, together with easily eroded greywacke rock, impressive rainfall and the resulting braided rivers, have all worked together to build up these wide alluvial plains.

These low-lying plains are relatively flat, with large areas towards the coast and river mouths less than 20m asl, rising to some 100m asl at Springbank. Minor topographical variations exist, particularly in the southeast corner bordering the Waimakariri River in the form of low stony ridges or terraces and swales formed by the river’s flood paths.

The Cust River, which rises in the hills above Oxford, flows through the centre of this character unit where it is largely channelised and called the Main Drain, then enters the Kaiapoi River. The Cam River - Ruataniwha is also a tributary of the Kaiapoi River, flowing southeast from Rangiora.

The large braided Ashley/Rakahuri and Waimakariri rivers mark the north and south boundaries of this unit respectively. A number of other small lowland streams and creeks flow through the area, though much of it was drained during the early years of European settlement in order to create farmland.

Land cover

There is little indigenous vegetation remaining in this character area, it having been largely replaced with high producing farmland and domestic gardens. A small wetland area off Sandhill
Road is notable with a QEII open space covenant. There are also small horticultural areas, exotic forestry blocks and riparian vegetation present. Tall trees, shelterbelts and roadside hedgerows of different heights frame and enclose many fields and residences.

The constantly changing environment of the dynamic braided rivers bordering the character area includes valuable pockets of vegetation and gives rise to unique ecosystems. The active plain of braided river channels of the Ashley River/Rakahuri on the northern boundary remains a largely unmodified natural environment, providing important habitat, which is particularly recognised for its birdlife. Threatened braided river birds that nest in the vicinity of this unit include the black-billed gull, the wrybill and black-fronted tern. Tall trees, shelterbelts and hedgerows are common, framing and enclosing fields, and compartmentalising the landscape.

**Land use**

The Lower Plains are highly modified and encompass the greatest density of small rural lots in the District.

Today, the boundaries of this character area comprise the densest rural settlement pattern in the District, edged by the urban areas of Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend and Pegasus. It also includes the patchwork of ‘Residential 4A and 4B Zones’ including Mandeville North, Ohoka and Fernside and the growing extent of rural residential blocks at Swannanoa. This denser settlement, with its increasingly urban characteristics, encircles the remaining tracts of larger rural lifestyle, farming and horticultural properties.

While the rural roads and development contain limited ‘urban’ infrastructure, such as kerb and channel and street lighting, the regular spacing of letterboxes at driveways and linear hedgerow patterns, particularly where they follow the roadside, are indicative of the changing pattern of smaller scale subdivision into rural residential land use. Business activities such as construction and manufacturing are also occurring in this Lower Plains character area. Medium to small blocks of pastoral farmland remain in the area, as well as more intensive primary production activities such as greenhouse production, poultry and nursery operations and some small scale commercial activities.

The land and waterways in this area are of profound importance to Te Runganga O Ngai Tuahuriri. The character area also incorporates Maori Reserve 873 (MR 873), encompassing over 1000ha, predominantly in farmland. Tuahiwi village, the home of Ngāi Tūāhuriri in North Canterbury, is at the centre. While the area has been subdivided into smaller rural lots, only limited development has occurred and the overall character remains open and rural.

Historically, the area was also very important to tangata whenua with a number of signs of early occupation. A concentration of midden sites is found on the eastern edge of the character area, indicating a pattern of coastal movement of Māori settlers (supported by sites found in the Coastal Plains area). These become very dense and numerous in Pegasus Town and Kaiapoi’s northern surrounds.

The Ashley Rakahuri Regional Park encompasses the Ashley River/Rakahuri and berm area from the Okuku River confluence downstream to the Ashley Estuary, allowing for protection works so that surrounding land can be protected from flooding, and enjoyed for a variety of recreation activities, from water-based activities to walking and cycling. There are multiple access points to the park, but one of the most popular is in this character area at the Rangiora/Ashley road bridge.
The north bank of the Waimakariri is partly in the Waimakariri River Regional Park – Kaiapoi Island, which caters for a range of recreational opportunities including cycling and walking access. The north bank of the river is also used for shingle extraction activities.

**Built form character and patterns**

The rural residential development of this area is characterised by medium to large modern homes with large garages and occasionally pools. Other common traits include paddocks between the road and dwelling, long curvy driveways, and gateway features such as post and rail fencing. Houses are generally some 30-70m from the road boundary and occasionally at a much greater distance.

The central part of the character area includes several Residential 4A and 4B zoned areas at Ohoka, Mandeville and Fernside. These clusters, with a relatively intense residential development, tend to be more urban in character than rural, due to their relatively large extent and presence of highly managed and modified landscaping, gardens, sealed driveways, and ornate entrances to subdivisions.

Other new patterns include properties that share a long, typically tree lined driveway, with smaller drives branching off to each of the respective dwellings. Only one or two of the dwellings within these subdivisions address the main road corridor, while residential development often extends several hundreds of metres behind the front sections.

Mandeville North is a key area of this subdivision growth where the traditional linear road network has noticeably changed to include new looping roading patterns.

The Woodend - Pegasus area in the northeast of this area is also facing a rapid pace of change. Pegasus Town is mixed density township of some 1800 modern residential dwellings and commercial businesses, backing onto the wetlands and pine forest in the coastal plains character area. The town is currently separated from Woodend township by a narrow stretch of rural land, and the Pegasus golf course (zoned as Rural Pegasus and Rural 4B) provides open space between the town and the Ravenswood development which will eventually adjoin the Woodend township on the west side of SH1.

In addition to the denser roading infrastructure, a number of major transmission lines traverse this character area on a broadly north-south alignment.

The lower reaches of the Waimakariri River are highly modified with stopbanks, groynes and cuts and the Ashley River/Rakahuri also has a long history of flooding through this character area, hence the river engineering and protection works visible along its banks from its confluence with the Okuku to the sea.

**Boundary/edges (relationship with rural residential/small lot development)**

The area has fundamentally been delineated by the density and size of the settlement pattern, given that the topography is essentially uniform throughout the area. The western boundary approximates the transition between the higher density rural residential character with the less dense extensive paddocks of the View Hill - Eyrewell Plains to the west. The outline of the character area generally follows the edge where contiguous lots are 4-5ha in size. This boundary roughly approximates the Greater Christchurch boundary, variously falling within and beyond it.

The area is bounded on the north by the Ashley River/Rakahuri and Rangiora urban boundary and to the east by the Kaiapoi and Woodend urban areas and less densely settled Coastal Plains.
Key characteristics

- Distinctly residential focused rural character overall with development clusters at Mandeville, Ohoka, Fernside (Residential 4A and 4B zones), having semi urban characteristics.
- The built and human modified environment is a prominent feature of the landscape.
- Moderate and high density of rural residential and small rural lots. The area is typified by finely textured lot boundaries and shelter planting, mailboxes, mown roadsides, entrance gates, houses and buildings resulting in an enclosed landscape.
- Predominance of lots 4.99ha and less with small areas of larger lots scattered throughout.

Potential for rural residential development / intensification of rural development

This area lies within the Greater Christchurch boundary which recognises and anticipates greater population density and development.

This area is already highly developed and has a distinct ‘residential’ rural character with very few areas of extensive productive farmland remaining. The area does have potential for some further rural residential development, without significantly changing what is already a very domesticated rural environment. Also, the flat nature of the topography enables further change to be less discernible from roads, as views are generally curtailed by boundary tree plantings adjacent to the roads. However, further intensification of residential activity will need to be managed carefully to avoid the whole area becoming a large sprawling ‘rural suburb’ devoid of structure or hierarchy of lot size. The remaining productive farmland provides important open space relief from the more densely settled land, being less enclosed by vegetation, allowing more distant views, and a simple uncluttered pastoral environment.

In order to retain some sense of rural character as well as providing for further rural residential development, planning measures should aim to achieve a landscape which is a complex of higher density nodes (such as Ohoka, Swannanoa and Mandeville) sitting within a matrix of less dense rural development or land uses. The critical aspect of this is that the whole area does not become a monotonous expanse of scattered rural residential and smaller lots. Rather, a coordinated pattern of development that concentrates more intensive rural subdivision around existing settlements (Springbank, Fernside, and Swannanoa) and retains large areas for productive land is required.

2.3 Waimakariri River Plains

This modified rural area is characterised by its proximity to the Waimakariri River, a very sparse level of settlement and built development, and prevalence of large scale dairy farming. This partially occurs on large blocks that contained forestry in the past. (Figure 6)
Open landscapes and productive land use dominates the Waimakariri River Plains character area

Landform

The Waimakariri River is an alpine river and one of the largest braided rivers in New Zealand. It rises in the mountains and enters the District at the gorge and exits at the coast at Kaiapoi, west of Kaiapoi. The underlying character of the unit is influenced by this major braided river, though it is not always a noticeable feature due to the limited public roads and viewing opportunities through this area. Willows lining the river banks cue to its presence from a distance, while it is generally incised below distinctive river terraces.

The western half of the character area is an Upper Plains land type, with the Lower Plains land type making up most of the eastern part of the unit. A small strip classified as Waimakariri Floodplain also extends into this area (refer Appendix 1 for detailed Land Type descriptions).

The plains comprise a series of gently sloping fans of greywacke gravels, made of rock debris produced during successive glaciations of the mountainous hinterland. Loess, carried by or blown down the river corridor covers the gravels to varying thicknesses.

These river plains vary in height, rising steadily from less than 20m asl below Eyreton, up to some 260m asl towards the upper reaches of the river. Burnt Hill is an exception to this, an isolated hill containing macrofossils rising 120 above the surrounding land.

The course of the View Hill Stream can be seen across the northern part of this area but flows appear ephemeral.
Land cover

This landscape is dominated by high producing grassland. Formerly encompassing large contiguous tracts of exotic forestry, much of Eyrewell has recently been converted to irrigated pasture, though relatively large strips of forestry continue to punctuate the landscape.

To the west and east of Eyrewell, shelterbelts and hedges create a gridded patchwork, with predominantly coniferous species. However, the more settled Eyreton area includes a more diverse range of vegetation with a variety of mature deciduous and indigenous trees and shrubs also utilised.

The typical linear vegetation patterns of shelterbelts and roadside hedges contrast with sinuous belts of willow following the terraced river edges of the Waimakariri River, and in the eastern corner of the unit, along the Kaiapoi River corridor. The roading pattern in the eastern part of the unit enables closer access to the river, and the distinctive willows signal the presence of water.

The Eyrewell Scientific Reserve, close to the river, is one of the few remaining remnants of dryland kanuka forest-shrubland on the Canterbury Plains. It has high biodiversity values in this area that is otherwise highly modified by agriculture and farming activities. Former vegetation of the wider Low Plains Ecological District likely to represented here include lowland short tussockland, kanuka and manuka, and dry riparian kowhai-mixed hardwood woodland flanking the river.

Land use

This river plains landscape has been modified by rural land uses, the changing agricultural landscape reflective of the area’s access to water and changing economic drivers in relation to primary production. It remains sparsely settled.

The early European runs in this character area such as Eyrewell, Worlingham and Burnt Hill were predominantly sheep farms, replacing indigenous vegetation with grassland. In the early 1900s, the government planted exotic forests throughout North Canterbury including Eyrewell Forest which occupied the eastern part of this unit. Over the years, strong northwest wind events felled many of the trees. More recently much of this forestry has been converted to irrigated pasture and dairy farming, altering the landuse pattern once more.

The pattern and density of shelterbelts and hedges shifts across the unit. From highly enclosed field patterns surrounded by well-managed hedges delineating small to medium parcels in the east around Eyreton, to more open rural shelterbelt patterns at the western end of the character area, and predominantly open fields in the centre of the area between Burnt Hill and the Eyre River.

Built form character and patterns

While modified, these River Plains are characterised by a relative lack of built form and associated openness. There is very little small rural lot or rural residential development. Built character is focused on farm dwellings and infrastructure including sheds, farm tracks, water storage ponds, and pivot irrigators, and stopbanks along the river.
Boundary/edges (relationship with rural residential/small lot development)

The northern and western boundaries adjoin the View Hill - Eyrewell Plains character area. The area is delineated by the comparatively lower settlement density and extensive farming patterns of the Waimakariri Plains character area.

The southern boundary follows the Waimakariri River margin.

Key characteristics

• Large scale pastoral farming – large paddocks, absence of shelterbelts, large sheds
• Central pivot irrigation structures and landuse patterns
• Plantation forests
• Open uncluttered landscape, enables expansive and distant outlooks
• Burnt Hill prominent topographic feature
• Waimakariri River margin with terraces and willows

Potential for rural residential development / intensification of rural development

This character area largely lies beyond the Greater Christchurch boundary and as such RPS guidance directs that its primary focus should be on rural activities, in particular primary production. This aligns with the area’s current rural character which is predominantly an open large scale productive landscape.

Development of rural residential lots in this character area should be discouraged in order to retain the existing open and productive character of the area. Given the absence of established settlements in the character area there is little opportunity for rural residential development to be developed in association with existing settlements.

2.4 Waimakariri River

The Waimakariri River forms the western and southern boundaries to the District. It exits the upper gorge at Woodstock and stretches in a distinctive braided reach approximately 85km through the plains to the coast. (Figure 7)

The river has a distinct identity in the District which contrasts with the adjoining land. It is one of Canterbury’s best examples of a large braided river, together with the Rakaia River, that traverses the lowland plains on its way from the Alps to the sea.
Braided riverbed at the lower reaches

Landform

Within the western part of the District the river winds through a gorge where it is confined to a single swift flowing channel deeply cut into the rock. High rocky cliff faces flank both sides of the river along a 16km stretch of the river where it passes the hilly terrain of Oxford Forest and Woodstock Station. Downstream of the gorge the river changes to a wide gravel bed with many braided channels (approximately 1-1.5km wide) all the way to the sea with the exception of where it narrows to a short rocky gorge at the GorgeBridge.

The braided river is a dynamic river system – one of several such rivers that are formative elements that created the Canterbury Plains. The river is made up of a broad active gravel bed with braided water channels. Frequent floods move the gravels in the riverbed and realign the river channels.

Old river terraces are evident at the upper sections of the braided river system, and gravel cliffs and banks cut by floods are present downstream. Stopbanks have been established in places along the lower reaches of the river where the riverbed and adjacent land are at similar elevations.

The tidal effects on the river extend upstream to just downstream of the SH1 and rail bridges.

Land cover

Vegetation in the gorge is dominated by indigenous vegetation and some exotic weed species. Downstream of the gorge the extent of the gravel bed and the margins are densely vegetated predominantly with exotic species. Plantings of willow, poplar and pine trees have been
established along many stretches of the river as a flood and erosion control measure. Further upstream production pine plantations extend into the river margins.

Land use

The predominant use of the river is for recreational purposes such as fishing, jet boating, and four-wheel driving. There are numerous formal and informal access tracks and roads that access the river from the surrounding land and road network. Coordinated gravel extraction is carried out in several places along the lower Waimakariri River, serving both as a flood protection measure and for extraction of the gravel resource.

Water for irrigation is diverted from the river at the Browns Rock intake just downstream of the Gorge Bridge.

Built form character and patterns

The road and rail bridges in the lower river reach and the Gorge Bridge are the most substantial structures in the river. In the lower reach, the SH1 and railway bridges are in close proximity to each other and the crossing of the high-voltage transmission line is upstream of that location. The Browns Rock irrigation water intake is located just downstream of the Gorge Bridge.

A jet boat ramp upstream of the SH1 bridge is used frequently, as are other access points in this area, to use the river for recreational purposes, such as swimming and fishing.

The Waimakariri River Regional Park includes streams and wetlands and provides for many recreational opportunities within the river including walking, mountain biking, trailbike riding, swimming, fishing and jetboating, and kayaking can be found in the lower river area, where the wetlands associated with the river can be explored.

Stopbanks line the lower part of the Waimakariri River and oxidation ponds are in the immediate hinterland downstream of Kaiapoi Township.

Just upstream of the river mouth the settlement of Kairaki is located in the immediate vicinity of the river, extending north along the coastal hinterland.

Boundary/edges (relationship with rural residential/small lot development)

The Waimakariri District boundary runs down the nominal centreline of the river bed. The outer edges of the river are delineated where the riverbed vegetation adjoins pastoral farm land, following the escarpment edges and stopbanks lining the river.

Key characteristics

- Sinuous river gorge in upper reaches with steep sided banks
- Dynamic gravel braided river system, creating distinctive pattern across the plains
- Active gravel bed flanked by dense exotic weedlands, riverbank protections and plantation forestry, and stream tributaries and wetlands in the lower reaches
- Well used for recreational activity especially the lower reaches

Potential for rural residential development / intensification of rural development

Not anticipated or appropriate within the river corridor.
2.5 View Hill - Eyrewell Plains

The View Hill - Eyrewell Plains is the largest character area. While characteristics vary across this extensive area, overall the landscape character is considered sufficiently cohesive to be defined as one unit. (Figure 8)

While land use patterns are relatively uniform, the western border of this area is distinguished by its proximity to the mountains and downlands; their visual prominence on the skyline and a growing sense of remoteness. The eastern boundaries of the unit, in contrast, mark the transition to the densely settled heart of the district.
Landform

As with the wider plains landscapes, these View Hill - Eyrewell Plains are made up of alluvial gravel fans with a very gentle gradient, built up from rock debris produced during successive glaciations of the mountains to the west. Loess mantles the gravels.

The land typing (refer Appendix 1 for Land Type descriptions) is a combination of Upper Plains to the west, where this character area meets the more elevated downlands, and the Lower Plains land type to the east, towards the coast.

The elevation of this extensive area increases steadily from east to west, broadly lying between 40m asl and 360m asl. View Hill (419m asl) and Starvation Hill (288m asl) are exceptions to this otherwise relatively uniform sloping topography. These isolated hill features comprise a different geological formation; Starvation Hill incorporating basalt lava flows while View Hill includes bands of sandstone, mudstone and coal.

The Ashley/Rakahuri and Eyre Rivers, and the smaller Cust River are key features flowing through this area, originating in the foothills immediately to the west.

Land cover

Most of the land cover in this character area is high producing exotic grassland. These pastoral plains are interspersed with patches of cropland and small stands of exotic forestry. Other vegetation includes the shelterbelt plantings that are prevalent throughout the area. Fields and parcels of varying shape are often bounded by dense, coniferous shelterbelts, though the outlook from roadsides varies to include open views across paddocks in places.

Enclaves of mature exotic trees associated with small well-established settlements and farmsteads punctuate the area (such as Horrellville, West Eyreton and Bennetts).

Deciduous trees, and gorse and broom along the sinuous riparian margins of the Eyre and Ashley Rivers and to a lesser extent, the Cust River, break the linear shelterbelt pattern. Despite the high level of weed invasion within and along the Ashley River/Rakahuri bed, its ecological and...
biodiversity values remain high with valuable pockets of indigenous vegetation surviving amongst the exotic plant species.

**Land use**

These View Hill- Eyrewell Plains landscapes have been highly modified, the indigenous vegetation replaced with high producing farmland, as well as forestry and cropping, many years ago. Several (6) European Archaeological Sites/Heritage NZ Sites are scattered across the character area reflecting this farming history. These include churches, farming artefacts and dwellings such as Mt Thomas Station Homestead.

While intensive dairy farm operations are becoming increasingly prevalent on the River Plains to the south, those large scale farming patterns are present but less common in this area. Instead, the grided pattern of fields and shelterbelts remains dominant. Broom and gorse form low roadside boundary hedges while coniferous shelterbelts, trimmed and untrimmed, delineate parcels of land, creating a patchwork of enclosed fields. Some horticultural activity is evident.

The area is characterised by a mixed settlement pattern where large areas of open farmland are interspersed with small rural settlements and expanding areas of rural residential subdivision such as around Cust, Horrellville, West Eyreton, Swannanoa, near the Waimakariri Gorge bridge and south of South Eyre Road.

**Built form character and patterns**

The built form character in this area encompasses a spectrum from traditional to contemporary, reflecting the time of settlement. Old farmsteads can be glimpsed set behind dense established shelterbelts and exotic garden plantings, clustered with associated farm sheds. Some are set back just 30m from the road, while others are located down long, straight driveways.

There are also traditional ribbon or road orientated patterns of development in older villages such as at Cust where there is a concentrated string of houses immediately fronting the Cust-Oxford Road (SH72). The more recent and rapidly growing rural residential settlement, taking place on parcels such as those off Eyredale Road and Depot Road between Oxford and the Gorge Bridge, conveys a different pattern of modern homes typically set further back. These more recent dwellings are often set back 50-70m and occasionally further, at the end of a relatively long swooping driveway and orientated in a variety of directions, not necessarily related to the road or lot boundaries.

As with much of the Waimakariri District, long straight roads are a distinct characteristic of the rural area, a result of the flat topography and historical alignments such as the Tram Road logging route. The more open nature of this character area (compared to the Lower Plains further east) accentuates the linearity of the roads and open expansiveness of the plains.

A major transmission line intersects this unit at the western end, close to the change in slope where it meets the downlands and foothills.

**Zone boundary/edges (relationship with rural residential/small lot development)**

Differing topography delineates the northern boundary of this area where the plains meet the foothills east and west of Oxford at the Eyre River and Ashley River/Rakahuri. To the south is the more open and larger scale farming area associated with the Waimakariri River plains, and the more densely settled Lower Plains to the east.
Key characteristics

- Expansive mosaic of medium scale pastoral farming, defined by grid pattern of the road network
- Many pockets of small rural blocks (4ha and less) scattered through the area
- Established settlements at West Eyreton, Horrellville, Cust, Bennetts and Carleton
- Small rivers and streams flow through the area, typified by exotic trees and shrublands
- Isolated landforms of View Hill and Starvation Hill
- Straight lines of mature shelter belts enclose small, medium-sized and large paddocks accentuating the grid pattern of the area
- Small plantation blocks and woodlots of exotic forest
- Clusters of mature shelter and amenity trees are often associated with established farmsteads and historic community centres (churches, schools, domains, community halls)

Potential for rural residential development / intensification of rural development

This character area lies outside the Greater Christchurch boundary and as such RPS guidance directs that its primary focus should be on rural activities, in particular primary production.

Parts of this character area are at risk of becoming continuous expanses of small lot subdivision with a similar ‘residential’ character to the Lower Plains character area. This is particularly evident in the eastern part of the character area south of the Eyre River and throughout the Horrellville/West Eyreton/ Cust area. While currently areas of open farmland remain, continuation of the current subdivision pattern is not sustainable in terms of retaining a ‘productive’ rural character.

Future rural residential development or small lot subdivision should be undertaken in a coordinated manner by building on the character of existing settlements, while avoiding land fragmentation between these areas. In order to maintain the rural character of the remainder of the character area, further rural residential development should be concentrated around existing settlement areas, such as Cust, Bennetts, Horrellville, and West Eyreton in order to coalesce the higher density development in defined locations and retain the large areas of rural productive land between the settlements.

2.6 Okuku - Ashley Plains

The Ashley River /Rakahuri forms the southern boundary of this character area, separating it from the View Hill Eyrewell Plains, with the northern boundary transitioning into the lower slopes of Mt Grey. (Figure 9). The topography is gently sloping from the higher downlands in the west towards the lower plains and coastal landscapes in the east. This Okuku-Ashley Plains unit encompasses a smaller area than its southern counterpart and includes the settled areas of Okuku, Loburn, Ashley and Sefton. It is characterised by its location between the Ashley River /Rakahuri and the foothills of Mt Grey, its accessibility to Rangiora and a regular spatial distribution of rural residential settlement, and a distinctive mosaic of vegetation cover and agricultural uses, including established orchards.
Okuku River runs through the Okuku Ashley Plains character area

Okuku Ashley Plains are slightly more undulating than the View Hill - Eyrewell Plains to the south

**Landform**

This character area is wedged between the major landscape features of the braided Ashley River/Rakahuri and the foothills of Mt Grey. The land typing (Refer Appendix 1) of these Plains
Landscapes are defined by the transition from the Upper Plains to the west at elevations of approximately 150m asl, to the Lower Plains to the east, at some 20m asl. The underlying geology is made up of river alluvium, gravel and sand fans, and terraces.

West-east running fault scarps, north of the Ashley River, reveal the Ashley and Loburn Fault Zones where the land appears buckled or folded.

Several creeks, streams and rivers dissect this character area on their way to join the Ashley River/Rakahuri and the sea, including the Garry River and Okuku River which drain Mt Thomas, and Makerikeri River, Stony Creek and Saltwater Creek draining Mt Grey.

**Land cover**

While high producing exotic grassland dominates the land cover in this area, the area is characterised by its greater density and range of tree and shrub cover than elsewhere on the plains. Open fields are interspersed with patches of exotic forestry, short-rotation cropland, and orchards and horticultural operations concentrated on the fringes of the Makerikeri River. Many shelterbelts, woodlots and deciduous amenity plantings add to the mosaic of vegetation.

The riparian margins of the Ashley/Rakahuri, Makerikeri, Okuku and Garry Rivers also contain a mix of deciduous hardwoods and gorse and broom. Pockets of indigenous vegetation survive amongst the exotic plant species on the Ashley River/Rakahuri, providing important habitat, particularly for birdlife, and high ecological values.

**Land use**

The differences in character between these northern Okuku-Ashley Plains and the View Hill - Eyrewell Plains to the south are in part related to the more undulating and dissected topography, however these plains also contain a finer grained settlement pattern, the patchwork of smaller parcels highlighted by the shelterbelts and hedgerows that frame and enclose them.

In the early days of European settlement, much of this area was once managed as one large farm, Loburn Station, before becoming a flourishing fruit-growing area by the mid-1900s. The pattern of protective shelterbelts partitioning the landscape can be seen developing alongside the Makerikeri River in aerial photographs from the 1960s.

Today, with its close proximity to Rangiora, numerous rural residential and lifestyle properties have developed, dispersed rather uniformly between the Ashley River/Rakahuri and Makerikeri River to the west, and fanning out to the northwest from the settlement of Ashley.

**Built form character and patterns**

The area encompasses a range of parcel sizes, from clusters of residential scale properties around 2000-10,000ha to different scales of rural residential and lifestyle lots, up to quite large tracts of land used for pastoral grazing around the Okuku area.

Given the extent and maturity of vegetation in the area, much of the more mature built development is screened or filtered from roadside views. The age and size of homes also appears diverse. However, there are many new rural residential properties containing medium to large modern homes which are noticeable due to the more limited vegetation around them. Some also introduce a new character and pattern where they occupy rear sections, many properties sharing an access way rather than fronting a road.
Three transmission lines traverse the character area, two in close proximity to Rangiora, across the Ashley River/Rakahuri and into the downlands area, and another towards the northern boundary.

The railway line extends along the eastern end of the character area from Ashley to Sefton and beyond. The historic settlement pattern along the railway is still evident in the settlements of Ashley and Sefton with the wood processing mill near Ashley being one of the biggest industrial operations in the District. While the Ashley River separates this character area from Rangiora, the Ashley River Bridge directly links the town to the largely rural Ashley area.

**Boundary/edges (relationship with rural residential/small lot development)**

The Ashley River/Rakahuri defines the southern boundary. The northern boundary with the adjoining Downlands character areas is defined by a change in slope and elevation and subsequent density of settlement. The road/railway line between Ashley and Sefton, extending towards the northern district boundary, defines the eastern boundary, as the plains to the east have a different, more extensive settlement pattern partially due to the flood risks associated with lower Saltwater Creek.

**Key characteristics**

- Streams and rivers cut through alluvial plains physically dissecting the landscape, creating more topographical diversity than found on the flatter View Hill - Eyrewell Plains to the south.
- Mosaic of medium scale pastoral farming, to the west, defined by the river/stream and road network.
- Historically a range of agricultural uses, including orchards and horticulture.
- Range from relatively high to moderate density of small rural lots and rural residential settlement typified by boundary and shelter planting, resulting in an enclosed landscape.

**Potential for rural residential development / intensification of rural development**

This character area lies outside the Greater Christchurch boundary and as such RPS guidance directs that its primary focus should be on rural activities, in particular primary production. The Greater Christchurch boundary adjoins this character area at its south west corner along the Ashley River/Rakahuri.

Parts of this character area are becoming continuous expanses of small lot subdivision with a similar ‘residential’ character to the Lower Plains character area. This is particularly evident in the eastern part of the character area from the Okuku River to Ashley between Loburn, Loburn North and extending along the northern margin of the Ashley River/Rakahuri east of the Okuku River. While areas of open farmland remain in this part of the character area, continuation of the current subdivision pattern is not sustainable in terms of retaining a ‘productive’ rural character. The Okuku area west of the Okuku River retains an open pastoral landscape character.

Future rural residential development or small lot subdivision should be undertaken in a coordinated manner by building on the character of existing ‘high density’ areas, while avoiding sporadic land fragmentation throughout the whole character area. In order to maintain the rural character of the remainder of the character area, further residential development should be concentrated around existing settlement areas, such as Ashley, Loburn, Loburn North, Loburn Lea and Okuku, in order to coalesce the higher density development in defined locations and
retain the large areas of rural productive land between the settlements. Future spatial planning should also recognise and reflect the particular character of the local topography (alluvial plains dissected by numerous rivers and streams) through creation of an open space/trail network along waterways and connecting to the road network.

2.7 Oxford Downlands

This character area is situated towards the northwest of the District and includes the township of Oxford and its hinterland. The area is bounded by the Eyre River and wraps around the toe of Mt. Oxford to Ashley Gorge. (Figure 10)
Landform

The landform varies from relatively flat to steeply rolling in places. Elevation across the area rises from approximately 250m asl around Oxford, increasing gradually to the west to some 400m asl, and more abruptly to the north where the downlands meet the spurs of the foothills.

Wedged between the Upper Plains and Northern Hard Rock Hills (refer Appendix 1), the land typing within this area is largely classified as 'northern loess mantled soft rock hills and downs’ (refer Appendix 1) predominantly comprising rounded rolling and steep rolling downlands dissected by river and stream valleys.

There are three geological features of note in the area: Whites Creek Eocene macrofossils, the Eyre River Eocene foraminifera, and the Oxford Oligocene Chalk Quarry, the only New Zealand example of chalk.

Land cover

As with the rest of the plains and downlands units, the dominant land cover is high producing exotic grassland. However, the area is notably more vegetated than the Mt Thomas Downlands to the north. Tracts of indigenous beech and podocarp remnant forest are scattered through the area particularly in gullies and on escarpment faces. One of the larger of these is View Hill Scenic Reserve, a separate stand of indigenous forest and manuka/kanuka, just south of the steeper hill ranges and Oxford Forest Conservation Area.

Gorse, broom and willows dominate the riparian margins of the Eyre River while linear areas of shelterbelts and hedgerows occupy the flatter land closest to the river and on the outskirts of Oxford village.

The landscape is a zone of transition from the modified pastoral rural plains to the more natural character of the hills beyond.
Land use

The settlement pattern of the area is dominated by Oxford village. The village is situated at the eastern end of the character area, at the base of the Mt Oxford foothills. One of the defining characteristics of the town is this backdrop, with views to the hills framed along the north-south orientated roads.

Two Heritage New Zealand sites in Oxford, the Oxford Lock Up and the Redwoods building, represent some of the early European history in the area. European settlement of Oxford dates back to the mid-1800s, development of the town being principally related to farming and forestry, activities that continue in the area today. The western part of the character area displays fewer signs of rural residential settlement, with farming use dominating these fan and river terraces west of Coopers Creek.

A number of QE II Open Space Covenants are present in the character area, with most of these being loosely grouped in the northern central part of the unit. Refer Appendix 2, Figure 8.

Four Maori artefact sites are identified loosely centrally in the character area: two along rivers, one near the Miro Downs valley and the last on the hillside above. Refer Appendix 2, Figure 9.

Built form character and patterns

The settlement pattern on the outskirts of Oxford village is relatively dense rural residential lots and small farms, with the density decreasing where the slopes become steep. West of Coopers Creek, settlement becomes increasingly dispersed with little sign of the recent growth in rural lifestyle properties so prevalent in many other parts of the District. The settlement pattern extends out from Oxford towards Coopers Creek and View Hill in the west and along Ashley Gorge Road towards the northeast. These areas have an established settled landscape character and high amenity with mature exotic trees.

Zone boundary/edges (relationship with rural residential/small lot development)

The southern edge is largely defined by the Eyre River and the eastern boundary approximates the transition between this and the adjacent character area based on density of settlement. The undulation of the downlands is used as a defining factor along the boundary to the adjacent plains.

Key characteristics

- The combination of the hilly topography, remnants of indigenous vegetation, small rural lots and forested hill backdrop give this area a distinct small scale character.
- Relatively high rural residential amenity from mature vegetation and long-established settlement within the diverse topography of the downlands landscape.
- Pastoral farming that follows the landform patterns dominates west of Coopers Creek.

Potential for rural residential development / intensification of rural development

This character area lies well outside the Greater Christchurch boundary and as such RPS guidance directs that its primary focus should be on rural activities, in particular primary production.
The rural area immediately adjoining Oxford village to the east, north and west to Gammans Creek has a relatively continuous and diverse mix of small rural lots ranging from 1000m$^2$- 4.0ha with a distinctive ‘residential’ rural character. In particular there are several clusters of 1000m$^2$- 10,000m$^2$ lots along Woodside Road and at Gammans Creek. These denser enclaves tend to occur on the flatter land. The density of lots less than 4.0ha decreases west of Coopers Creek and towards Ashley Gorge. There are several areas of Residential 4a adjoining or close to Oxford village.

Future rural residential development or small lot subdivision should be undertaken in a coordinated way to avoid sporadic fragmentation of rural land across all of the Oxford Downlands. The creation of rural residential lots down to 1000m$^2$ in the rural area needs to be carefully managed if the rural character is to be retained.

The future settlement pattern could be based on the current situation where smaller rural lots are clustered around already settled locations such as Oxford, Woodside and Coopers Creek, while the remainder of the open farmland is retained in larger rural lots and farms. Elevated and hilly topography has a higher visual sensitivity to change (than flat land) in that poorly sited buildings or earthworks can be seen form many locations. Consideration should be given as to how this potential effect can be managed.

2.8 Mt Thomas Downlands

This downlands landscape at the foot of Mt Thomas has a predominantly pastoral agricultural character with built form and modification largely limited to fencing, farm tracks, farm sheds and dwellings. (Figure 11)

Numerous waterways flow through these downlands, draining into the upper reaches of the Ashley River/Rakahuri while the proximity to the steepening hills and mountain ranges beyond conveys a sense of enclosure to the northwest.
Landform

This character area comprises the slopes and downlands forming a transition between the foothills and ranges around Mt Thomas, and the rural plains to the east. The elevation ranges from approximately 150m asl near the Ashley River/Rakahuri border, to 300m asl and more along the lower Mt Thomas slopes. The elevation provides an outlook south over the lower lying plains landscapes, where there are gaps in vegetation.

The landscape is finely dissected by a series of rivers (Ashley/Rakahuri, Garry and Okuku Rivers) and streams, with the geology of these downlands dominated by associated alluvial gravel fans and occasionally extending into the basement greywacke sandstone and argillitic mudstone/siltstone of the slopes above.

Land cover

These elevated, undulating hills predominantly support high producing exotic grassland, interspersed with a few tracts of exotic forest. The relatively open paddocks contrast with the densely vegetated slopes above, where native and exotic forest dominates.

While tall coniferous shelterbelts provide a gridded pattern to parts of the landscape, the riparian edges of many of the waterways are also vegetated, largely by gorse and broom, exotic trees and smaller pockets of broadleaved indigenous hardwoods, adding more informal, sinuous lines to the overall field pattern. This accentuates the underlying landform pattern that follows the drainage of the catchment towards the Ashley River/Rakahuri in the south.
Land use

This character area is very sparsely settled with few roads. The dominant land use remains farming, with a small proportion of exotic forestry. The downlands and foothills are a transition between the highly modified plains below, and the more natural mountain ranges above and the overall character is of a relatively remote rural landscape. Sheep and cattle farming is more common than dairy farming in this area, with limited irrigation compared to the plains landscape.

Built form character and patterns

There is very little built form in this area. Primarily it consists of farm buildings, sheds, barns, farm workers’ accommodation and homesteads. Apart from outlying sheds, buildings are typically grouped together at the end of roads, each primary dwelling with a number of associated farm buildings clustered around.

Boundary/edges (relationship with rural residential/small lot development)

The northern boundary is delineated by the change in land use from grass farmland to steeper forest/native bush.

The Ashley River/ Rakahuri marks some of the southern boundary with the differing settlement patterns of the adjoining zones delineating the remainder. The Karetu River at Whiterock forms the northeastern boundary with the District boundary to the north in this area.

Key characteristics

- Predominantly medium to large pastoral farming operations.
- Elevated land provides outlooks across the plains giving it an open feel. This is contrasted with the substantial presence of the steep and forested hill backdrop, that provides large scale enclosure to the north.
- Rivers and streams dissect the sloping farmland with associated vegetation.

Potential for rural residential development / intensification of rural development

This character area lies well beyond the Greater Christchurch boundary and as such RPS guidance directs that its primary focus should be on rural activities in particular primary production. This aligns with the area’s current rural character which is predominantly an open large scale productive landscape.

With the exception of Glentui, there are no established settlements in this character area. Rural residential development or small lot subdivision can not be absorbed in this character area without changing its existing rural character. Long term planning should seek to retain the current character of productive farmland.

2.9 Loburn-Sefton Downlands

This long narrow character area wraps around the base of Mt Grey and the Ashley Forest, which fall into adjacent Hurunui District. It is characterised by a marked transition in slope from the Coastal and Okuku-Ashley Plains boundary up to the Mt Grey foothills, and a significant rural residential pattern of settlement along the lower slopes. (Figure 12)
Mix of small rural lots and farmland

Landform

These foothills and undulating downlands are predominantly categorised as Northern Loess Mantled Soft Rock hills and downs (refer Appendix 1 Land Types Descriptions), while the Upper Plains land type extends into the southwest of the area. The underlying geology is largely composed of old gravel alluvial fans interspersed with younger material and occasionally extending into the more elevated areas of greywacke conglomerate. The Karetu River, a tributary of the Okuku River, contains a bed of limestone (as exposed in the Whiterock limestone quarry).

Elevation varies from approximately 100m asl along the Plains boundary to some 400m asl in the vicinity of Whiterock and the lower slopes of Mt Karetu.

Land cover

The majority of the area is medium and small sized pastoral farming, with small tracts of forestry and vegetated gullies extending into the area from the adjacent steeper slopes. A small part of the Ashley Forest extends into this character area and there are also some plantation forestry operations and woodlots scattered throughout. In the northwest area of the character area the landcover includes a patch of broadleaved indigenous hardwoods within a gully system associated with the Grey River. The area around Loburn and Loburn North is more closely vegetated with exotic shelterbelt and amenity plantings.
Land use

These rolling hills support a relatively fine grain of subdivision as well as pastoral farmland. While not all developed, the settlement pattern is distinctly rural residential in some pockets such as Copples and Forestry Road and some clusters off Carrs Road. Most of the settled downlands occur within a band between 100m and 200m asl while the upper slopes are farmed or in forestry. The downlands accessed off Marshmans Road are more rolling and some parts of this area contain larger paddocks and farms. Northeast of Carrs Road the downlands rise relatively steeply and dwellings can be found along the escarpment near the road with an outlook over the plains.

A lime quarry is cut into the hillside north of Whiterock at the northern end of the unit.

Built form character and patterns

The buildings in the downlands range from homes and farm utility sheds clustered in well-established settings to relatively new medium to large residential dwellings. The latter appear to be more numerous, located on evenly dispersed rural residential parcels fanning out from the Ashley/Rangiora area, breaking up open farmland into smaller scale blocks.

From Carrs Road in the Loburn area, the relatively abrupt rise in slope and layers of vegetation limits views to the development. Development in the eastern part of this unit is more visible due to the greater road access and less complex topography, however, the established shelterbelts help filter and break up views.

Boundary/edges (relationship with rural residential/small lot development)

The upper elevation boundary is the Waimakariri District boundary. The lower boundary utilises roads and the Makerikeri River to approximate the change in settlement density to that in the adjoining character area and the steepening of the slope. The eastern boundary is delineated along the road/ railway between Ashley and Sefton, extending north towards the District boundary.

Key characteristics

- Rolling and incised more complex topography, with steeply rising slopes along Carrs Road.
- Areas of medium sized pastoral farming, with shelterbelts and plantation forests.
- Relatively dense small block landholding with density lessening as elevation increases — with associated shelter and amenity planting.

Potential for rural residential development / intensification of rural development

This character area lies well beyond the Greater Christchurch boundary and as such RPS guidance directs that its primary focus should be on rural activities in particular primary production.

Small lots of 4ha and less are relatively common and dispersed throughout the area, particularly at lower elevations. There are very few lots less than 2000m² in this character area. The long
established Loburn North, Loburn and Sefton are recognised local communities. The more densely settled areas are separated by medium to large areas of productive farmland.

The rural character resulting from the settlement pattern and density of small rural lots of this downlands landscape is between the denser ‘settled’ Oxford Downlands and the predominantly farmland rural character of the Mt Thomas Downlands.

Future rural residential development or small lot subdivision should be undertaken in a coordinated manner to avoid sporadic sprawl of small lots throughout the area and to retain some open farmland character. In order to maintain the rural character of the remainder of the character area, further residential development should be concentrated around existing settlement areas, such as Ashley, Loburn, Loburn North and Sefton.

Future development of the downlands needs to be managed to ensure the rural character is retained. Elevated and hilly topography has a higher visual sensitivity to change (than flat land) in that poorly sited buildings or earthworks can be seen from many locations. Consideration should be given as to how this potential effect can be managed.

2.10 Summerhill Downlands

The Summerhill Downlands form a distinct unit characterised by its abrupt elevation within an otherwise relatively flat plains landscape. The character area is bounded to the north by the Ashley River/Rakahuri and to the south by the View Hill - Eyrewell plains. (Figure 13)

Western end of Summerhill dominated by grazed pasture.
Landform

The rolling Summerhill Downlands rise rapidly to a height of almost 300m asl, approximately 140m higher than the surrounding plains. The area shares similar geological characteristics with the other downlands character areas to the north and east, particularly the Loburn area and Mt Grey foothills. Summerhill is classified as a land type of Northern Soft Rock Hills and Downs (refer Appendix 1 for Land Type descriptions), with a small area of Upper Plains encircling it on the boundaries.

The core rolling downlands comprise an area of brown-weathered greywacke-clast conglomerate or sedimentary rocks, surrounded by gravel alluvial outwash fans of different ages. The Ashley River/Rakahuri flows around the base of the steeply rising hill along its northern boundary, where it has eroded the slopes of Summerhill into steep escarpments.

Land cover

Much of the landcover on the Summerhill Downlands is pastoral farmland, however a large band of exotic forest covers the central area. Smaller stands of trees, riparian vegetation following minor watercourses, and shelterbelts are also present. The Ashley River/Rakahuri to the north is lined with deciduous trees, gorse and broom.

Land use

Farming and forestry are the primary land uses in this character area. Settlement of the area is limited, focused at the western end of the character area. The eastern end of the area is dominated by open rolling paddocks with a few dispersed clusters of farm dwellings and associated utility buildings.
Pine Hill House and Buckland are registered heritage buildings, old farmsteads dating back to the mid to late 1800s, associated with early European farming in the Summerhill area.

**Built form character and pattern**

The lower elevation and more gentle topography at the western end around Summerhill and Elliot Roads has the highest density of settlement with small rural blocks and rural residential lots. Here, a number of newer, more densely settled rural lifestyle developments are located amidst scattered homes of more mature character.

There are a few small clusters of newer homes on the elevated central downlands. As these dwellings are clustered together, the open space between groups is maximised. Together with the rolling topography and vegetation this assists with their integration into the rural landscape.

**Zone boundary/edges (relationship with rural residential/small lot development)**

The area is bounded to the north by the Ashley River/Rakahuri and to the south by the differing topography between the adjacent flat, low-lying character areas.

**Key characteristics**

- Isolated hill topography amidst the flat plains.
- Predominantly pastoral farming in east and more rural residential development on western part, separated by an area of forestry in the centre.

**Potential for rural residential development / intensification of rural development**

This character area lies beyond the Greater Christchurch boundary and as such RPS guidance directs that its primary focus should be on rural activities in particular primary production. The greatest density of small lots is concentrated on the gentler topography at the northern end of the character area and south of Summerhill Road. Compared to the adjacent plains area there are few lots of 4ha and less.

Future rural residential development or small lot subdivision should be restricted to the gentler topography and avoid sporadic sprawl across all of the Summerhill Downlands. While the steeper slopes are less likely to be subdivided, a coordinated approach to retain the existing productive rural character is required. As with the other Downlands area, the elevated slopes which are highly visible from the surrounding plains have an additional sensitivity to changed land uses.

A concentrated cluster of settlement can not be absorbed into the existing character of the Summerhill Downlands, rather, small to medium sized farms should be retained to provide a predominantly productive rural character. Future settlement patterns of this character area should be considered in parallel with the adjacent View Hills - Eyrewell Plains area with existing settlements at Cust, Bennetts and Carleton.
2.11 Lees Valley Basin

Lees Valley character area is a large elevated basin floor enclosed by steep undeveloped hill country and the mountains of the Puketeraki Ranges and Oxford foothills, dominated by pastoral farming and its sense of isolation. (Figure 14)

![Image of Lees Valley Basin](image)

The relatively flat basin floor is dominated by grazed pasture with some areas of valued indigenous habitat.

**Landform**

The Lees Valley character area is part of a land type defined as a Small Intermontane Basin, and is surrounded by the Front Ranges that separate the basin from the plains in the east. The valley floor lies at an elevation varying between approximately 400m and 500m asl, transitioning abruptly into the surrounding ranges. The basin floor is generally flat and slopes down to the southeast corner where the Ashley River/Rakahuri exits the basin and cuts through the mountains via the Ashley Gorge.

The Whistler River and Ashley River/Rakahuri originate in the foothills west of this valley and encircle the lower part of the basin, separating the flats from the moderately steep hill country surrounding them. The upper end of the basin, Duck Creek catchment, is typified by areas of wetland, streams and drainage channels.

The rocks and soils in the valley are derived from glacial alluvium, a mix of gravels, silt and clay in low river terraces. It includes most of the water catchments of the Ashley/Rakahuri, Whistler, Lillburn, and Townshend Rivers, while the Puketeraki Range falls predominantly into Selwyn District.
Land cover

The character area is dominated by large areas of improved pastures, dissected in places by shelterbelts and small woodlots. However, high value remnant areas of indigenous vegetation remain in places. Lees Valley contains some of the best preserved indigenous lowland and montane ecosystems in the South Island. The valley floor remnants are particularly important. They include numerous fens, bogs and swamps, many of which are highly representative of pre-European vegetation communities. Several areas of indigenous grasslands and red tussock on alluvial outwash surfaces also remain. These ecosystems are now very rare in Canterbury. The indigenous grasslands on the Ashley River Alluvial Fan are of particularly high value.  

Land use

Pastoral farming is the primary landuse. Clusters of farm buildings, homesteads and their associated shelter planting are located at the outer edge of the basin often near the toe of the hill. The area provides a high-country like appearance, which differs from the more intensively farmed plains.

There are several small conservation areas within the valley including the Whistler River Marginal Strip, the Lees Valley Recreation Reserve and an Open Space Covenant.

Built form character

The valley is very sparsely settled, however there are several moderately sized dwellings of various ages and a full array of farm buildings including woolsheds, workshops, cattle yards, three huts, and an office/staff amenities complex. The remote high-country character is underpinned by the openness, views to the mountain ranges, remote qualities relating to the difficult access and the sparse settlement of the basin.

Boundary/edges (relationship with rural residential/small lot development)

The boundary of the character area is defined by the change in topography and land use, where the flat pastoral basin floor adjoins the steep undeveloped slopes.

Key characteristics

- Isolated, elevated basin enclosed by mountains.
- Dominant land use pastoral farming.
- Contains some of the best preserved indigenous lowland and montane ecosystems in the South Island.
- Sparse settlement pattern with few farmsteads and other buildings and structures to support farming activities.

Potential for rural residential development / intensification of rural development

This character area lies well beyond the Greater Christchurch boundary and as such RPS guidance directs that its primary focus should be on rural activities in particular primary

---

6 Boffa Miskell 2012, Identification of Vegetation and Habitat Sites on Cromdale Station Lees Valley. Prepared for Waimakariri District Council
production. This aligns with the area’s current rural character which is predominantly an open large scale productive landscape with relatively extensive grazing.

The basin has open productive farmland character dominated by flat grazed pasture lands.

Intensification of small lot rural subdivision could not be absorbed into the Lees Valley landscape without changing its existing rural character.

2.12 Oxford - Puketeraki Hill Country

The Mountain Ranges Character Area encloses the Lees Valley basin and is composed of the southern end of the Puketeraki Range and the Oxford foothills with elevations between approximately 500m and 1950m. The extent of this area marks the southwestern boundary of the Waimakariri District and is a small part of the Canterbury foothills. (Figure 15) The foothills abutting the downs and plains comprise the well-known Canterbury peaks of Mt Oxford (1364 m), Mt Richardson (1047m) and Mt Thomas (1023m) A large proportion of the character area is owned/managed by DOC as Forest Conservation Areas (Puketeraki, Oxford, Mt Thomas). Refer Appendix 2 Figure H.
The Puketeraki Range encloses the northwest side of Lees Valley basin.

The Puketeraki Range is part of the Canterbury mountains and foothills comprising steep to very steep dissected terrain. Sharp crested peaks and relatively smooth rounded ridgetops are characteristic of the area, and scree and bedrock outcrops are common at higher elevations. The Oxford foothills are strongly rolling to steep, moderately dissected hills that graduate down to the edge of the plains. Ashley Gorge is a significant feature of the area where the river cuts through the Oxford foothills and also enables road access to Lees valley.

**Land cover**

The steep inland ranges support a dynamic pattern of ecological habitats, which have often been grazed in the past, including snow tussock, subalpine scrub, alpine rockfield vegetation above 1200m and induced short tussock grassland, matagouri scrubland, and pockets of remnant beech forest at lower elevations.

Extensive indigenous beech and remnant podocarp forest are the dominant vegetation on the Mt Oxford and Mt Thomas foothills, in contrast with the pasture dominated downlands and plains below. Large parts of the indigenous forest are contained within the Oxford Forest and Mt Thomas Forest conservation areas. The Puketeraki Forest conservation area is located to the north of Lees Valley, where it forms the District boundary to Hurunui and Selwyn Districts. Exotic forest plantations occupy the lower eastern slopes of Mt Thomas.

**Land use**

Large areas of the hill country accessed from Lees Valley is in pastoral lease for extensive grazing (Mt Pember and Snowdale) with Woodstock pastoral lease extending across the western slopes of Mt Oxford above the Waimakariri Gorge.

The Oxford foothills are characterised by a lack of built development and the large Conservation Areas of Mt Oxford and Mt Thomas with their network of walking tracks. Dramatic long-distance
views over the District are available from elevated ridgelines. This character area is enjoyed for recreation and conservation. The Puketeraki Ranges are more remote and together with their higher elevation and more challenging terrain are less frequented for recreation than the more accessible foothills, but are still well used for tramping and hunting.

**Built form character and patterns**

There are very few built elements in this character area. Recreational huts managed by DOC are scattered within these ranges, linked by tracks. Some historical tracks and structures associated with logging operations in the 1800s and early 1900s are still evident in places along the foothills, such as those found around the Wharfdale Track area.

**Boundary/edges (relationship with rural residential/small lot development)**

The boundary of the character area is defined by the change in topography and land cover/use, where the flatter farmed land of the downlands and Lees Valley Basin adjoins the steep undeveloped slopes of Mt Oxford.

**Key characteristics**

- High, steep incised hills which have a dominant presence on the adjacent downlands and plains.
- The mountain ranges provide an important backdrop to views across the plains, as viewed from many places across the District.
- Predominance of dense indigenous vegetation on the foothills including beech and podocarp forest communities.
- The open slopes of the Puketeraki Ranges support a diverse range of vegetation and habitat – alpine, subalpine, scrublands, tussock grasslands and remnants of beech forest.
- Very little built form or infrastructure.
- The area has a remote character with a dominance of native vegetation and supports a dynamic natural environment.
- Public conservation land provides for recreation and accessible backcountry experiences.

**Potential for rural residential development / intensification of rural development**

No ability to absorb subdivision within the Oxford-Puketeraki Hill Country due to high landscape character sensitivity and very low levels of existing modification.

**3.0 Conclusions**

1. The current single approach subdivision provisions for the whole Rural Zone is not sustainable in terms of retaining rural character throughout the District. The 4.0ha minimum lot size is resulting in sporadic fragmentation of the Rural Zone. Subsequently, in places where subdivision has been most intense, the rural character of the landscape is at risk of
being lost altogether.

2. The advice provided in this report for locating any future rural residential development is aligned with the RPS guidance. The RPS recognises and anticipates greater population density and development within the Greater Christchurch boundary and a focus on productive primary production beyond the boundary. The regional growth policies seek to ensure that rural residential development is well planned and coordinated, and that areas zoned for rural residential development are located close to existing towns or villages. For many of the rural character areas, this report has identified the preference for future rural residential development to be located where there is already a high density small rural lots, or adjacent to existing settlements and villages (regardless of their zoning). Concentration of small rural lots/rural residential subdivision in particular locations rather than allowing sporadic fragmentation of the rural land, will serve to protect the open productive rural character while providing for areas of settlement with a more ‘residential’ rural character.

3. If future rural residential development is planned to occur in association with existing settlements, careful consideration will need to be given on a location by location basis as to how this can be achieved sympathetically to retain and enhance the character of the settlement and adjacent rural area. The existing settlements in the district differ greatly in terms of their scale and character. For example, providing for additional rural residential development around a very small settlement such as Bennetts is quite different to development at Cust village. As far as possible the character of the existing settlement should be reflected in any new rural subdivision, such as the extent of area around existing settlement, accessway and lot layout patterns, lot size and orientation, building setbacks, and vegetation patterns. This should be considered at the appropriate stage of the plan review process.

4. Special consideration of how further small lot subdivision could occur on the Oxford Downlands, Mt Thomas Downlands and Loburn-Sefton Downlands is required. While the undulating topography of the downlands is able to visually absorb small lot subdivision and new dwellings due to its ability to ‘hide’ built structures in the folds of the land, it is also the case that poorly sited structures in elevated or prominent locations can change the rural character of an area. This could be potentially managed through rules/standards in the Plan that require, for example the identification of a building platform and that enable the consideration of the potential effects of building location and earthworks.

5. The table below summarises the potential for future intensification/rural residential subdivision for each rural character area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural Character Area</th>
<th>Potential intensification/ rural residential subdivision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Plains</td>
<td>Concentrate any future rural residential /rural subdivision around existing intensive nodes/settlement areas such as Woodend/Waikuku/Sefton. Variety of lot sizes 1ha to 5000m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Plains</td>
<td>Concentrate future rural residential /rural subdivision around existing intensive nodes/settlement areas such as Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Ohoka, Swannanoa, Mandeville, Fernside, Tuahiwi, Woodend, Waikuku. Lots &lt; 5000m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri River Plains</td>
<td>Rural residential /rural subdivision should not be encouraged in this character area given the absence of existing settled nodes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri River</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View Hill - Eyrewell Plains</td>
<td>Concentrate any future rural residential/rural subdivision around existing intensive nodes/settlement areas such as Cust, Carleton, Horrellville, West Eyreton, Bennetts. Variety of lot sizes 1ha to 5000m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okuku-Ashley Plains</td>
<td>Concentrate any future rural residential/rural subdivision around existing intensive nodes/settlement areas such as Ashley, Loburn, Loburn North, Okuku. Sefton. Variety of lot sizes 1ha to 5000m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Downlands</td>
<td>Concentrate any future rural residential/rural subdivision around existing intensive nodes/settlement areas such as Oxford, Woodside and Coopers Creek, Gammans Creek. Variety of lot sizes &lt;5000m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Thomas Downlands</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loburn - Sefton Downlands</td>
<td>Concentrate any future rural residential/rural subdivision around existing intensive nodes/settlement areas such as Ashley, Loburn, Loburn North, Sefton. Variety of lot sizes 1ha to 5000m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Hill Downlands</td>
<td>Concentrate any future rural residential/rural subdivision around existing intensive nodes/settlement areas such as Cust, Carleton, Bennetts. Variety of lot sizes 1ha to 5000m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lees Valley Basin</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford - Puketeraki Hill</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 4: Coastal Plains Character Area
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Figure 5: Lower Plains Character Area
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Figure 7: Waimakariri River Character Area
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Figure 8: View Hill Eyrewell Plains Character Area
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Figure 10: Oxford Downlands Character Area
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Figure 11: Mt Thomas Downlands Character Area
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Figure 12: Loburn Sefton Downlands Character Area

Waimakariri District Rural Character Study

Date: 31 May 2018  |  Revision: 0

Plan prepared for WDC by Boffa Miskell Limited

Yvonne.Pfluger@boffamiskell.co.nz  |  Drawn: BMc  |  Checked: BFa

This plan has been prepared by Boffa Miskell Limited on the specific instructions of our Client. It is solely for our Client’s use in accordance with the agreed scope of work. Any use or reliance by a third party is at that party’s own risk. Where information has been supplied by the Client or obtained from other external sources, it has been assumed that it is accurate. No liability or warranty is accepted by Boffa Miskell Limited for any errors or omissions in the detail that may have consequent information provided by the Client or any external sources.

Data Sources:
Topo maps sourced from LINZ Topo 50 map series.


Legend
- Greater Christchurch Boundary
- Non Rural Zones
- Landscape Character Boundary

File Ref: C17060A_004_A3L_MLLM_RuralCharacterAreas.mxd
Figure 14: Lees Valley Basin Character Area

Date: 31 May 2018  |  Revision: 0
Plan prepared for WDC by Boffa Miskell Limited

Legend
- Greater Christchurch Boundary
- Non Rural Zones
- Landscape Character Boundary

Data Sources:
- Topo maps sourced from LINZ topo 50 map series.
This plan has been prepared by Boffa Miskell Limited on the specific instructions of the Client. It is solely for the Client's use in accordance with the agreed scope of work, any use or reliance by a third party is at that party's own risk. Where information has been supplied by the Client or obtained from other external sources, it has been assumed that it is accurate. No liability or responsibility is accepted by Boffa Miskell Limited for any errors or omissions to the extent that they arise from inaccurate information provided by the Client or any external source.

Data Sources:
Topo maps sourced from LINZ topos 50 map series

Projection: NZGD 2000 New Zealand Transverse Mercator

Figure 15: Oxford Puketeraki Hill Country Character Area
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Appendix 1: Land Type Descriptions

From Canterbury Landtypes Lucas Associates/ Ian Lynn

Low Altitude Plains Landscapes

L1 Plains - Coastal Fringe Land Type

Canterbury plains coastal fringe incorporating undulating to rolling coastal beach sand dunes and associated interdune back swamps, sand plains, gravel beach ridges and bars, and saline lake and lagoon fringe wetlands. Elevation ranges from 0 - 20m and rainfalls from 600 - 800 mm/A. The land type includes the coastal fringe from the Waipara River mouth to Banks Peninsula, the margins of Lake Ellesmere and the coastal fringe north and south of Timaru.

L2 Lower Plains Land Type

Lower Canterbury plains; broad very low angle coalescing outwash fans and associated low terraces of the major rivers (Waimakariri, Rakaia, Rangitata, and the Waitaki Rivers), comprising Pleistocene glacial outwash gravels with variable loess cover, and extensive Holocene alluvium, coastal swamp deposits and minor inland dune belts. Elevation ranges from 0 - 150m, and rainfall from 600 to 800mm/A.

L3 Upper Plains Land Type

Upper Canterbury plains; broad low angle coalescing outwash fans and associated high terraces of the major rivers, and onlap fans, fringing the foothills, comprising Pleistocene glacial outwash gravels with variable loess cover. Holocene alluvium and minor Cretaceous Tertiary inlier hills (eg. Burnt Hill). Elevation 150-600m, rainfall 800 to1 000 mm/A.

L4 Plains - Recent Floodplains and Low Terraces Land Type

Active, recent, major river floodplains incorporating wide, braided, active and recently active riverbeds, recent floodplain terraces and associated backswamp wetlands. Elevation ranges from 0 to 600 m and rainfall from 600 to 1000 mm/A. The land type includes the lowland sections of the Clarence, Conway, Wairau, Hurunui, Waimakariri, Rakaia, Rangitata, and Waitaki Rivers.

Downland and Foothill Landscapes

L11 Northern Loess Mantled Soft Rock Hills and Downs Land Type

Smooth rounded, rolling to strongly rolling downland landscape developed on loess mantled Cretaceous/Tertiary sedimentary and igneous strata, and early Pleistocene gravels, with minor associated terraces, floodplains and fans. Elevation ranges from 50 to 500m and rainfall from 650 to 1000mm/A. Example areas would include the Cheviot and Waikari Valley districts.
L12  Northern Soft Rock Hills and Downs Land Type

Hill and valley landscapes underlain by Cretaceous/Tertiary sedimentary and igneous strata, and minor associated Torlesse Group rocks; incorporating smooth rounded hill slopes developed on weakly indurated strata, and minor structurally controlled hills, e.g. cuestas and hogbacks; minor 'hard rock' hill slopes developed on Torlesse rocks, and associated terraces, floodplains and fans. Elevation ranges from 50-650m and rainfall from 600 to 1200mm/A. Example areas would include the Ashley Forest and the Glenmark districts.

L21  Northern Hard Rock Hills Land Type

Strongly rolling to steep, moderately dissected, stable, low elevation, low land, Torlesse hard rock hill country, with rock outcrop especially on spur and ridge crests, and some soil slipping and minor scree erosion. Lower slopes are predominantly oversown and top dressed but frequently with a high scrub component: matagouri, manuka, some gorse and broom, mixed native scrub in gullies and around rock outcrops, and minor remnant native forest. Upper slopes are predominantly in undeveloped 'native' pasture with scrub. Elevation ranges from 200 to 1400 m, the balance below 1100 m, and rainfall from 650 to 1150 mm/A. Typical North Canterbury hard rock foothill terrain, example areas include the Lowry Peaks Range, and the Doctors Hills, with Haldon and/or Hurunui Steepland and Hill soils.

Inter-Montane Range and Basin Landscapes

H1  Major River, Valley Fill Land Type

Recent, major river valley fill, incorporating wide, braided active and recently active riverbeds, recent floodplain terraces, and low angle valley fill fans. Elevation ranges from 300 to 1000 m with rainfalls from 1000 to 6000 mm/A. The land type includes the high country segments of the Clarence, Conway, Wairau, Hurunui, Waimakariri, Rakaia, and Rangitata. Waitaki and Ahuriri River floodplains.

H2  Glacial and Fluvial Valley Floor Land Type

Glacial and fluvial valley flood landforms, outwash terraces, ablation and terminal moraine, lakes, fans, meandering floodplains, back swamps, plateaus and high remnant terraces, and glacial moulded hills and mountains under 1300 m. Elevation ranges from 380 to 1300 m with the balance below 1000 m, and rainfall ranges between 800 and 4800 mm/A. The land type includes the high country sections of the Clarence, Wairau, Hurunui, Waimakariri, Rakaia, Ashburton, Rangitata, Waitaki and Ahuriri River valley floors.

H5  Small Intermontane Basins and Valleys Land Type

Intermediate sized intermontane basin and valleys with extensive gently sloping, alluvial fans, terrace lands, floodplains and wetlands, and associated soft rock Tertiary and hard rock. Elevation ranges from 280 to 620 m and rainfall from 1000 to 1250 mm/A. The degree of agronomic development varies significantly from intensively developed mixed farming to extensive grazing. Example areas include the Hanmer basin and Lees valley.
H9 Northern Eastern Front Range Land Type

Steep to very steep, dissected, front mountain ranges fringing the upper plains in the north east and rising to 2000 m; minor cirque glaciation although with a distinctive periglacial imprint; extensive scree and bedrock outcrop especially at higher elevations, and sharp crested peaks and relatively smooth flat-topped ridge crests. Deep colluvium and moraine mantles moderately steep to steep rectilinear lower mountain slopes. Elevation ranges from 450 to 2000 m and rainfall between 1200 and 2500 mm/A. Snow tussock, subalpine scrub and alpine and rockfield vegetation features above 1220 m, with an induced short tussock grassland, scrubland, or remnant beech forest cover at lower elevations. The land type includes the Puketeraki, Torlesse and Big Ben Ranges.
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1 Introduction

In accordance with our recent instruction and scope of works from the Waimakariri District Council, we provide our analysis of the demand and supply for lifestyle and rural residential property in the Waimakariri District and provide analysis on the implications of potential minimum allotment size changes.

The purpose of this report is to assist with decision making around the District Plan Review, specifically in relation to the supply and demand for property in the rural areas of the Waimakariri District, focusing on three distinct roll approximated areas described as follows:

- **NEW** - North Eastern Waimakariri. The area encompasses land north of the Ashley River and east of the Okuku River.
- **UDS** – A roll approximated area comprising of properties east of Two Chain Road, South of the Ashley River and North of the Waimakariri River.
- **REST** - The rest of the district not in the NEW or UDS area.
2 Glossary of key terms

**District Valuation Roll**
Roll of all properties in a District.

**Improved properties**
Properties identified in this study as having a habitable dwelling.

**Lifestyle properties**
Lifestyle properties identified as being a lifestyle category in the District Valuation Roll.

**Rural residential properties**
Rural residential properties were identified in this study as properties 0.25 – 2ha in size and zoned 9D and 9E as per the Digital Valuation Roll or Residential zone 4A and 4B in the Waimakariri District Plan.

**Small Holdings**
The term ‘Small holdings’ for the purposes of this study have been identified by selecting properties from the District Valuation Roll that have the ‘Lifestyle’ category.

**Subdivision**
The process of dividing land into smaller parcels.

**Vacant Properties**
Properties identified in this study that do not have a habitable dwelling. These properties may still have other improvements such as sheds, outbuildings etc.
3 Market Overview

The Waimarkairi Market has performed strongly over the last 5 years, with a significant uplift in value after the Canterbury Earthquakes. This increased demand resulted in a large increase in new development in both the residential and lifestyle markets.

Located to the north of Christchurch City, properties in the district provide an affordable alternative to the higher valued properties in Christchurch, but still within a short commute of the City. The major townships of Rangiora and Kaiapoi continue to expand with development around the periphery, as well as major investment in the rebuild of the commercial areas.

3.1 Lifestyle Property Market

Latest Real Estate Institute statistics indicate that the lifestyle market nationally has seen a 3.8% lift in sales in the three months to October 2018 with 1665 sales recorded. In the year to October 2018 there have been 7190 lifestyle properties sold nationwide, which is 8% less than the year to October 2017.

In the Canterbury region, demand for lifestyle property in close proximity to Christchurch remains relatively strong with the region experiencing the most substantial increase in sales (+47) in the three months to October 2018 of all regions across the country. The median lifestyle block in the Canterbury region was 13% less in the three months to October 2018 than in the three months to October 2017.

In the Waimakariri district there were 397 lifestyle properties sold in the year to October 2018, 1.25% less than in the year to October 2017 when there were 402 sales. The median value of lifestyle properties sold in the district for the year to October 2018 was $650,000. This represents an increase of 3.6% or $22,500 on the 2017 median that was $627,500.

Our research focuses on the property market for small holdings, in particular the market for 4-7.99ha properties and smaller Rural Residential properties up to 2ha. The following graph illustrates the change in average sale value of lifestyle properties over the research period.

Graph 1 - Average Sale Price
The Average sale price for both property types is approximately $740,000, which is showing a 20-40% increase in value since 2006, the strongest growth being recorded in the Rural Residential market, which is more closely aligned to the residential market.

3.2 Sales Volumes

As an overview we have extracted sales data for the district of lifestyle sales in the target range of 4-7.99ha.

There have been over 2700 sales of vacant and improved lifestyle properties 4 – 7.99ha in size in the District since 2005. Since this time there has been an overall reduction in the total number of 4-7.99ha lifestyle properties sold on an annual basis. The largest decrease is noticed in the UDS area, whilst the NEW area has been the steadiest with the smallest reduction of the three areas.

Sales volumes of rural residential property for the district was also analysed over this period. Rural residential properties were identified to be 0.25 – 2ha in size and zoned 9D and 9E as per the digital valuation roll. The majority of the rural residential properties are in the UDS area.

There are on average around 200 lifestyle sales annually in the district between 4 and 7.99ha. These are summarised in the table below into the three target groupings as well as the total for the overall district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NEW</th>
<th>REST</th>
<th>UDS</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>2703</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1a - Sales Volumes within Waimakariri District
The overall demand for lifestyle property is less than 300 sections in any calendar year with an even spread between the target areas.

In comparison, there are less than 80 sales on average of Rural Residential Zoned properties. Sales volumes of rural residential properties have increased over the period with peak sales recorded in 2012 when there were 126 rural residential sales.

Graph 2 - Rural Residential Sales Volumes

### 3.2.1 Vacant Lifestyle Property

Values of vacant lifestyle follow a similar trend to the improved, with the value of an average lifestyle section being less than $300,000. There are a number of factors that influence value, including the locality and availability of services.

The following graph shows the average sale price of 0.25-2ha rural residential and 4-7.99ha lifestyle properties across the District.
Graph 3 - Vacant Sale Prices

The graph shows a 20-30% increase in value over the research period, the majority of this value increase has occurred after 2011.

The sales of vacant lifestyle blocks continue to decline through to 2018 as the market softens, as well as the demand for larger land parcels decreases due to changes in people's lifestyles. The graph below illustrates the drop in sales over the research period.

Graph 4 - Sales Volumes Per Annum of vacant lifestyle property

There are currently less than 50 sales of 4-7.99 ha blocks per year, with sales volumes being relatively steady for the last four years. There were between 100-110 sales recorded in 2012-2013, which is the most recent peak in the market post the Canterbury Earthquakes, when demand in the District was high. Market dynamics have changed since 2007, and the people's needs for large sections have reduced, and the number of sales reflecting this.
3.2.2 Improved Lifestyle Property

There have been over 1450 sales of lifestyle properties that have sold improved with a dwelling and are 4 – 7.99ha in size across the District since 2005. Over this period, the sales volumes have remained relatively steady with annual sales volumes ranging from 77 to 134 with the average number of improved sales across the district being approximately 120 a year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NEW</th>
<th>REST</th>
<th>UDS</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>1458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 - Sales Volumes of improved properties within Waimakariri District

Graph 5 - Sales Volumes Per Annum of vacant lifestyle property
4 Current Availability of Lifestyle Land

To determine the current supply of lifestyle land we have looked at the number of properties that are categorised as vacant in the District rating roll. Overall there are 1198 vacant lifestyle currently properties in the District, of which 719 are 4 – 7.99ha in size. The UDS area has the most vacant lifestyle properties with 565 properties of which 273 are 4-7.99ha in size.

The following graph provides an account of the total vacant lifestyle properties and 4 – 7.99ha in the District.

![Graph 6 - Total vacant vs 4-7.99ha land](image)

There are currently 719 4-7.99ha vacant lifestyle blocks based on category. We note that a number of these properties are utilised as alternative to housing, such as sheds or grazing.

Section sales volume is approximately 50 section sales per year in the district, thus giving 14 years of current supply, without new subdivision.

4.1 Subdivision

The minimum subdivision standard for rural property under the current district plan is 4ha. Those parcels that range between 4-7.99ha are not considered subdividable ‘as of right’ and are considered to be single occupancy parcels.

For the sample period we have reviewed the number of new lots that have been created between 4-7.99ha. It is assumed that these represent the development of lifestyle land in the locality, with any sections that are less than 4ha in size having been created under resource consent, or within a higher density zoning.

To obtain the number of 4 – 7.99ha parcels that have been created annually since the last plan change in 2005, historical subdivision records were used with only properties categorised as lifestyle considered.

We have summarised this data into the number of parcels created by subdivision annually for each of the target areas. Since 2005 there have been 554 lifestyle category properties, 4-7.99ha in size, within the district. This comprises of 154 in the NEW area, 169 in the UDS area and 231 in the REST area.

Annual numbers of 4 – 7.99ha parcels created by subdivision are displayed on the table and graphs below;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>NEW</th>
<th>UDS</th>
<th>REST</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3- 4-7.99ha parcels created

Overall, the number of sections created in the district averages between 40-45 new parcels per year. The highest percentage of these are located within the REST sample area, which represents around 40% of the total.

The 40-50 new lifestyle lots created per year is maintaining the current demand for land in the District.

Graph 7 - Number of New Lifestyle Blocks Created

The above graph illustrates that there has been a continuing increase in the number new properties created annually by subdivision from 2012 to 2018. There is a notable reduction in the number of parcels created annually from 2008 – 2012. This is consistent with property market trends nationally at this time due to the effects of the Global Financial Crisis and the Canterbury Earthquakes respectively.
Leading up to the GFC (2008) there was a strong influx in new development, which likely remained undeveloped and supported the demand for the following years, which showed little activity. The demand for land in the District has increased following the Canterbury Earthquakes, in 2010-2011 with new development coming on-stream in 2012 to accommodate for the initial demand. These numbers have decreased since this time as the demand has reduced.

There has been a notable increase in the number of parcels created annually in the NEW area. This is especially evident from 2012 to 2018. There has been a slight decrease in numbers of 4 – 7.99ha parcels created annually in the UDS area since 2005.
5 Construction and New Development

5.1 Improved lifestyle properties

To indicate the overall demand for land and new building, we reviewed the number of properties that have had new construction during the period. This indicates the demand for vacant land to build on.

As an overview, we have considered Lifestyle improved category properties that have had new construction since 2005 have been tabulated below relative to land size. They have also been split into three size relative groups; 4-7.99ha, 8-19.99ha and 20ha+.

The data has been determined by identifying the category change from Lifestyle Vacant (LV) – Lifestyle Improved (LI). This is reliant on the construction of the new home having been completed, and added to the district valuation roll.

There have been 1678 lifestyle category properties 4 – 7.99ha improved with a dwelling across the district since 2005. There has also been 79, 8-19.99ha and 14, 20ha+ lifestyle properties improved.

Overall there has been a clear decrease in the number lifestyle category properties improved with a dwelling since 2005 across all size brackets. This is evident across all of the areas.

The below tables gives an account of this as do the following graphs;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>NEW</th>
<th>UDS</th>
<th>REST</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>1678</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 - 4-7.9ha Vacant Lifestyle Properties with Dwelling
### Table 5 - 8-19.99ha Vacant Lifestyle Properties with Dwelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>NEW</th>
<th>UDS</th>
<th>REST</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6 - 20+ha Vacant Lifestyle Properties with Dwelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>NEW</th>
<th>UDS</th>
<th>REST</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graph below provides a graphical representation of construction on lifestyle properties 4.0-7.99ha between 2005 and 2018.
The number of new building has steadily decreased since 2006. The reduction in the number of buildings, affirms the reduction in demand, which is evident in sales of lifestyle properties.

Graph 8 - 4-7.99ha Lifestyle Properties Improved with a Dwelling
6 Subdivision Potential within UDS

The UDS area comprises properties east of Two Chain Road, South of the Ashley River and North of the Waimakariri River. This is a concentrated around Ranigora and Kaiapoi where there is currently a large number of lifestyle properties, and typically of the highest value in the District.

To account for the potential number of 4-7.99ha properties, we have taken data of all categories of properties, excluding ‘other’ categories properties, which includes schools, reserves etc. The likelihood of future development of Other "O" category properties is limited.

The following table assumes that there are no development restraints in place or any restrictions on subdivisions. This does not however take into account individual property characteristics and assumes that the subdivision maximises district plan rules.

Development of 8 - 52 hectare land within the UDS area could equate to 1240, 4ha parcels if all were developed. If parcels 52ha and greater where considered a potential 4276, 4 hectare parcels are achievable. Those properties over 52 hectares are less likely to be redeveloped completely as they are likely to be currently economic farming units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANGE (HA)</th>
<th>NUMBER OF PROPERTIES</th>
<th>MAX POTENTIAL 4HA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-11.99</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-15.99</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-19.99</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-23.99</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-27.99</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-31.99</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-35.99</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-39.99</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-43.99</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44-47.99</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48-51.99</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52-596</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>4276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 - Subdivision Potential

The following graph represents the above tabled data.
Graph 9 - Potential 4ha properties in the UDS area from existing parcels 8 - 51.99ha in size.
7  Reduction in Development Potential

Under the current provisions of the district plan, all rural zoned properties are subdividable down to 4 hectares. By increasing the minimum subdivision standard, a number of properties in the District will have their development potential exhausted.

Should the development standard be increased from 4 hectares to 20 hectares, those properties between 8-19.99 hectares will forgo development potential. It is assumed that properties with land areas less than 7.99 hectares are not subdividable as of right. Our targeted area for this analysis are those sections between 8-19.9 hectares.

The below table shows the number of properties that subdivisions could be forgone relative to area, if restrictions were placed on the subdivision of 8 – 19.99ha parcels. It is assumed that the maximum utilisation of available land was to take place and does not include ‘other’ category properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Range</th>
<th>Number of properties</th>
<th>Potential forgone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-19.99ha</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>1234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are 824 properties 8 – 19.99ha that could have future development restricted if such restrictions were placed on subdivision. This could lead to some 1234 4ha properties that could forgo subdivision. Which at the current level of demand would equate to approximately 12 years of supply.
8 Turnover and Ownership

8.1 Length of Ownership

Analysis was carried out on properties that have sold twice since 2005. This analysis was carried out on rural residential properties and 4-7.99ha lifestyle properties across the district. Only properties that have sold more than once have been included in this analysis.

There were 1238 small holdings, 4-7.99ha in size across the district that sold twice during the aforementioned period. The average length of ownership was 45.5 months or 3.8 years. The average period of ownership for properties that sold twice within the period was 40 months in the NEW area, 44.7 months in the Rest area and 51.7 UDS area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>NUMBER OF 4-7.99HA SOLD TWICE 2005-2018</th>
<th>AVERAGE LENGTH OF OWNERSHIP (MONTHS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>40.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REST</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>44.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDS</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>51.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT</td>
<td>1238</td>
<td>45.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 - 4-7.99ha Average Length of Ownership

There were 225 rural residential properties, 0.25-2ha in size that sold twice in the district over the period. The average ownership of properties that sold twice was 52.5 months or 4.4 years. The majority of the rural residential properties in the district are located in the UDS area where the average length of ownership was lower at 47.8 months compared to 57.4 and 52.3 months in the NEW and REST areas respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>NUMBER OF 0.25 – 2HA RURAL RESIDENTIAL SOLD TWICE BETWEEN 2005 - 2018</th>
<th>AVERAGE LENGTH OF OWNERSHIP (MONTHS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REST</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDS</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>47.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>52.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 - Rural residential average length of ownership
8.2 Property Turnover

The turnover takes into account the number of properties developed/created during the period as well as the level of sales activity. As the below table illustrates, over all the areas there has been a decrease in turnover of 4-7.99ha properties over the research period from approximately 8% down to below 4% across the district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NEW</th>
<th>UDS</th>
<th>REST</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 - 4-7.99ha percentage turnover

For comparison, we also include the turnover of sales for the rural residential properties 0.25-2ha as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21 - Rural residential percentage turnover

Of note the high turnover in 2014 where a number of subdivisions were coming on stream.
9 Value Implications

To determine the impact of imposing a subdivision restriction upon these parcels the potential realisation of these properties has been considered. To obtain this, similar sized parcels of land that have been subdivided previously were analysed. This was completed to determine the relationship between the roll land values of the property’s gross realisation post subdivision, i.e. the value of the new lots created. The targeted range for this analysis is properties between 20-20.99ha.

There are a total of 84 properties in the District that are 20-20.99ha in size across all categories. These properties are from a variety of category groups including lifestyle, arable, pastoral and specialist. The average land value of a 20-20.99ha parcel in the district is $630,000 which equates to $34,300 per hectare.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF 20-20.99HA PROPERTIES</th>
<th>CV</th>
<th>LV</th>
<th>POTENTIAL GROSS REALISATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12127000</td>
<td>8927000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REST</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39460000</td>
<td>25327000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDS</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29815000</td>
<td>18710000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>$81,402,000</td>
<td>$52,964,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 - Potential Gross Realisation

In total all properties within the sample have a combined capital value of $81,402,000 of which $52,964,000 comprises the land value.

If the 84, 20-21 ha parcels were to be restricted from further development the total realisation that would be lost is $79,446,000 in land value across the district. This assumes that the pre subdivision land value would not change with a restriction on subdivision in place.
10 Comparative Analysis – Selwyn District Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Selwyn</th>
<th>Waimakariri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Assessments</td>
<td>26802</td>
<td>26579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lifestyle category Properties</td>
<td>6032</td>
<td>6858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle properties 4-7.99ha</td>
<td>2652</td>
<td>3767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle properties 8-19.99ha</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant lifestyle properties 4-7.99ha</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant lifestyle properties 8-19.99ha</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdividable Parcels 20-20.99ha</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Average Subdividable Parcel 20-20.99ha</td>
<td>$1,094,000 (2018)</td>
<td>$630,523 (2016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 - Comparative Analysis

In comparison to the Selwyn District, there are a larger number of 4-7.99ha properties in the Waimakariri District. This is also indicative in the vacant lifestyle blocks of 4-7.99ha bracket.

Selwyn has 152 20-20.99ha parcels, of which 118 are zoned outer plains where subdivision into 4ha is not a permitted activity. There are only 15 properties zoned inner plains where subdivision is permitted down to 4ha parcels. The remaining 19 parcels are predominantly of mixed zone or residential.

The average Selwyn 2015 land value for these 15 20-20.99ha parcels zoned inner plains was $894,933 at approximately $44,200 per hectare with the average 2018 Land value $1,094,600 at approximately $54,000 per hectare. The 2015 land value average for the 118 20-20.99ha parcels in the outer plains where subdivision is restricted was $560,847 at approximately $27,700 per hectare and the average 2018 land value $627,034 at approximately $31,000 per hectare.
The above graphs illustrate the difference in lifestyle vacant sales have stayed relatively similar during the research period but the gap between improved properties has widened.
We have also compared the length of ownership between the two districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>NUMBER OF 4-7.99HA SOLD TWICE</th>
<th>AVERAGE LENGTH OF OWNERSHIP (MONTHS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SELWYN</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>54.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAIMAKARIRI</td>
<td>1238</td>
<td>45.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5- Length of Ownership comparison

The most notable being the number of properties that have sold twice over the period. Waimakariri has twice that of the Selwyn District. This is also illustrated in the average length of ownership.

Graph 84 - 4-7.99ha properties average length of ownership comparison
11 Summary of key findings

The purpose of this report is to assist with decision making around the District Plan Review, specifically in relation to the supply and demand for property in the rural areas of the Waimakariri District. To achieve this, data has been analysed that pertains to the lifestyle and rural residential property market within the District.

Below is a summary of the findings from this research that are considered most poignant to assist with decision making around the District Plan Review, specifically in relation to the supply and demand for property in the rural areas of the Waimakariri District.

Property market for Small Holdings

- Over the research period small holdings 4-7.99ha have increased in value at a relative steady rate with rural residential property increasing at a slightly higher rate.

Sales Volumes

- Over the research period that has been an overall reduction in the total number of 4-7.99ha properties sold on an annual basis. The largest annual decrease has been noticed in the UDS area.

- There are on average around 200 lifestyle property sales annually in the district between 4 and 7.99ha in size.

- Sales volumes of 4 – 7.99ha vacant small holdings have decreased significantly over the research period.
• Sales volumes of 4-7.99ha improved properties have remained relatively steady over the research period.

On average, there are less than 80 sales annually of Rural Residential Zoned properties. Sales volumes have increased over the research period, peaking in 2012 where there were 126 sales recorded.

**Current Availability of Lifestyle Land**

• Overall there are 1198 vacant lifestyle currently properties in the District, of which 719 are 4 – 7.99ha in size.

• Section sales volume is approximately 50 section sales per year in the district, this giving 14 years of current supply, without new subdivision.
Subdivision

- Since 2012 there has been a steady increase in the number of 4-7.99ha properties created by subdivision.
- The creation of new sections appears to be keeping pace with the sales of similar sized land parcels.

**4-7.99ha Lifestyle Property Created By Subdivision**

![Graph showing the number of 4-7.99ha lifestyle properties created by subdivision from 2006 to 2018.](image)

Construction and New Development

- The number of properties being improved with a dwelling has steadily decreased since 2006. The reduction in the number of buildings, affirms the reduction in demand, which is evident in sales of lifestyle properties.

**4.0ha - 7.99ha Lifestyle Property Improved with a Dwelling**

![Graph showing the number of 4.0ha - 7.99ha lifestyle properties improved with a dwelling from 2006 to 2018.](image)
Subdivision Potential within UDS

- Development of 8 - 52 hectare land within the UDS area could equate to 1240, 4ha parcels if all were developed.
- If parcels 52ha and greater where considered a potential 4276, 4 hectare parcels are achievable.

Reduction in Development Potential

- There are 824 properties 8 – 19.99ha in the district that could have future development restricted if restrictions were placed on subdivision. This could lead to some 1234 4ha properties that could forgo subdivision. At the current level of demand would equate to approximately 12 years of supply.

Length of Ownership

- The average length of ownership of properties that sold twice during the research period for small holdings 4 – 7.99ha in size was 45.5 months or 3.8 years.
- There were 225 rural residential properties, 0.25–2ha in size that sold twice in the district over the period. The average ownership was 52.5 months or 4.4 years.

Property Turnover

- There has been a decrease in turnover of 4-7.99ha properties over the research period from approximately 8% down to below 4% across the district.

Value Implications if subdivision restriction implements

- If the 84, 20-21 ha parcels across the district were to be restricted from further development the total realisation that would be lost is $79,446,000 in land value.

Comparative Analysis – Selwyn District Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Selwyn</th>
<th>Waimakariri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Assessments</td>
<td>26802</td>
<td>26579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Small Holdings</td>
<td>6032</td>
<td>6858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Holdings 4-7.99ha</td>
<td>2652</td>
<td>3767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Holdings 8-19.99ha</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Small holdings 4-7.99ha</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Small holdings 8-19.99ha</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdividable Parcels 20-20.99ha</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Average Subdividable Parcel 20-20.99ha</td>
<td>$1,094,000 (2018)</td>
<td>$630,523 (2016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The gap between the average sale price of vacant 4 – 7.99ha small holdings has stayed relatively the same over the research period whilst the gap between the improved 4 – 7.99ha small holdings has widened.
- The average length of ownership of 4 – 7.99ha small holdings that have sold twice over the research period was 54 months in the Selwyn district compared to 45.5 months in the Waimakariri District.
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Rural Residential Development Strategy (RRDS)
January - June 2019
Communications and Engagement Plan
1. Background

The Waimakariri District continues to see sustained growth which is expected to accelerate over the next 30 years. The Waimakariri Growth Model anticipates approximately 120-150 households will be required over the next 10 years (2022-2032), in the portion of the District that lies within the Greater Christchurch boundary, to meet the demands of this growth.

As per the requirements of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS), Waimakariri District Council’s Development Planning Unit (DPU) is drafting a Rural Residential Development Strategy (RRDS) that provides for future rural residential development across the District.

The development of an RRDS in 2019 follows on from Council’s adoption of the District Development Strategy (DDS) in July 2017. The RRDS is intended to provide a level of certainty to landowners, developers, the Council and the wider Waimakariri community by indicating growth locations for future rural residential development.

Through a robust and extensive process of selection, evaluating the advantages and constraints of a number of potential locations, the Council’s RRDS draft outlines the potential for growth in the following locations – Swannanoa, Ashley/Loburn, Oxford, Ohoka, and Gressons Road (the latter two are secondary propositions).

As per DPU’s preference for the procedural approach leading up to notification of the proposed District Plan in 2020, the RRDS will serve to confirm the rural residential nodes for extension, while the District Plan Review will be the key vehicle through which the final RRDS will be implemented. The most suitable method of implementation via the proposed Waimakariri District Plan will be determined when it is clear to what extent landowners within the identified growth areas are interested in developing their land.

A formal consultation is needed to ensure the community has a say on which areas will be mandated for growth in the RRDS. The consultation - to be held Friday 8 March to Friday 5 April 2019 - will ask the wider District community to consider the aforementioned locations, with their feedback shaping the final RRDS to be adopted by Council on Tuesday 4 June 2019. Appended to this plan is a map of key milestones leading up to Council adopting the final strategy.

This RRDS Communications & Engagement Plan will provide the framework for how Council promotes and manages opportunities for community participation in the consultation. It inherits and will adhere to the thinking and values captured in the Waimakariri District Plan Review (2018-2020) ‘Phase One’ Communications and Engagement Strategy.

2. RRDS Communications & Engagement Mandate: ‘Our Promise to Our Residents and Stakeholders’

To carry out a respectful, strategic consultation. The communications and engagement programme will be integrated; incorporate targeted, personalised communications; and provide for one-to-one engagement for ‘sensitive’ stakeholders where appropriate.
Our commitment throughout the entire programme is to **view what we are doing as an investment in our future**, not just a requirement.

The central idea that will guide us throughout the RRDS consultation is grounded in a first principles approach to our narrative. The narrative will be committed to answering our target audiences’ resounding question – ‘**What does this mean for me?**’ This is the axiomatic principle of any consultation and the common denominator between all our target audiences. If we continue to be guided by this central idea, our key messaging can be tailored accordingly and has the greatest chance of resonating.

### 3. Communications and engagement objectives

- To ensure people who will or may be affected by the RRDS, or have an interest in it, are provided with relevant information in a manner and format that enables them to make informed decisions during the consultation process
- To ensure people feel encouraged to have their say and that they are clear why their participation in the consultation is valuable
- To promote the importance of a successful RRDS and what this means for the District now and in the future.

#### 3.1 Tactical objectives

- Implement a **full consultation** under the “Let’s Talk” brand for the new RRDS to ensure consistency with the process undertaken for the current Rural Residential Development Plan (RRDP)
- Mitigate barriers to participation by providing information through multiple channels and ensure plain English is used to communicate RRDS options
- Create and promote reasonable opportunities for people to present their views to Council
- Provide opportunities for Māori to contribute to the process.

### 4. IAP2 Public Participation Spectrum

As per the commitment outlined in the *Waimakariri District Plan Review (2018-2020) ‘Phase One’ Communications and Engagement Strategy*, the RRDS Communications & Engagement Plan will use the internationally recognised and respected **IAP2 Public Participation Spectrum** to assist with determining and defining the level of public participation in shaping the RRDS and what the communications and consultation programme should look like to help them assume this role.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation goal for people</th>
<th>Our promise to people</th>
<th>What delivering on our promise looks like</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inform</td>
<td>We will keep you informed.</td>
<td>Providing people with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the options</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Target audiences

Further to defining the communications and engagement, there is a need to define target audiences. This plan recognises **all target audiences are important**, but also appreciates that cataloguing audiences into low, medium and high sensitivity categories, enables us to strategically consider the appropriate communication and engagement for that group. By sensitivity, we mean: a) first and foremost, how **affected** a target audience is likely to be by the outcome of the RRDS; b) secondly, the target audience’s **influence** over the RRDS, and c) the target audience’s level of **interest** in the RRDS. Moreover, classification helps to prioritise and more efficiently manage resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target audience</th>
<th>Sensitivity (high, medium, low)</th>
<th>Rationale for classification</th>
<th>Communications and engagement approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXTERNAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents - Swannanoa, Ashley/Loburn, Oxford, Ohoka, and Gressons Road</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Could be directly affected by the outcome</td>
<td>Letter advising them of the RRDS process in high level detail; inviting them to attend the drop-in sessions; and directing them to where they can find more information/contact Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners under arrows</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Could be directly affected by the outcome</td>
<td>Digital communications channels (website, social media, electronic noticeboards) Advertising FAQs at service centres and libraries Drop-in sessions Phone/email as required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming industry</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Has a vested interest in the protection of versatile soils and could be affected by reverse sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consult

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consult</th>
<th>Obtain public feedback on what is proposed, any alternatives and/or decisions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We will keep you informed, listen and acknowledge concerns and aspirations, and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Involve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involve</th>
<th>Work directly with people throughout the process to ensure their views, aspirations and concerns are understood and considered.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We will work with you to ensure your concerns and aspirations are understood, and where possible, reflected in the outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd (MKT)/Iwi

Medium

Treaty partner

Meetings

Strategic partners - ECan, NZTA, CCC, HDC and SDC

Medium

Vested interests in the RRDS. ECan requires the strategy to comply with its Regional Policy Statement (RPS) and other strategic partners form the Greater Christchurch Partnership (GCP) which exists to provide long-term direction and enable consistent, effective and efficient decision-making about growth and development.

Meetings

Interest groups:
1. Rangiora Airfield
2. Christchurch Airport
3. Developers (refer stakeholder map for details)

Medium

1. Their operation may be affected by reverse sensitivity
2. A courtesy – the RRDS will avoid the airport noise contours
3. Interests in purchasing land and/or subdividing.

1. Write to Rangiora Airfield early in process and follow up with a phone call to ensure they are aware of RRDS Consultation and the implications/opportunities for them and invite them to drop-in sessions
2. Notify Christchurch Airport by letter
3. Notify by email, phone or letter about consultation timeframe and opportunity to attend drop-in sessions.

Infrastructure and service providers - Transpower, telecommunications, Ministry of Education, emergency services

Medium

Have a vested interest in the outcome as this impacts their provision of services and they may be affected by reverse sensitivity.

Write to infrastructure and service providers to provide a high level overview of the RRDS and offer further one-to-one engagement where needed and appropriate.

Wider District community

Medium

Not directly affected by the outcome, but may be broadly interested in the outcome and has a strong degree of influence over the decision.

Digital communications channels (website, social media), advertising.

Department of Conservation (DoC)

Low

Has a vested interest in conservation areas.

Write to DoC early in process to provide a high level overview of the RRDS, notifying them of the consultation period and offer further one-to-one engagement where needed and appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target audience</th>
<th>Sensitivity (high, medium, low)</th>
<th>Rationale for classification</th>
<th>Communications and engagement approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERNAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Planning Unit</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Portfolio holder</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>Activities/Outcomes</td>
<td>Communication Channels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Department</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Devising and delivering comms and engagement programme</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities &amp; Roading Department</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Area of interest: Natural hazards, transport, servicing and infrastructure.</td>
<td>Intranet, meetings, briefings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor &amp; Councillors</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>It is important that elected members understand what is proposed so they can play a role in relaying accurate information to the wider community and understand what the RRDS means to their constituents.</td>
<td>Meetings, briefings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Team</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Influence over the strategy and interest in consultation outcomes.</td>
<td>Intranet, meetings, briefings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Document storage is essential under the Official Information Act.</td>
<td>One to one briefings, where appropriate Intranet, email, one to one briefings where appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer services/ all Council staff</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Keeping all departments on the same page and informed works to the consultations advantage in terms of ensuring the right messaging is being used to describe the opportunity and promotes a greater degree of cooperation between departments. Internal information quickly becomes external.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Advisory Group (TAG)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Peer review of RRDS and process.</td>
<td>Meetings, briefings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Control Group (PCG)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Peer review of RRDS and process.</td>
<td>Meetings, briefings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Will approve the draft and adopt the strategy on 4 June 2019.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
District Planning and Regulation Committee (DPRC) | High | Invested in and overseeing the entire District Plan Review and all it encompasses including the RRDS consultation. | Meetings, briefings, retreats

Plan Implementation Unit | Medium | Area of interest: resource consents, public enquiries relating to rural residential development, process private plan changes, market trends indicated via developers. | Meetings, briefings

Community & Greenspace Department | Medium | Area of interest: Provision of parks and green space for rural residential areas | Meetings, briefings

Community Board Members/community groups | Medium | It is important that elected members and community leaders in the District, particularly those representing the areas shortlisted for potential inclusion in the RRDS, understand what is proposed so they can play a role in relaying accurate information to the wider community and understand what the RRDS means to their constituents. | Meetings, briefings

Waimakariri Water Zone Committee | Medium | The Waimakariri Water Zone Committee is a joint committee of Council and ECan. The zone is part of Ngāi Tūāhuriri’s takiwa and its rivers, streams, lagoons and wetlands have always been an important place and food basket for the rūnanga. Engaging Iwi’s and ECan’s views is an important priority to DPU, therefore the Committee’s involvement is pertinent and valuable. | Meetings, briefings

6. Key messaging

6.1 General - district wide

- Waimakariri District is a special place to live and it is important to make provisions for its growth in the future
- We expect significant growth over the next ten years - the Waimakariri Growth Model tells us that approximately 120-150 households will be required between 2022-2032 in the portion of the District that lies within Greater Christchurch boundary
- Because this growth needs to be carefully planned for and managed, Council has prepared a draft Rural Residential Development Strategy (RRDS)
- The RRDS will direct which already established areas of the Waimakariri District should be extended for new rural residential development
- Diverse living options are important
The RRDS will provide more options for people who enjoy living in a rural residential setting so they can make a choice that best reflects their needs and preferences. Through a robust and extensive process of selection, evaluating the advantages and constraints of a number of locations, the Council has shortlisted established locations in the District as potential places for further rural residential development. The shortlisted locations are Swannanoa, Ashley/Loburn, Oxford, Ohoka, and Gressons Road. The growth direction arrows are currently only indicative. The Council values your important feedback on these proposed locations and invites you to have your say through our RRDS Consultation. Your feedback will help shape our future.

6.2 Tailored - directly affected ‘under the arrows’
You live in and/or own land in areas that have been shortlisted in the draft RRDS as potential locations for future rural residential development.

The Council understands and respects how important your home and area are to you and values your opinion on the proposed areas for rural residential development. Your views will help to shape the future of the area you live in. There are no confirmed changes at this stage and plenty of time for you to have your say before anything we have proposed is finalised.

7. Communications and Engagement Channels
- Website
- Social media
- Drop-in sessions
- Email
- Phone
- Formal consultation hearings
- Frontline staff (service centres)
- News media
- Advertising/public notices
- Electronic noticeboards
- Mail outs

8. Tools for Engagement
- RRDS document
- Feedback form
- News stories
- Information displays at service centres
- FAQs
- Presentations
9. Risks and Mitigation

Community exclusion is the primary risk we face through our RRDS communications and engagement. Exclusion can manifest in different ways. Considering all factors that may lead to individuals or groups feeling excluded from the process is key to front-footing and addressing issues. Using a risk register is also advisable so we can track unforeseen issues and apply our learning as we progress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Overview</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of comprehension</td>
<td>Only 16 percent of New Zealand adults are considered to have high literacy levels. Policy-dense information can lead to misinterpretation, disinterest and frustration.</td>
<td>Reduce jargon, use simple words where possible, and lead with an active voice to improve the clarity of our thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive isn’t strong enough</td>
<td>Incentive is instrumental to raising awareness, and in turn, increasing the likelihood that people engage with and comprehend the options so they can provide feedback on them.</td>
<td>A first principles approach guides everything the Council says and does regarding the RRDS, always coming back to one central idea, ‘What does the RRDS mean for me?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media influence on public perception</td>
<td>Where the media is misinformed or relationships are managed poorly, there is a high likelihood of RRDS facts being misrepresented or having risks/opportunities taken out of context leading to a distorted view of the facts.</td>
<td>Working alongside the news media where opportunity permits to build a relationship that is more friend than foe. While we can never control the message through the news media, we need to treat them as an ally and be respectful of their role as a key point of contact for the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squeaky wheel syndrome</td>
<td>Whether fed by the news media’s agenda/misrepresentation of the facts, or a result of hearsay, even small-scale community angst can be particularly detrimental to the success of the RRDS consultation.</td>
<td>Our resolve should be to take a constructive never defensive approach to difference of opinion expressed in an open forum. Where we can educate and enlighten to address a misunderstanding we will. Maintaining perspective is important with ‘complaints’ so we should look at the number of these against the volume of those ‘informed’ and ‘engaged’ as this helps offer perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap of projects</td>
<td>There is cross-over with two other consultations.</td>
<td>Integration between teams to ensure promotional clashes are avoided; clear delineation between projects while also being mindful to clarify their interrelationship where</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The DPR Initial Public Consultation runs from 1 April - 30 April (4 days crossover)

The Annual Plan runs from 11 March - 11 April (RRDS has 3 days headstart)

An extended programme of communications and engagement can result in waning interest or disorientation over the status of the process. In turn, this can lead to disengagement.

Unrealistic expectations

Unrealistic expectations can arise from simple misunderstandings as well as inherent biases.

Proactivity is essential to anticipate problems. We must be clear about what is negotiable and non-negotiable.

Landowners living in affected areas/wider community disappointed with outcomes

For landowners and people living in affected areas, emotions could be heightened.

Relationships with these people will need to be managed with sensitivity and care. The key message to lead with is that no decisions have yet been made.

10. Metrics of Success

Assessing how effectively we are meeting our objectives should involve quantitative and qualitative measurement.

10.1 Quantitative

Rates of conversion – looking at how many did what we wanted/needed them to do and how this compares to in-kind consultations. Here we would look at:

- Measurement of those who have been ‘informed’ – while our ultimate aim is to encourage submissions, being informed is evidence we removed a barrier to participation
- Submission numbers
- Meeting/workshop/drop-in session turn out
- Website analytics (page views, how many people visit the RRDS related pages)
- Social media analytics (number of online postings)
10.2 Qualitative

- Quality of feedback gathered – does it demonstrate awareness of the RRDS and its content, and is the feedback useful and relevant to us?
- Volume and integrity of news media coverage
- Sentiment towards Council’s efforts is positive, anecdotally, and through news media coverage

11. Communications and engagement timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Updates to internal stakeholders</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>SM/HD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters to landowners of properties</td>
<td>1-2 weeks before the draft is released</td>
<td>KP/SM/HD</td>
<td>Drop-ins must be mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under proposed growth arrows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media briefing – TBD dependent on media</td>
<td>Ideally Monday 4 March 2019</td>
<td>KP/SM/HD</td>
<td>Information can be provided under strict embargo where needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News stories</td>
<td>Friday 8 March 2019</td>
<td>KP/Webmaster</td>
<td>To coincide with the commencement of the consultation and then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Tuesday 4 June 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>following adoption of the strategy in June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>Ongoing throughout the consultation</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>Social media comms calendar will specify dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Friday 8 March 2019</td>
<td>KP/Webmaster</td>
<td>See timeline below for production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media advertising “Let’s Talk”</td>
<td>Dates to be confirmed/</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>Timeline below to specify dates and guide production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coordinating with comms department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FAQs distributed to service centres and libraries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone 1</th>
<th>Milestone 2</th>
<th>Milestone 3</th>
<th>Milestone 4</th>
<th>Milestone 5</th>
<th>Milestone 6</th>
<th>Milestone 7</th>
<th>Milestone 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Just ahead of consultation commencing on Friday 8 March 2019  
KP  
See timeline below for production

### Drop-in sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone 1</th>
<th>Milestone 2</th>
<th>Milestone 3</th>
<th>Milestone 4</th>
<th>Milestone 5</th>
<th>Milestone 6</th>
<th>Milestone 7</th>
<th>Milestone 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5pm-7pm, Monday 18 March 2019 at Loburn Domain Pavilion  
DPU  
Coordinated by AB with support from DPU

5pm-7pm, Tuesday 19 March 2019 at Ohoka Domain Pavilion

5pm-7pm, Thursday 21 March 2019 at A&P Room of the Oxford Town Hall

### 12. Production timeline for deliverables (approximate dates to guide accountability and improve efficiencies)

Josie Warring, typing – ‘JW’

Heike Downie/ Shelley Milosavljevic, Development Planning Unit – ‘DPU’

Kate Pierson, DPU/Comms – ‘KP’

Audrey Benbrook, DPU – ‘AB’
### 13. Key project milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural Residential Development Strategy document (including imagery)</th>
<th>DPU files draft strategy content with typing – draft content should be as refined as possible by this stage.</th>
<th>JW completes and supplies first version of designed draft</th>
<th>DPU makes changes</th>
<th>KP provides changes to JW and oversees these</th>
<th>JW supplies second version of designed draft</th>
<th>DPU makes final changes</th>
<th>KP provides changes to JW and oversees these</th>
<th>JW supplies final version of designed document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final check by DPU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Content sent to printer by 5pm, Tuesday 5 March 2019.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public notices</td>
<td>KP drafts content and files with typing</td>
<td>JW completes and supplies first version of designed draft</td>
<td>DPU makes changes</td>
<td>KP provides changes to JW and oversees these</td>
<td>JW supplies second version of designed draft</td>
<td>DPU makes final changes</td>
<td>KP provides changes to JW and oversees these</td>
<td>JW supplies final version of designed document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final check by DPU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KP sends to newspapers for publishing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>KP drafts website content</td>
<td>KP completes and supplies draft content to DPU</td>
<td>DPU makes changes</td>
<td>KP amends content based on DPU changes</td>
<td>KP supplies second version of website content</td>
<td>DPU makes final changes</td>
<td>KP finalises website copy</td>
<td>KP supplies website copy to Webmaster for publishing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAQs</td>
<td>KP drafts FAQ content and files with typing</td>
<td>JW completes and supplies first version of designed draft</td>
<td>DPU makes changes</td>
<td>KP provides changes to JW and oversees these</td>
<td>JW supplies second version of designed draft</td>
<td>DPU makes final changes</td>
<td>KP provides changes to JW and oversees these</td>
<td>JW supplies final version of designed document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final check by DPU. KP sends FAQs to print and arranges distribution to service centres/libraries on Wednesday 6 March 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News story 'introducing the RRDS consultation'</td>
<td>KP drafts news story</td>
<td>KP completes and supplies draft content to DPU</td>
<td>DPU makes changes</td>
<td>KP amends content based on DPU changes</td>
<td>KP supplies second version of news story</td>
<td>DPU makes final changes</td>
<td>KP finalises news story</td>
<td>KP sends news story to Webmaster for publishing on Wednesday 6 March 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media comms calendar</td>
<td>KP drafts social media comms calendar</td>
<td>KP completes and supplies draft social media comms calendar to DPU</td>
<td>DPU makes changes</td>
<td>KP amends content based on DPU changes</td>
<td>KP supplies second version of social media comms calendar</td>
<td>DPU makes final changes</td>
<td>KP finalises social media comms calendar</td>
<td>Social media comms calendar executed on Friday 8 March 2019.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RRDS – Reporting Map for key milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/13 Dec</td>
<td>Update memo to DPRC</td>
<td>Process, shortlisted locations, survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Dec</td>
<td>TAG</td>
<td>discuss draft ‘arrows’ for proposed growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January – mid Feb</td>
<td>................write draft Strategy.........................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Catch up with MKT</td>
<td>To schedule? Or get input otherwise?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Feb</td>
<td>DPRC retreat</td>
<td>update draft Strategy taking shape, buy in for ‘arrows’, next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Feb</td>
<td>TAG</td>
<td>draft Strategy shaping up – any crucial changes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Feb</td>
<td>PCG</td>
<td>endorse draft Strategy for consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Feb</td>
<td>Letters to landowners ‘under arrows’</td>
<td>make aware of project, invite to put in submission/come to drop ins, “don’t panic”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Feb</td>
<td>Council report due</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 March</td>
<td>Council meeting</td>
<td>approve draft Strategy for consultation, appoint a hearing panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 March</td>
<td>All Boards (Draft AP) – checking with Sarah Nichols if can get on agenda</td>
<td>Brief on draft Strategy – encourage submit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 March</td>
<td>Consultation opens</td>
<td>comms, drop ins x4 (Ohoka, Oxford, Woodend, Ashley) etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 April</td>
<td>Consultation closes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 April</td>
<td>DPRC briefing</td>
<td>Flavour of consultation feedback, next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early-mid April</td>
<td>Write submissions analysis/summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-April</td>
<td>Circulate submission analysis to hearing panel, DPRC, TAG, PCG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Easter (19 – 22 April) & Anzac (25 April) holiday period (many people will likely be away take leave from Friday 19 April and be back on Monday 29 April)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29-30 Apr</td>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 May</td>
<td>Deliberations</td>
<td>Depending on volume of submissions, could be same day as hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>………………………amend Strategy to make final……………………………...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 May</td>
<td>TAG</td>
<td>Consultation outcomes, hearing &amp; deliberations, directions for final Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 May</td>
<td>TAG</td>
<td>Consultation outcomes, hearing &amp; deliberations, directions for final Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 May</td>
<td>DPRC briefing</td>
<td>Final Strategy shaping up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or 20 May</td>
<td>PCG (set up special mtg)</td>
<td>endorses final Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 May</td>
<td>Council report due with final Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 June</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>adopts final Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Acronyms:**
- TAG – Technical Advisory Group
- PCG – Project Control Group
- DPRC – District Planning and Regulations Committee
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: SEW-03-04-05 / 190220019715

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 5 March 2019

FROM: Gary Stevenson, Development Manager
       Kelly LaValley, Project Delivery Unit Manager

SUBJECT: Request Authorisation for Additional Funding for a Water Reticulation Extension and Reallocation of Funding for Sewer Extensions.

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

1. SUMMARY

1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform Council of the progress of the sewer extension project along Tuahiwi and Topito Roads to service development including proposed cluster housing and also seek approvals for water and sewer budgets.

1.2 It is proposed that Council reallocates both the Tuahiwi sewer level of service (LOS) budget ($58,748 excluding GST) and the Tuahiwi sewer renewals budget ($58,748 excluding GST) to the Tuahiwi growth budget for the current 2018/19 financial year. Reallocation of the LOS and renewals budgets will increase the Tuahiwi growth budget from $125,852 excluding GST to $243,348 excluding GST, providing adequate budget to extend the sewer mains in Topito Road and Tuahiwi Road. Note that the sewer LOS and renewals budgets were intended for this project, however should have been allocated as growth budgets.

1.3 It is proposed that Council provide budget of $14,000 excluding GST in the current financial year to extend the water main in Topito Road. This extension has not previously been proposed to Council, however, is required to facilitate the proposed cluster housing development at 80 Topito Road.

Attachments:

i. Report to Council 7 November 2017 - Tuahiwi Sewerage Extension, Trim 171020113861
ii. Report to Council 3 April 2018 - Request Authorisation to Bring Forward Funding for Reticulation Extension, Trim 180219017018
iii. Appendix A: Maps Showing Previously Proposed Works
iv. Appendix B: Maps Showing Currently Proposed Works
v. Appendix C: Topito Road Carriageway Upgrades
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report TRIM number 190220019715.

(b) **Approves** the reallocation of the 2018/19 sewer level of service budget 101067.000.5113 of $58,748 excluding GST and 2018/19 sewer renewals budget 101067.000.5114 of $58,748 excluding GST to the growth budget 101067.000.5115 to facilitate the installation of a sewer main extensions in Topito Road and Tuahiwi Road.

(c) **Approves** a budget of $14,000 excluding GST for the current 2018/19 financial year to install a water main extension in Topito Road.

(d) **Notes** that water and sewer main extension contract for Tuahiwi and Topito Roads is currently being tendered.

(e) **Notes** that Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga will contribute $57,391.30 excluding GST toward the cost of the sewer extensions with Council funding the balance of $157,270.70 excluding GST.

(f) **Notes** that Council funding (existing and reallocated budgets) for the sewer extensions shall be recovered partly via Financial Contributions in the 2018/19 and 2019/2020 financial years, partly from Development Contributions in the 2018/19 and 2019/20 financial years and in full with Development Contributions from 2020/21.

(g) **Notes** that Council funding for the water extension shall be recovered partly via Financial Contributions in the 2018/19 and 2019/20 financial year, and then via Development Contributions in the 2020/21 financial year and future years.

(h) **Notes** that staff are completing further investigation into funding options for infrastructure upgrades in the Maori Reserve 873 to enable future cluster housing developments.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 Council have entered into an agreement with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga to provide for the extension of sewer mains along Tuahiwi and Topito Roads, to service proposed cluster housing developments and properties along these portion of road.

3.2 Since project inception, Council has received a resource consent application, RC185168, for a 7 unit cluster housing development at 80 Topito Road. This property is not serviced for water and sewer and is at the western end of Topito Road. Leading to the proposed development, the Topito Road road reserve width is 10m for the majority of its length and the road carriageway unsealed for 465m, is 3m wide, bounded by two drains either side, and is limited to its current use without upgrading of the road. It is also important to note that 80 Topito Road lies outside of the previously reported extent of sewer main extension however, both water and sewer can be extended to the property.

3.3 Council has also received resource consent application, RC195034, from Mana Waitaha Trust for a 6 unit Papakainga cluster housing development at 233 Tuahiwi Road. It is intended that this development be serviced by the proposed sewer extension and water from Topito Road. The water supply is available to connect to the development without further extension. As with 80 Topito Road, for 275m of the 465m reported above, the road is unsealed and is limited to its current use without upgrading of the road.

3.4 **Sewer**
3.5 At its meeting 7 of November 2017 (Trim 171020113861), Council approved a budget of $95,191 excluding GST ($109,470 including GST) for the construction of a pressure sewer main in Tuahiwi Road from Topito Road to Waikoruru Road. Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga will contribute $28,696 excluding GST ($33,000 including GST) towards this. Appendix A shows the location and extent of the proposed works. This report also sought approval for a connection charge of $2,250 including GST be levied per dwelling unit for the first ten units that would connect to the sewer along the length of Tuahiwi Road serviced by the new main.

3.6 At its meeting 3 of April 2018 (Trim 180219017018), Council approved $35,720 excluding GST of funding be bought forward from the 2018/19 financial year, as budgeted in the Draft Long Term Plan, to the then current financial year of 2017/18 for the design and partial construction of the main extension in Tuahiwi Road. The cost of implementing the Topito Road portion of sewer main at $74,877 excluding GST ($86,109 including GST), of which Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga would contribute $28,696 excluding GST ($33,000 including GST), was also budgeted for the 2018/19 financial year. Also, an additional budget of $8,908 excluding GST was approved for the 2017/18 financial year to design a wastewater main extension in Topito Road from Tuahiwi Road to 61 Topito Road. Appendix A of this report shows the location and extent of the proposed works.

3.7 To accelerate the servicing of wastewater, a funding contribution of $57,391 excluding GST ($66,000 including GST) was put forth by the Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga. This contribution was divided equally between the two segments, or $28,696 excluding GST ($33,000 including GST) per road, to be serviced and was seen as a means of accelerating development in the area and leveraging the recently-adopted planning provisions for MR 873. This private agreement was proposed to and accepted by Council at the two aforementioned meetings.

3.8 The Tuahiwi Road sewer main extension was therefore to be funded partly via private agreement ($33,000 including GST), and partly via connection charges ($2,250 including GST per dwelling unit for the first ten units to connect). It is noted that in the recommendations section of the report to Council 7 November 2017 it is stated that the connection charge shall apply to the first ten dwelling units, however, in the main body of the report it was stated as applying to the first 34 dwelling units. For all of Council’s costs to be recovered the connection charge should apply to the first 34 dwelling units.

3.9 At the time of the report to Council 7 November 2017, a high level assessment had been completed by Council staff with regards the capacity of the Turiwhaia pump station. It was determined that the wastewater flows for an additional ten connections in the Turiwhaia pump station catchment could be accommodated within the existing pump station. Flows above that were considered to trigger an upgrade to the pump station and reticulation downstream of the pump station. The upgrade was to be funded by new development, replacements, and level of service charges. Provision for the pump station and reticulation upgrades was proposed in year two of the LTP budget at a cost of $1.934 million. The costs were to be recouped through development contributions and rates. This is considered to be the reason for the connection cost only being applied to the first ten connections as opposed to the originally assessed 34 connections.

3.10 Council staff have undertaken further assessment to ascertain the redundant capacity of the Turiwhaia pump station. The previously estimated ten connection limit is no longer considered applicable.

3.11 Similarly, the Topito Road sewer main extension was to be funded partly via private agreement ($33,000 including GST), and partly via connection charges ($3,056 including GST per dwelling unit for the first 19 units to connect). It is noted that the connection
charges were not included in the report’s recommendations to Council, however, they were necessary for Council costs to be recovered.

3.12 It has subsequently been determined, based on likely development and existing properties not currently connected to reticulation, that up to 30 dwelling units are likely to be connected to the sewer main in Topito Road over time.

3.13 Council staff have designed the two wastewater extensions and undertaken a detailed engineers estimate, the revised total estimated cost is $225,125 excluding GST. The revised budget for the works therefore exceeds the current financial year Tuahiwi wastewater growth budget of $125,852 excluding GST by $98,810 excluding GST. The growth budget is development contribution funded. $117,572 excluding GST being accounted for in the development contributions for the 2018/19 financial year and $125,852 excluding GST being accounted for in the 2019/2020 financial year, equating to a shortfall of $8,280 excluding GST in the development contributions for the 2018/19 financial year. The additional $8,280 excluding GST being the funding for design of the Topito Road extension approved by Council in April 2018. Note the $8,280 excluding GST differs to the $8,908 excluding GST stated in the April 2018 report due to the carry over budgets from 2017/18 being rounded down (by $628 excluding GST) to the nearest thousand dollars.

3.14 Additionally, for the current financial year the following budgets have been previously allocated for works on the Tuahiwi wastewater system: $58,748 excluding GST previously for level of service (LOS) and $58,748 excluding GST previously for renewals. Note that the sewer LOS and renewals budgets were intended for this project, however should have been allocated as growth budgets.

3.15 It is therefore proposed that the level of service budget and the renewals budget be reallocated to the growth budget. Hence, resulting in a total budget of $243,348 excluding GST for this project.

3.16 The combined reallocated budget of $117,496 excluding GST will not be captured in the 2018/19 nor the 2019/20 development contribution rates. However, Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga contributions ($57,391 excluding GST) will be paid on completion of the sewer main extensions with the outstanding balance of $68,461 excluding GST to be captured by financial contributions and 2020/21 development contribution rates.

3.17 Should the entire budget be expended a financial contribution of $1,229 including GST per unit title would need to be levied on the cluster developments occurring at 80 Topito Road and 233 Tuahiwi Road. The financial contribution is calculated by the total budget ($243,348 excluding GST), minus the portion of the existing budget captured in the 2018/19 development contributions ($117,572 excluding GST), minus the Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga contribution ($57,391 excluding GST), divided by 64 being the total number of dwelling units, (30 in Topito Road and 34 in Tuahiwi Road), that are anticipated to connect to the wastewater extensions.

3.18 It is acknowledged that once the works have been completed the opportunity for taking financial contributions from future developments will lapse. However, development contributions from 2020/21 onwards will include this cost as part of the development contribution.

3.19 Recent discussions with representatives of Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga indicate that the delaying of the wastewater extension may hinder the progress of single-family cluster housing developments in the immediate area, and may result in the Runanga’s development at 233 Tuahiwi Road falling over due to restricted funding timeframes.
3.20 The design works for the Topito Road wastewater extension have been completed by Council staff and the work is currently out to tender.

3.21 It is anticipated that the Topito Road wastewater extension will be completed and ready for connections in May 2019.

3.22 **Water**

3.23 The water main in Topito Road currently ceases approximately 600m southwest of Tuahiwi Road, at 61 Topito Road.

3.24 The extension of the water main in Topito Road has not previously been considered or assessed by Council staff in earlier reporting, hence to date no budget has been approved by Council for these works.

3.25 Water installation works along Topito Road are estimated as $14,000 excluding GST including a 10% contingency if works are completed in conjunction with sewer installation works.

3.26 It is proposed to request a financial contribution of $1,150 including GST per dwelling for the 7 cluster home development at 80 Topito Road (equalling a total of $8,050 including GST) which represents half of the projected 14 dwellings likely to connect to the extended water main. The balance is proposed to be funded by Development Contributions from the 2020/21 financial year. This would require Council Funding this share initially then recovering with Development Contributions later. A new budget is required to be allocated for this work.

3.27 The design work for the Topito Road water extension has been undertaken by Council staff in conjunction with the design of the wastewater extension, and the water main has been included as a provisional item in the tender document.

3.28 The extension of the water main is required to facilitate the proposed cluster housing development at 80 Topito Road.

3.29 **Roading**

3.30 The upgrading of Topito Road has not previously been assessed by Council staff.

3.31 Topito Road is sealed for approximately the first 330m southwest of the Tuahiwi Road intersection, with a minimum formed width of approximately 5m. Beyond this point Topito Road is unsealed and decreases to a minimum width of approximately 3m in the vicinity of 80 Topito Road’s frontage. Refer to Appendix C for an annotated aerial image.

3.32 The upgrading of Topito Road is considered necessary to facilitate the proposed cluster developments at 80 Topito Road and 233 Tuahiwi Road, which is to be accessed via Topito Road. The current road formation is not considered adequate to safely and effectively accommodate the vehicle movements associated with the aforesaid developments.

3.33 The Topito Road corridor is of limited width, approximately 10m at its narrowest. Typically a roading corridor should have a minimum width of 15m, thus enabling the required carriageway formation, verge, and associated drainage to be effectively accommodated within the road reserve.

3.34 Additionally, it is acknowledged that substantial open stormwater drains run down either side of Topito in the vicinity of 80 Topito Road’s frontage, and a number of power poles are located within or in close proximity of the road reserve at this location. Both of these
factors further limit the space available for carriageway widening and associated infrastructure to be effectively accommodated.

3.35 Topito Road’s legal boundary is not straight, stepping in to adjoining properties at certain locations, and hence increasing the width of the road corridor. The acquisition of land adjacent to Topito Road, 5m on the northern side, would increase width to the preferable 15m minimum. This could be achieved with Council incrementally purchasing or having vested the land as part of subdivision, noting that this appears to have been previously done at 40 and 50 Topito Road. The ownership of the land adjacent to Topito Road is fragmented, and hence the purchasing of all the required land could take a considerable length of time or may not be possible. A cost assessment to calculate the financial implications of this land purchase has not been undertaken.

3.36 The proposed site plan for the cluster housing development at 80 Topito Road would require amending if the vesting or purchase of a 5m strip adjacent to Topito Road is to be pursued by Council. Currently a wetland area / stormwater detention pond encroaches upon this 5m strip. The proposed site plan is Trim Report Number 180612065228.

3.37 The possibility of land being vested in Council for road reserve has not been discussed with the developer at 80 Topito Road.

3.38 Staff recommend that obtaining additional road reserve width along Topito Road not be pursued at this time and that this matter be discussed with Runanga in terms of the ongoing development in MR873.

3.39 Council staff have undertaken a high level engineer’s estimate for the upgrading of Topito Road. The following options were considered, noting that Options 2a & 2b must be effected concurrently if 80 Topito Road is developed:

Option 1) Widen and seal Topito Road from the end of the seal to the proposed access at No. 80 Topito Road (which is adjacent to the eastern boundary of the property). This work is not to be undertaken this financial year, instead Council shall take financial contributions for developments which are valued proportional to the length of road utilised by each development and the upgrading work may be undertaken at some time in the future, depending on the level of development in the vicinity;

Option 2a) Upgrade the length of Topito Road between 233 Tuahiwi Road’s Topito Road access & No. 80 Topito Road’s proposed access to a width of 4m in accordance with the Engineering Code of Practice Standard Drawing 600-273 (Issue D), Rural Right of Way, including passing bays at 90m intervals. This work is to be completely funded by the developer of 80 Topito Road; and

Option 2b) Widen Topito Road to 5m from the end of seal to the 233 Tuahiwi Road’s access, to be funded by Council and the developer of 233 Tuahiwi Road.

3.40 The high level engineers estimate allows for the costs to be correctly apportioned between new developments and to ascertain the cost implications for the proposed cluster housing developments at 80 Topito Road and 233 Tuahiwi Road.

3.41 Table 1: The Financial Breakdown (Excluding GST) for the Upgrading Options for Topito Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description of Works</th>
<th>Total Budget (Excluding GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Widen &amp; Seal Topito Road from End of Seal to 80 Topito Road</td>
<td>$253,449</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.42 Option 1 is the most desirable outcome and allows for future development beyond the two known cluster housing developments, however, it is also the most expensive option as considerable works are required.

3.43 To enable Option 1 at a future date it is intended that a roading financial contributions shall be taken from developments occurring on Topito Road southwest of the current end of seal. The applicable roading financial contributions will differ for each development, and will be dependent upon the length of upgrade required to access the property.

3.44 Typically, when Council has taken financial contributions that equate to more than 30% of the total budget for the upgrading works (e.g. Option 1) it triggers Council to undertake the associated works.

3.45 It is proposed that the costs of Option 2a be fully borne by the developer at 80 Topito Road. This is considered appropriate as if any further developments that occur on this portion of Topito Road the road will require further upgrading, in accordance with Option 1, in order to accommodate the increased traffic loading. Hence, the minimum solution only benefits the development at 80 Topito Road.

3.46 The developer at 80 Topito Road will therefore be required to undertake roading works estimated at $129,118 excluding GST, prior to obtaining the 224 Certificate of Completion for their proposed cluster housing development, thus negating a requirement for a roading financial contribution requirement for this development. The applicable roading financial contribution being $32,385 including GST for 80 Topito Road, less than the cost of the interim upgrading works.

3.47 It is proposed that the costs for Option 2b be partly borne by the developer at 233 Tuahiwi Road ($29,239 excluding GST), and partly borne by Council ($29,239 excluding GST). This is considered reasonable as the development at 233 Tuahiwi Road cannot occur without this section of Topito Road being widened, however, there is an existing demand on this section of Topito Road with a number of properties already utilising it for vehicular access. It is therefore considered appropriate that Council contributes a proportion (50%) of the costs associated with the staged upgrade of this section of Topito Road.

3.48 The developer at 233 Tuahiwi Road will therefore be required to undertake roading works costing in the region of $29,239 excluding GST, prior to obtaining the 224 Certificate of Completion for their proposed cluster housing development thus negating a requirement for a roading financial contribution requirement for this development. The applicable roading financial contribution being $14,002 including GST for 223 Tuahiwi Road, less than the cost of the widening works.

3.49 The aforementioned cost apportionment for the upgrading of Topito Road is dependent upon the development at 233 Tuahiwi Road occurring prior to the development at 80 Topito Road. The 80 Topito Road consent may be conditioned to ensure this. This is yet to be discussed with the developer at 80 Topito Road, however, the staging of the development to allow for the incremental upgrading of Topito Road has been previously raised.

3.50 The uncertainty around the anticipated location and rate of development within the Tuahiwi area makes it challenging to predict future demand. In order to facilitate the two pending cluster housing developments (at 80 Topito Road & 233 Tuahiwi Road) it is proposed as per Option 2b that the widening of Topito Road from 27 Topito Road up to 233 Tuahiwi Road’s Topito Road access be undertaken now and that this work be partly funded by
Council and partly by financial contribution by the developer at 223 Tuahiwi Road. This is to be achieved by Council entering into a cost share agreement with the developer at 233 Tuahiwi Road.

3.51 To ensure that the timeframe of the developers at 233 Tuahiwi Road is met, design and construction of the upgrading of Topito Road from the end of seal to 233 Tuahiwi Road’s Topito Road access needs to commence in the current 2018/19 financial year. The Council funded portion of these works is to be sourced from the Roading Subdivision Extra-over Development budget.

3.52 Excluding the cluster housing development at 80 Topito Road, the proposed solution of adopting Options 2a & 2b does not allow for further development along Topito Road west of the 233 Tuahiwi Road’s Topito Road access.

3.53 Council staff need to further investigate/assess funding options for further roading upgrades that may be required to facilitate future cluster housing developments within Maori Reserve 873.

3.54 **The Cost of the Topito Road Water and Sewer Extension, and Roading Upgrades**

3.55 Table 2 provides a summary of the water, sewer, roading and development contribution costs that are to be incurred by the developers seeking to establish new dwelling units at 80 Topito Road and 233 Tuahiwi Road. Please note that the summary includes GST, but excludes all onsite costs that may be applicable. Development Contribution credits have been applied to the first lot of the 80 Topito Road development but credits are not applicable to 233 Tuahiwi Road as a dwelling presently exists. Furthermore, the assessment is based on the 2018/19 development contribution rates.

3.56 As can be shown Table 2 above developments occurring within the Tuahiwi area are susceptible to considerable costs even before onsite works are considered.

3.57 Onsite costs would include the installation of infrastructure within the property to convey wastewater to the public mains (i.e. septic tanks, pumps and service laterals). These costs would apply to new developments requiring an entirely new system or homeowners choosing to replace an existing system. Council staff have estimated the cost of these works to be in the region of $16,600 per a dwelling unit. In a cluster housing development multiple dwelling units may utilise a communal system, hence potentially reducing the expense incurred by an individual dwelling unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster Site Location</th>
<th>No. of Units</th>
<th>2018/19 Development Contributions* per Unit</th>
<th>Roading Upgrade Cost – Estimate per Development</th>
<th>Sewer Financial Contribution per Unit</th>
<th>Water Financial Contribution per Unit</th>
<th>Total Cost per Unit</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80 Topito Road Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$19,292</td>
<td>$148,486</td>
<td>$1,229</td>
<td>$1,150</td>
<td>$170,157</td>
<td>$341,497.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$26,178</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,229</td>
<td>$1,150</td>
<td>$28,557</td>
<td>$170,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233 Tuahiwi Road Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$26,177</td>
<td>$33,625</td>
<td>$1,229</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$61,031</td>
<td>$198,059.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$26,177</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,229</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$27,406</td>
<td>$132,406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The development contributions include Reserves (Rural & Res 4 Zone), Water (Tuahiwi), Water – ODA (Woodend – Tuahiwi), Sewer (Eastern Districts – Outfall), Sewer (Tuahiwi), and Roading (District).
4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. Land Use Recovery Plan Action 21 directed the Council to change its District Plan in 2015 to facilitate residential development on Maori land in Maori Reserve 873. This includes provision for phased cluster housing on conforming rural zoned properties.

4.2. Cluster housing creates small but highly concentrated areas of development (up to seven dwelling units per a 5,000m² lot in accordance with Rule 31.34.1 of the District Plan, Revision 18th of October 2018) in rural areas where effective servicing is not necessarily present. Hence, the costs and challenges of enabling such developments may be considerable.

4.3. Council is at risk of development in this area not proceeding as planned or existing properties electing not to connect to the wastewater extensions. If Council chooses to install the infrastructure to service planned growth in the area but this development does not occur, then Council has no means of recovering the infrastructure costs incurred.

4.4. It is standard practice for the Developer/Consent Holder to cover the full cost of any reticulation extension or roading upgrade required to service a new development.

4.5. The Council will need to continue to work with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga, and property owners to determine the feasibility of servicing each cluster proposal on its merit, and a coordinated service development for the wider Maori Reserve 873 area.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga have collaborated with Council in the funding of sewer main extensions in Tuahiwai.

5.2. **Wider Community**

No wider community views have been sought.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.1.1. This project has been approved by Council and the budgets to complete the job is contained within the Turiwhaia Pump Station & Reticulation Upgrade – Construct & Design Growth Budgets totalling $125,852 excluding GST.

6.1.2. Two sewer budgets for Tuahiwi, being Level of Service 101067.000.5113 and Renewals 101067.000.5114 each of $58,748 excluding GST respectively, were budgeted for this sewer reticulation project. However, as this project is a growth project these two budgets cannot be automatically utilised, therefore creating the projected budget short-fall.

6.1.3. It is proposed that the level of service and renewal budgets for this year be reallocated to growth 101067.000.5115, hence increasing the project budget total to $243,348 excluding GST. This is adequate to meet the estimated costs.

6.1.4. Table 3: Financial Breakdown (excluding GST) of the Exiting Sewer Extension Budgets 2018/19
6.1.5. Less the Runanga contributions for each sewer main alignment of $57,391.30 excluding GST a balance of $167,270.70 excluding GST is to be funded by Council.

6.1.6. Currently $125,852 excluding GST has been budgeted by Council for the sewer extension. Of this $117,572 excluding GST is included in the 2018/19 financial year development contributions with the remaining included from 2019/20 financial year. It is acknowledged that the current (2018/19) development contribution rates will not capture the additional $8,280 excluding GST included in the 2019/20 development contributions nor the reallocated budget that has been requested by Council staff, less the Runanga contributions. This equates to $68,385 excluding GST. The Development Contribution rates will capture this additional expenditure in 2020/21 as part of the budgeting process. Any developments that occur prior to the extension works being completed and the revised 2020/21 Development Contribution rates becoming applicable will be charged a financial contribution to cover the cost.

Table 4: The Proposed Financial Breakdown (excluding GST) of the Sewer Extension Budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Current Project</th>
<th>Budget (Excl. GST)</th>
<th>Runanga Private Agreement</th>
<th>Financial Contributions</th>
<th>Development Contributions 2019/20</th>
<th>Development Contributions 2020/21*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101066.000.5115</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101067.000.5115</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>$105,852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$105,852</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101067.000.5113</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>$58,748</td>
<td>$57,391</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101067.000.5114</td>
<td>Renewals</td>
<td>$58,748</td>
<td>$8,413</td>
<td>$8,413</td>
<td>$125,852</td>
<td>$51,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$243,348</td>
<td>$57,391</td>
<td>$8,413</td>
<td>$225,124</td>
<td>$51,692</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The 2020/21 Development Contributions rates capture the reallocated budget.

**The above figures are based on the assumption that the developments at 80 Topito Road and 233 Tuahiwi Road shall occur in 2019/20.

6.1.7. Water installation works along Topito Road are estimated as $14,000 (excluding GST) including a 10% contingency if works are completed in conjunction with sewer installation works. The water main has been designed and is currently allowed for as a separable portion in the Topito Road and Tuahiwi Road sewer main extension contract. There is currently no budget for these works. If water installation was completed as a separate contract then these costs would increase in the order of $2,000 to $3,000.

6.1.8. The extension of the water main along Topito Road has not been budgeted for. It is proposed that Council fund this work, and costs be partly recovered by a financial contribution of $8,050 (including GST) from the proposed development at 80 Topito
Road and the Development Contribution rates being revised to recover the remaining costs.

6.1.9. It is proposed that the upgrading of the Topito Road carriageway between the end of seal at 29 Topito Road and 233 Tuahiwi Road’s Topito Road access is to be funded partly by the development occurring at 233 Tuahiwi Road ($30,964 excluding GST), and by Council ($30,964 excluding GST).

6.2. **Community Implications**

6.3. **Risk Management**

Growth distribution of cluster housing in particular within Tuahiwi offers challenges in terms of utility servicing given the unexpected or out-of-sequence development that can occur. A Master Planning exercise is planned to ascertain future serving of Tuahiwi.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

The Local Government Act of 2002 is relevant in this matter.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**

This report relates to the following community outcomes:

- **Effect is given to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi**
  - The Council in partnership with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga, continue to build our relationship through mutual understanding and shared responsibilities. 1,2,3,4

- **There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that effects our District**
  - The Council takes account of the views across the community including mana whenua. 1,3

- **Core utility services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner**
  - Council sewerage and water supply schemes, and drainage and waste collection services are provided to a high standard. 1,4
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval to enter into private agreements with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga and private property owners to extend the STEP sewerage scheme in Tuahiwi to facilitate development in accordance with revised planning provisions applying to MR873.

Attachments:

i. Map of the Tuahiwi village area

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 171020113861.

(b) Agrees to enter into a private agreement with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga to receive $33,000 towards the cost of implementing a STEP sewer main in Tuahiwi Road from Topito Road to Waikoruru Road at a total cost of $109,470 (incl. GST).

(c) Approves a connection charge of $2,250 per dwelling unit for the first ten units to connect to the sewer along this length of Tuahiwi Road.

(d) Notes that those connecting to the service would be required to also pay development contributions required for the Eastern Districts Sewerage Scheme Ocean Outfall and the Woodend reticulation system and treatment plant at the sum of $9,471.

(e) Notes that further extensions of the STEP scheme in the vicinity will likely give rise to the need to upgrade the capacity of the Turiwhaia pumping station and further recoveries of these costs will need to be made via an additional development contribution.

(f) Notes that the costs of that upgrade is included in draft LTP budgets for the Council's consideration in January 2018.
3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. Land Use Recovery Plan Action 21 directed the Council to change its District Plan in 2015 to facilitate residential development on Maori land in Maori Reserve 873. This include provision for phased cluster housing on conforming rural zoned properties.

3.2. Since these provisions became operative, a number of Whanau groups have progressed development proposals but none have gone onto completion at this stage. While issues of financing and finalising arrangements among descendent owners have been causes for delay, so too has arrangements to provide for and fund necessary servicing.

3.3. Unlike development of contiguous lots within a subdivision under the control of a single party, this situation involves discontinuous properties, multiple owners and parties who wish to progress incremental development for residential purposes over extended periods. Financing networked water and wastewater services in this situation is problematic and a barrier to expeditious development.

3.4. Recent discussions with the Upoko of Ngai Tuahuriri, Te Maire Tau, have sought to progress servicing along a segment of Tuahiwi Road between Topi to Road and Okaihau Road and along Topito Road for approximately 970 metres south of Tuahiwi Road. Water service is available along most of the length of these sections, but the current STEP sewerage scheme does not provide service for any of the area along Tuahiwi Road and most of the area along Topito Road.

3.5. To accelerate this servicing of wastewater, a funding contribution of $66,000 has been put forth by the Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga. This contribution would be divided equally between the two segments, or $33,000 per road, to be serviced and would be seen as a means of accelerating development in the area and leveraging the recently-adopted planning provisions for MR 873.

In the interim to facilitate development along Tuahiwi Road, a wastewater main would be extended from the existing Turiwhaia Pump Station to Waikoruru Road. The total cost for this extension would be approximately $109,469. After the Rununga contribution of $33,000 is subtracted from this amount, a total of $76,469 would be funded by the Council. To recover these costs, a connection charge of $2,250 per property wanting to connect would be required.

The connection cost of $2,250 was arrived at by assuming that, in the next 10 years, the 20 existing properties along Tuahiwi Road would connect to the new reticulation system and that an additional two parcels would be developed to their maximum 7 residences per parcel. This yields a total of 34 connections that would share in the Council-funded portion of $76,469 for the new reticulation system.

In addition to these connection costs, persons wanting to connect to the reticulation system in Tuahiwi Road would need to pay the following costs:

- **Development contributions** – costs that contribute to recouping the cost of the existing reticulation system and treatment plant infrastructure in Woodend and in the Eastern Districts Sewer Scheme.

- **Onsite costs** – the costs to install infrastructure within the property boundary to convey wastewater to the public mains, i.e. septic tanks, pumps, and service laterals. These costs would apply to new development requiring an entirely new septic system or homeowners choosing to replace their existing septic tank.
and pump. If a homeowner has an adequate septic tank and chooses to retain that tank and pump, then these costs would not apply.

The table below details each of these costs for the first ten connections along Tuahiwi Road.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Connection Cost</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Development Contributions (DC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Woodend DC</td>
<td>$231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Eastern Districts DC</td>
<td>$9,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Onsite Costs</td>
<td>$16,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Total incl. GST</td>
<td>$28,281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 – Costs Associated with Wastewater Connection

3.6. Wastewater flows for up to ten new connections in the Turiwhaia pump station catchment can be accommodated within the existing pump station. The above costs apply to those first ten houses to connect along Tuahiwi Road. Additional development beyond these ten homes, whether they occur along Tuahiwi Road, Topito Road, or elsewhere in the Turiwhaia pump station catchment, will trigger an upgrade to the pump station and reticulation downstream of the pump station. This upgrade would be funded by new development, replacements, and level of service charges. Provision for the pump station and reticulation upgrades is proposed in year two of the LTP budget at a cost of $1.934M. These costs would be recouped through development contributions and rates. Appropriate development contribution costs will be determined in the next financial year as part of the design of the pump station and downstream reticulation.

To achieve a sustainable solution, considerable engagement and consultation with the community will be required to determine an appropriate scale of reticulation upgrade and its feasible uptake duration.

3.7. Council staff are aware of a proposed development at 80 Topito Road. If this development moves forward as planned, then Council staff may bring forward a similar proposal for wastewater infrastructure along Topito Road.

3.8. The Management Team/CE has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Community views were canvased in relation to the planning provisions facilitating additional residential development in rural zoned MR873 and factored into the decision-making on the Plan Change at that time.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. Council faces the following financial implications to service Tuahiwi village with wastewater service.

5.1.1. To extend wastewater service along Tuahiwi Road, Council faces a financial contribution of $76,469. To service development in Tuahiwi Village beyond the ten homes mentioned earlier in this report, Council faces a $1.934M cost to make upgrades to the Turiwhaia pump station and
downstream reticulation. These costs would be recovered over a period of time as properties connect to the sewer system.

5.2. Council is at risk of development in the area not proceeding as planned or existing properties choosing to not connect to the sewer system. If Council chooses to install the infrastructure to service planned growth in the area but this development does not occur, then Council has no means to recover the infrastructure costs incurred.

6. CONTEXT

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

6.2. Legislation
The Local Government Act of 2002 is relevant in this matter.

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

1. Effect is given to the Treaty of Waitangi.

2. There is a safe environment for all.

Simon Markham
Strategy & Engagement Manager

Chris Parton
Wastewater Asset Manager
1. SUMMARY

1.1. There are four distinct purposes of this report. Each of these is detailed below.

1.2. The first is to seek approval from Council to bring forward funding of $35,720 into the 2017/18 financial year for a wastewater reticulation main extension in Tuahiwi Road. This budget was approved by Council on 7 November 2017, and funding for this extension was placed in the draft Long Term Plan for the 2018/19 financial year. This timeframe does not meet the required timeframe of Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga (the Runanga) and therefore needs to be accelerated. The amount of $35,720 provides for design fees and 25% of the cost of installing the main. The remaining 75% of the construction cost will remain in the 2018/19 financial year budget.

1.3. The second is to seek approval from Council to accept $33,000 from the Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga (the Runanga) toward the extension of wastewater reticulation in Topito Road from the existing Turiwhaia pump station to the vicinity of 61 Topito Road to serve a proposed development at 233 Tuahiwi Road. The total cost of this main extension is estimated at $86,109, with the Council portion estimated to be $53,109. This will be a new budget item placed in the draft Long Term Plan by staff submission for the 2018/19 financial year.

1.4. The third is to request funding of $8,908 for the current financial year to begin design of the main extension in Topito Road.

1.5. The fourth is to update Council on efforts toward developing a master plan for improving wastewater service in the Tuahiwi area.

Attachments

i. Map showing Tuahiwi Road Main Extension
ii. Map showing Topito Road Main Extension


2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180219017018.

(b) **Approves** the request to bring funding of $35,720 forward from the 2018/19 financial year in the draft Long Term Plan to the current financial year of 2017/18 for design and partial construction of the main extension in Tuahiwi Road.

(c) **Approves** a budget of $8,908 for the current financial year of 2017/18 to design a wastewater main extension in Topito Road.

(d) **Agrees** to enter into a private agreement with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga to receive $33,000 (incl. GST) towards the cost of implementing a STEP sewer main in Topito Road from Tuahiwi Road to 61 Topito Road at a total cost of $86,109.

(e) **Notes** that additional works to develop a master plan for wastewater service in the Tuahiwi area will be conducted in parallel to these main extensions, with extensive public engagement with residents of the Tuahiwi community beginning later in 2018.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

**Tuahiwi Road Reticulation Extension**

3.1. At a meeting on 7 November 2017, Council approved a request to enter into an agreement with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga to receive $33,000 toward the construction of a wastewater reticulation main in Tuahiwi Road and to fund the remaining cost of this construction. Council’s portion of this construction is estimated to be $76,470. This is detailed in Trim report number 171020113861. The location of this main is shown in Figure 1.

3.2. Council’s portion of the design and construction of this wastewater main was included in the draft Long Term Plan for the 2018/19 financial year, with design currently planned to commence in July 2018.

3.3. Recent discussions with representatives of Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga indicate that this timeframe is not adequate and will potentially hinder progress toward development of single-family cluster housing in the Tuahiwi area.

3.4. In order for development to progress in the timeframe desired, design and construction of the main extension needs to begin before the start of the 2018/19 financial year.

3.5. Resources internal to Council’s Project Delivery Unit (PDU) can design and call for tenders for the main extension in the timeframe required to service the development. Therefore, Council staff requests that funding for design and 25% of construction of this main extension be made available in the 2017/18 financial year. The amount of funding to be brought forward into the current financial year is $35,720. The remaining amount of $45,750 will be placed in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan.
**Topito Road Extension**

3.6. During a recent meeting with representatives from Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga, plans to construct cluster housing at 233 Tuahiwi Road were also discussed. The builder of these homes wishes to connect to Council’s wastewater scheme.

3.7. A wastewater reticulation extension along Topito Road from the existing Turiwhaia pump station to the vicinity of 61 Topito Road would be required for these new homes to connect to Council’s scheme. The cost of this main extension is estimated to be $86,109 for construction, professional fees, and contingency. The location of this main is shown in Figure 2.

3.8. The Runanga has offered to contribute $33,000 (incl. GST) toward the extension of this main. The balance of the works is $58,059 after the Runanga contribution is deducted. This amount would be paid by Council. Budget provision for this main extension will be placed in year 1 of the draft Long Term Plan by staff submission.

3.9. These costs would be recovered by a connection cost of $3,056 per property. This was arrived at by assuming that the 9 existing properties along Topito Road that aren’t connected to public reticulation would connect to the system and that two additional properties along Topito Road will develop to their full potential in the next 10 years. This yields a total of 19 new connections to share in the Council-funded portion of $58,059 for the new reticulation system.

3.10. To ensure that the timeframe of the developers is met, design and tendering for the works needs to commence in the current financial year. Resources internal to PDU can design and call for tenders for the main extension in the timeframe required to service the development. Therefore, Council staff request that funding for the design of this main extension in the amount of $8,908 be made available in the 2017/18 financial year.

**Master Plan for Wastewater Service in Tuahiwi**

3.11. In addition to these main extensions in the Tuahiwi area, Council staff will begin working on a master plan for servicing the Tuahiwi community with reticulated wastewater. This master plan will include anticipated reticulation extensions needed, estimated upgrades to the Turiwhaia pump station, and funding strategies for the work necessary to upgrade wastewater service in the Tuahiwi community.

3.12. A significant portion of this planning process will involve consulting with the Tuahiwi community to identify those properties that plan to develop in the next 10 to 15 years, as well as existing properties that don’t plan to develop but that would still like to connect to a public wastewater system.

3.13. This information, along with estimated costs for reticulation and pump station upgrades, will be used to develop an appropriate development contribution for the Tuahiwi scheme.

3.14. The main output of this master plan will shape the extent of the public wastewater scheme in the Tuahiwi area.
4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. The public has not been consulted on this matter to date; however, funding for the main extension in Tuahiwi Road is included in the Long Term Plan which is currently out for public consultation. Therefore, the public will have ample opportunity to review that project.

4.2. Extensive public consultation will be conducted as part of the master planning efforts. This consultation will be geared toward identifying those properties which might develop in the future and those properties that have a desire to connect to a public wastewater scheme in the future.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. Council faces the following financial implications to service Tuahiwi village with wastewater service.

5.1.1. To extend wastewater service along Tuahiwi Road, Council’s share is $76,469.

5.1.2. To extend wastewater service along Topito Road, Council’s share is $53,109.

5.1.3. Once upgrades to the existing Turiwhaia pump station are required, Council’s share will be approximately $1.934M.

5.2. These costs will be recovered through development contributions over a period of time as properties connect to the sewer system.

5.3. Council is at risk of development in the area not proceeding as planned or existing properties choosing to not connect to the sewer system. If Council chooses to install the infrastructure to service planned growth in the area but this development does not occur, then Council has no means to recover the infrastructure costs incurred.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Legislation**

The Local Government Act of 2002 is relevant in this matter.

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

This report relates to the following community outcomes:

- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable and affordable manner.
Figure 1 – Tuahiwi Road Main Extension
Figure 2 – Topito Road Main Extension
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: SEW-03-04-05 / 171020113861

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 7 November 2017

FROM: Chris Parton, Wastewater Asset Manager
Simon Markham, Manager Strategy & Engagement

SUBJECT: Tuahiwi Sewerage Extension

SIGNED BY:

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval to enter into private agreements with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga and private property owners to extend the STEP sewerage scheme in Tuahiwi to facilitate development in accordance with revised planning provisions applying to MR873.

Attachments:
iv. Map of the Tuahiwi village area

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(f) Receives report No. 171020113861.

(g) Agrees to enter into a private agreement with Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga to receive $33,000 towards the cost of implementing a STEP sewer main in Tuahiwi Road from Topito Road to Waikoruru Road at a total cost of $109,470 (incl. GST).

(h) Approves a connection charge of $2,250 per dwelling unit for the first ten units to connect to the sewer along this length of Tuahiwi Road.

(i) Notes that those connecting to the service would be required to also pay development contributions required for the Eastern Districts Sewerage Scheme Ocean Outfall and the Woodend reticulation system and treatment plant at the sum of $9,471.

(j) Notes that further extensions of the STEP scheme in the vicinity will likely give rise to the need to upgrade the capacity of the Turiwhai pumping station and further recoveries of these costs will need to be made via an additional development contribution.

(k) Notes that the costs of that upgrade is included in draft LTP budgets for the Council’s consideration in January 2018.
3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. Land Use Recovery Plan Action 21 directed the Council to change its District Plan in 2015 to facilitate residential development on Maori land in Maori Reserve 873. This include provision for phased cluster housing on conforming rural zoned properties.

3.2. Since these provisions became operative, a number of Whanau groups have progressed development proposals but none have gone onto completion at this stage. While issues of financing and finalising arrangements among descendent owners have been causes for delay, so too has arrangements to provide for and fund necessary servicing.

3.3. Unlike development of contiguous lots within a subdivision under the control of a single party, this situation involves discontinuous properties, multiple owners and parties who wish to progress incremental development for residential purposes over extended periods. Financing networked water and wastewater services in this situation is problematic and a barrier to expeditious development.

3.4. Recent discussions with the Upoko of Ngai Tuahuriri, Te Maire Tau, have sought to progress servicing along a segment of Tuahiwi Road between Topi to Road and Okahau Road and along Topito Road for approximately 970 metres south of Tuahiwi Road. Water service is available along most of the length of these sections, but the current STEP sewerage scheme does not provide service for any of the area along Tuahiwi Road and most of the area along Topito Road.

3.5. To accelerate this servicing of wastewater, a funding contribution of $66,000 has been put forth by the Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga. This contribution would be divided equally between the two segments, or $33,000 per road, to be serviced and would be seen as a means of accelerating development in the area and leveraging the recently-adopted planning provisions for MR 873.

In the interim to facilitate development along Tuahiwi Road, a wastewater main would be extended from the existing Turiwhaia Pump Station to Waikoruru Road. The total cost for this extension would be approximately $109,469. After the Rununga contribution of $33,000 is subtracted from this amount, a total of $76,469 would be funded by the Council. To recover these costs, a connection charge of $2,250 per property wanting to connect would be required.

The connection cost of $2,250 was arrived at by assuming that, in the next 10 years, the 20 existing properties along Tuahiwi Road would connect to the new reticulation system and that an additional two parcels would be developed to their maximum 7 residences per parcel. This yields a total of 34 connections that would share in the Council-funded portion of $76,469 for the new reticulation system.

In addition to these connection costs, persons wanting to connect to the reticulation system in Tuahiwi Road would need to pay the following costs:

- Development contributions – costs that contribute to recouping the cost of the existing reticulation system and treatment plant infrastructure in Woodend and in the Eastern Districts Sewer Scheme.

- Onsite costs – the costs to install infrastructure within the property boundary to convey wastewater to the public mains, i.e. septic tanks, pumps, and service laterals. These costs would apply to new development requiring an entirely new septic system or homeowners choosing to replace their existing septic tank
and pump. If a homeowner has an adequate septic tank and chooses to retain that tank and pump, then these costs would not apply.

The table below details each of these costs for the first ten connections along Tuahiwi Road.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Connection Cost</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Development Contributions (DC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Woodend DC</td>
<td>$231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Eastern Districts DC</td>
<td>$9,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Onsite Costs</td>
<td>$16,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Total incl. GST</td>
<td>$28,281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 – Costs Associated with Wastewater Connection

3.6. Wastewater flows for up to ten new connections in the Turiwhaia pump station catchment can be accommodated within the existing pump station. The above costs apply to those first ten houses to connect along Tuahiwi Road. Additional development beyond these ten homes, whether they occur along Tuahiwi Road, Topito Road, or elsewhere in the Turiwhaia pump station catchment, will trigger an upgrade to the pump station and reticulation downstream of the pump station. This upgrade would be funded by new development, replacements, and level of service charges. Provision for the pump station and reticulation upgrades is proposed in year two of the LTP budget at a cost of $1.934 Million. These costs would be recouped through development contributions and rates. Appropriate development contribution costs will be determined in the next financial year as part of the design of the pump station and downstream reticulation.

To achieve a sustainable solution, considerable engagement and consultation with the community will be required to determine an appropriate scale of reticulation upgrade and its feasible uptake duration.

3.7. Council staff are aware of a proposed development at 80 Topito Road. If this development moves forward as planned, then Council staff may bring forward a similar proposal for wastewater infrastructure along Topito Road.

3.8. The Management Team/CE has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Community views were canvased in relation to the planning provisions facilitating additional residential development in rural zoned MR873 and factored into the decision-making on the Plan Change at that time.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. Council faces the following financial implications to service Tuahiwi village with wastewater service.

5.1.1. To extend wastewater service along Tuahiwi Road, Council faces a financial contribution of $76,469. To service development in Tuahiwi Village beyond the ten homes mentioned earlier in this report, Council
faces a $1.934M cost to make upgrades to the Turiwhaia pump station and downstream reticulation. These costs would be recovered over a period of time as properties connect to the sewer system.

5.2. Council is at risk of development in the area not proceeding as planned or existing properties choosing to not connect to the sewer system. If Council chooses to install the infrastructure to service planned growth in the area but this development does not occur, then Council has no means to recover the infrastructure costs incurred.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Legislation**

The Local Government Act of 2002 is relevant in this matter.

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

This report relates to the following community outcomes:

1. Effect is given to the Treaty of Waitangi.
2. There is a safe environment for all.

Simon Markham     Chris Parton
Strategy & Engagement Manager   Wastewater Asset Manager
Appendix A: Maps Showing Previously Proposed Works

Figure 1: Previously Proposed Tuahiwi Road Main Extension
Figure 2: Previously Proposed Topito Road Main Extension
Appendix B: Maps Showing Current Proposed Works

Figure 3: Approximate Current Proposed Tuahiwi Road Wastewater Main Extension (Orange Line)
Figure 4: Approximate Current Proposed Topito Road Wastewater Main Extension (Orange Line)
Figure 5: Approximate Current Proposed Topito Road Water Main Extension (Turquoise Line)
Appendix C: Topito Road Roading Upgrades

Figure 6: Topito Road, (Sealed Green Line, Distance to 233’s Frontage Orange Line, & Distance to 80’s Frontage Red Line)
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: SHW-02-01 / 190221020361

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 5 March 2019

FROM: Kitty Waghorn, Solid Waste Asset Manager

SUBJECT: Branding of Solid Waste Contracts and Services Information and Educational Material

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

Department Manager

Acting Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report is to seek confirmation from Council that the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party have delegated authority to approve the Brand and design of the kerbside collection information pamphlets, facilities signage and other educational material for Solid Waste contracts and services.

1.2 Staff are working with Beck & Caul to design the information pamphlets for Council’s new bin services. The information in the pamphlets will be updated to include the organics and rubbish bin collection services. We consider that it is timely to refresh the Brand or overall look of the pamphlets and to tie in that look to the transfer station and resource recovery park signage.

1.3 We intend to create a Brand that reflects our commitment to reducing the amount of waste going to landfill, that can be used across our solid waste services and educational material in a variety of ways, and that will help us encourage behaviour change in a positive way.

1.4 In order to meet the timelines for developing the brand, designing the promotional materials, truck branding, and printing and packaging the information packs to accompany the new bins when deliveries begin in mid-April, staff are working on a tight schedule. The designs need to be signed off before the end of March to meet these deadlines. We wish to have Councillor involvement in the development phase but the Council’s meeting schedule doesn’t fit within these timeframes.

1.5 Under their terms of reference the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party (SHWWP) has delegated authority “to decide on all matters relating to Solid and Hazardous Waste that do not have an affect on the Annual Plan and Budget”. Staff are seeking confirmation from Council that this includes sign-off of the Brand and look of the promotional materials, which will be circulated to the members of the working party for initial feedback, and finalised at a proposed meeting on 20 March.

Attachments:

i. WDC Recycling Guide Current Pamphlet (190221020510)
ii. Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party Terms of Reference (161214128948)
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

   **THAT** the Council:

   (a) **Receives** report No. 190221020361.

   (b) **Confirms** that the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party has delegated authority to approve the Brand and to sign-off the promotional materials.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 The existing kerbside collection information pamphlet is based on the “Recycle Waimakariri” brand: it contains information about the Council’s recycling and rubbish bag collection services as well as additional information about reducing waste that is best placed on the website.

3.2 The graphics were developed in early 2011 when the Council was replacing recycling crates with recycling bins. When the resource recovery park was opened in late 2011, the signage was designed to match the “Recycle Waimakariri” design guidelines. Calendars have continued to match this brand, as have some advertisements, but more recent advertisements don’t follow the same brand guidelines.

3.3 Now that the Council is introducing rubbish and organics bin services, the contents of the kerbside collection information pamphlet needs to be refreshed. With the introduction of these new kerbside bin services, and the change in focus to divert more materials at our solid waste facilities, it is also timely to revisit the Branding or ‘look’ of our information pamphlets, site signage, collection truck branding, advertisements about solid waste services and other educational material.

3.4 Staff are working with Beck & Caul (B&C) to create a new Brand, and B&C will provide graphic elements and design guidelines that Council can use in-house to use for advertisements and other informational packages in future years.

3.5 The designs need to be signed off before the end of March in order to meet the timelines for printing and packaging the information packs that will accompany the new bins when deliveries begin in mid-April. Staff are working on a tight schedule to meet the deadlines for developing the brand, designing the promotional materials, and signing off on the materials which includes truck branding.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1 The “Recycle Waimakariri” brand is specific to kerbside and transfer station recycling, and staff consider that altering the wording of this to cover the rubbish bin and organics bin services is impractical. While residents are familiar with the “Your Choice” graphics, these were only developed for one very specific campaign. These graphics cannot easily be used for signage at our facilities, and the font is not easy to read at a glance.

4.2 Staff consider that a new brand and taglines need to be created to reflect our commitment to reducing the amount of waste going to landfill, it must be able to be used across our solid waste services and educational material in a variety of ways, and to help us encourage behaviour change in a positive way.

4.3 The Brand needs to be finalised in early March, and the final designs finalised by the last week of March in order to meet the deadlines to print, package and deliver the information packs to Waste Management so that the packs can be delivered with the bins. The website needs to be updated and advertising needs to be developed by late March to alert residents to the upcoming deliveries, and provide information about the new services.
4.4. Given the importance of the image that Council portrays, we are seeking Councillor input into the development of the brand and information packages, however the Council’s and Utilities & Roading Committee’s meeting deadlines do not fit within the timeframe staff are working to.

4.5. It is appropriate that this material is considered by the SHWWP, as the working party was formed to be responsible for considering issues relating to Solid and Hazardous Waste, ensure the effective implementation of the Waste Management Plan and plan for future directions and initiatives in waste management and minimisation.

4.6. Staff propose to circulate the initial brand concepts to the members of the SHWWP in early March, to obtain their feedback, and to seek the working party’s final approval for the final branding designs at a meeting proposed for 20 March 2019.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

Staff from different Council departments and the Solid & Hazardous Waste Working Party will have input into the design concepts.

5.2. Wider Community

This will not be put to the wider community.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

If the Brand is not finalised in a timely manner, the documentation design and printing will not be completed within the necessary timeframes. There would be additional costs involved with having the information packs delivered separately to the rubbish and organics bins, but this cost has not been estimated.

6.2. Community Implications

If the information packs are not fit for purpose, and if they are not delivered with the bins, there will be a considerable amount of confusion in the community around what can be placed in the bins and when the bins can start being used.

6.3. Risk Management

Utilising the SHWWP to provide input into the design process and approve the final branding of solid waste services will reduce the risk of missing the deadline for approval of the final branding and documentation.

This will ensure that the deadline for sending the design files for printing the information packs is met, and that advertisements and the website can be developed with sufficient lead time for the information to be in the public arena before the bin deliveries start, and so the collection trucks can be branded prior to the start of the contract.
6.4. Health and Safety

There are no specific health and safety concerns related to the design of a brand for promotional and educational 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

Local Government Act – delegations to working parties

7.3. Community Outcomes

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

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

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

7.4. Delegations

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.

Kitty Waghorn
Solid Waste Asset Manager
Your recycling bin is for items like...

- Newspapers & magazines
- Rinsed food tins
- Glass jars (put lids in the rubbish)
- Cereal boxes
- Cardboard packaging
- Telephone directories
- Tetra pak cartons
- Glass bottles (put lids in the rubbish)
- Envelopes & junk mail
- Yoghurt pottles
- Ice cream containers
- Cardboard
- Egg cartons
- Wire bottles (put lids in the rubbish)
- Shampoo & Conditioner bottles (put lids in the rubbish)
- Plastic bags
- Plastic pottles
- Aerosols
- Plastic bottles (put lids in the rubbish)
- Plastic drink bottles (put lids in the rubbish)
- Pizza boxes
- Aluminium cans
- Cleaning bottles (put lids in the rubbish)

What not to put in your recycling bin:
- Ash (hot or cold)
- Batteries
- Bubble wrap
- Car parts & scrap metal
- Ceramics, crockery and porcelain
- Flimsy plastic packaging
- Food & garden waste
- Gas bottles
- Hoses & plastic tubing
- Lightbulbs (normal & eco)
- Liquids
- Meat trays (polystyrene)
- Medical waste
- Mirrors
- Nappies
- Paint or chemicals
- Plastic wrap
- Polythene
- Rubbish
- Strapping (plastic or steel)
- Syringes & needles
- Toys
- Tyres & rubber
- VHS & music tapes
- Window or windscreen glass.

Recycling one glass jar saves enough energy to power a light bulb for four hours.

Recycling one aluminium can saves enough power to run a computer for three hours.

Every tonne of paper and cardboard recycled saves 13 trees.
Your kerbside recycling and rubbish collection service

All occupied properties inside the Council’s kerbside collection areas are rated separately for, and are eligible to receive, the Council’s kerbside recycling collection services. Therefore they are all provided with a recycling wheelie bin. Only WDC branded black rubbish bags can be put out for collection, and these can be bought from any WDC service centre and most local supermarkets. WDC’s rubbish bags are collected every week. Recycling wheelie bins are collected every two weeks, on the same day as the rubbish collection.

The recycling bin is labelled with your property’s address, your collection day and collection week. The Week 1 and Week 2 calendars are printed opposite with the collection weeks highlighted in yellow. You can write your collection day on the appropriate calendar as a reminder.

Check www.waimakariri.govt.nz for more information about the kerbside collections,
or call Council’s customer services department on 0800 965 468 (0800 WMY GOV).

Bin placement

Place your wheelie bin and rubbish bag at the kerbside in front of your house by 7 a.m. on your collection day (you can put the bin out the night before).

• Place your bin at the kerb or on the grass verge or brim close to the road, but please don’t block the footpath or driveways.
• Face the wheels and handle of the bin toward your house (away from the road).
• Don’t put the bin too close to trees, power poles, light poles, fences, cars or other bins. If a car is in the way place the bin in front of the car, if possible.
• Please don’t overfill your bin. the bin lid must be completely closed.
• Please don’t put rubbish bags on top of the bin.

Why might my recycling bin not get collected?

You may have put something non-recyclable in the bin.

• Broken glass, broken china or other sharp objects.
• Explosives, flammable or flammable materials.
• Hazardous or toxic waste.
• Liquids, including oil or paint.
• Radioactive waste (such as domestic smoke detectors).
• Uncleaned recyclable material.
• Special Wastes or Prohibited Wastes.

What to do if...

• You have missed the recycling bin or rubbish bag collection.
• You have a damaged or stolen bin.

Call the Council’s customer services department on 0800 965 468 (0800 WMY GOV).

Your recycling bin or rubbish bag was presented correctly and was not by the kerb time, but has been missed on your collection day.

Your recycling bin has been damaged or stolen.

How can you get rid of the items you can’t put in the rubbish bag?

Broken glass or crockery

Small amounts of broken glass or crockery can be put in a plastic container. e.g. a litre ice cream container and placed beside your rubbish bag for the collector to pick up. Large pieces or larger quantities of broken glass or crockery should be taken to Southbrook Resource Recovery Park (RRP) or Oxford Transfer station for disposal.

Hot ashes

Hot ashes should be put in a metal can or on your garden for at least 3 days to cool down before they are put in your rubbish bag or rubbish bin.

Household Hazardous Waste

Household chemicals, garden sprays, pool chemicals, paint, engine oil, gas cylinders and other such hazardous materials threaten human safety and will harm the environment if not disposed of properly.

• Unsuitable, unwanted water-based and paint could be donated to a community group or school. You can also take unwanted paint to participating communities stores or ReStore Colour shops in Christchurch. These stores paint the paint away to be recycled.

• ‘Domestic’ quantities of household hazardous waste are collected if you drop them off at Southbrook RRP or Oxford Transfer station free of charge. (10 litres or 20 kg).

Do not put hazardous wastes in the RRP bag, rubbish bag or refuse pit.

• Don’t your liquid hazardous wastes into the ground, or into drains or sewers.

• Please return unwanted medicines to your pharmacy or doctor. don’t flush them down the toilet or put them in your rubbish.

Commercial hazardous waste

Please check in the Yellow Pages for companies who specialise in removal of commercial quantities of hazardous wastes.

Agricultural Chemicals & AgChem Containers

For chemicals and chemical containers disposed, see www.agcure.co.nz and www.plastback.co.nz

Other ways to reduce your waste

To Reduce, you can...

• Choose products with little or no packaging.
• Buy in bulk to reduce packaging.
• Put a ‘no circulars’ or ‘no junk mail’ sticker on your letterbox.

To Recycle, you could...

• Take your own reusable bags or baskets to the shop and say no to plastic bags.
• Buy recyclable, long lasting, separable products instead of disposable items.
• Store food or other small items in empty plastic jars and containers.
• Save wrapping paper and boxes to use again.
• Donate unwanted clothes or household items to opportunities shops, to your local school, church or kindergarden or drop off at our Bulk Waste Store in Southbrook RRP.

• Shop second-hand for “pre-loved” items.

• Salvaged unwanted items instead by swapping them away (you can do online or hold a garage sale).

More Recycling options...

You can recycle a greater range of materials at Southbrook RRP or Oxford transfer station than we collect at the kerbside, and also some household items: most of these can be disposed of free of charge.

• Food scraps and garden waste: you can compost your food scraps and garden waste at home, and grow your own vegetables and fruits to save on shopping bills.

• Garden waste: separate compostable materials can be taken to Southbrook RRP or Oxford transfer station, and it costs less than rubbish to dispose of.

• Scrap steel, car batteries & whiteware: can be disposed of at Southbrook RRP or Oxford transfer station, free of charge.

• Kerbside recyclables: Plastic containers & lids, all plastic types, supermarket carry bags, glass bottles and jars, aluminium cans and steel tins. Talc, caraboo, drink and milk cartons are accepted free of charge at Southbrook RRR or Oxford transfer station.

• Waste oil: domestic quantities are accepted at Southbrook RRP or Oxford transfer station, no charge (maximum size 20 litre container).

• Polystyrene packaging: food meal trays can be dropped off for recycling at Southbrook RRP but it must be clean and dry, and there is a charge.

• Clothing: can be put in the clothing bins located around the towns or at a local charity shop.

• Aluminium cans: some schools have cages for cans, as a fund raiser.

• Slat wrap: for disposal, recycling of bale or slat wrap, vine, nuts, polyethylene bags, twine, and other thin plastic. see www.plastback.co.nz

Thank you for recycling. Remember, you make the difference.
Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party

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 Council's 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 2019 Local Body Elections to elect the Mayor, ten Councillors and board members to each of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi, Woodend-Sefton, Rangiora-Ashley and Oxford-Ohoka Community Boards will be held on Saturday 12 October 2019. This report seeks to confirm the voting order of candidates on the voting papers.

1.2. Every six years the Council is required to undertake a Representation Review which involves review and consultation on the number of elected members, community boards and community areas of the district. Staff will commence the next Review process from mid-2020 with the Determination finalised in April 2022, ahead of the October 2022 Local Body elections.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No 190220019931.

(b) **Resolves** to use the Random order for showing the names on the voting documents for the October 2019 Local Body Elections.

(c) **Notes** the Council's resolution of August 2014 to conduct the 2016 and 2019 Local Authority elections by way of the postal voting method using First Past the Post (FPP) system.

2. **BACKGROUND**

2.1. Prior to the introduction of the Local Electoral Act 2001 it was required that the names shown on the voting documents be in alphabetical order. The regulations allows the Local Authority to decide whether the names are to be arranged in alphabetical order, pseudo-random or random order.

2.2. Council resolved to use random order in 2004, 2007, 2010, 2013 and 2016. Due to an error during the voting paper production stage, the final order of candidates in 2007 was alphabetical. There are improved systems in place to reduce any risk of incorrectly printed voting papers.
3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. Since 2004 the Council has resolved to use random order of candidate names on voting papers.

Features of these systems are:
- (i) Alphabetical. This is self-explanatory. This was used by all local authorities prior to 2004.
- (ii) Pseudo-random. Under this system all candidates’ names are drawn from a hat by the Electoral Officer and are placed on all voting papers for that election issue in that order drawn.
- (iii) Random. Under this system the names are shown in different order on each and every voting document, utilising software, which permits the names of the candidates to be laser printed in a different order on each paper.

3.2. If no choice is made the names are shown alphabetically of surname.

3.3. Based on fairness it is recommended the Random system be used.

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

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. **Groups and Organisations**
- There has been no consultation with groups or organisations.

4.2. **Wider Community**
- There has been no consultation with the wider community. From past years when elections and by-elections have been held there has been no negative feedback received related to the order of candidates are listed. The random listing is considered the fairest method for all voters and candidates.

5. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. **Financial Implications**
- Election related costs, including printing of vote papers are met within existing Council election budgets. There is no additional cost factors associated with the printing of the voting papers in random order. Printing of voting papers is included in the operational election budget.

5.2. **Community Implications**
- Random order is seen as the fairest system for all voters and candidates.

5.3. **Risk Management**
- There could be a risk or perception of risk to the transparency of democracy if another method other than random order is used on the voting papers.

5.4. **Health and Safety**
- No health and safety aspects applicable.
6. **CONTEXT**

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

6.2. **Legislation**
Local Electoral Regulations 2001, section 31.

6.3. **Community Outcomes**
There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision-making by local, regional and national organisations that affect our District.

6.4. **Delegations**
The Council must determine the voting paper order and cannot delegate its responsibility.
If no decision is made, the order of names on the voting papers will be alphabetical.

S Nichols
Governance Manager
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is for the Council to receive information in relation to elected members’ remuneration for the period of 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019 and to seek endorsement of the elected members expenses policy. The Remuneration Authority will subsequently endorse the elected members’ policy.

1.2. In November 2018 the Remuneration Authority issued the Local Government Members (2018/19) (Local Authorities) Amendment Determination 2018 which affected the vehicle mileage allowances entitled to be claimed by elected members. Therefore the expenses policy is required to be updated and endorsed by the Authority.

Attachments:


2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190224021130.

(b) Acknowledges the Remuneration Authority determination from 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019 for the Mayor of $123,068pa, Deputy Mayor $46,913pa, Councillors $42,011pa, Rangiora-Ashley Community Board Chair $22,105pa and Board members $11,052pa; Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board Chair $17,137pa and Board members $8,569pa; Woodend-Sefton Community Board Chair $14,158pa and Board members $7,080pa; Oxford-Ohoka Community Board Chair $16,145 and Board members $8,072.

(c) Confirms the Elected Members Expenses Policy S-CP 1035, 5 March 2019 (v13) for approval by the Remuneration Authority.

(d) Notes the Remuneration Authority will issue a new determination for the period of 1 July 2019 to 12 October 2019 and notes Remuneration Authority communications on the changes proposed to the remuneration determination following the 2019-22 elections.

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

3.1 The Remuneration Authority is an independent agency that sets the rates of remuneration for elected members. It normally sets a Determination from 1 July to 30 June, except in election year when separate determinations cover the periods 1 July to mid-October, and then mid-October to 30 June the following year.

3.2 The Remuneration Authority set the standard Determination for 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019. It subsequently set another determination in November 2018 that affected the vehicle mileage allowance that elected members are entitled to claim. This report updates the Council and Community Board Expenses Policy (S-CP 1035) to reflect the Remuneration Authority changes.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. Elected Member Remuneration as per the July 2018 – June 2019 Determination is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Increased Value</th>
<th>1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019 (pa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>$4,811</td>
<td>$123,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Mayor</td>
<td>$1,032</td>
<td>$46,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillors (as portfolio holders)</td>
<td>$924</td>
<td>$42,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora-Ashley Board Chairperson</td>
<td>$327</td>
<td>$22,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora-Ashley Board member</td>
<td>$163</td>
<td>$11,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Board Chairperson</td>
<td>$253</td>
<td>$17,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Board member</td>
<td>$127</td>
<td>$8,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford-Ohoka Board Chairperson</td>
<td>$239</td>
<td>$16,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford-Ohoka Board member</td>
<td>$119</td>
<td>$8,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend-Sefton Board Chairperson</td>
<td>$209</td>
<td>$14,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend-Sefton Board member</td>
<td>$105</td>
<td>$7,080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. All Councillors are Committee Chairs and Portfolio holders during their time of the 2016-19 electoral period, therefore receiving slightly more than a Councillor base rate.

4.3. The Elected Members expenses policy is attached and outlines the reimbursements available for the Councillors and Community Board members.

4.4. The July 2018 Determination included provision of maximum prices paid for vehicles (including hybrid or electric) for the Mayor. The Mayor, nor any elected member has an allocated Council purchased vehicle for private or business use.

4.5. The July 2018 Determination had an allowance payable as follows:

The allowance payable to a member for eligible travel is,—
4.6. In November 2018 the Remuneration Authority issued an amendment that affected vehicle mileage allowance on or after 1 December 2018 being:

The allowance payable to a member for eligible travel on and after 1 December 2018 is,—

(a) for a petrol or diesel vehicle,—
   (i) 76 cents per kilometre for the first 14,000 kilometres of eligible travel during the term of this determination; and
   (ii) 26 cents per kilometre after the first 14,000 kilometres of eligible travel during the term of this determination:

(b) for a petrol hybrid vehicle,—
   (i) 76 cents per kilometre for the first 14,000 kilometres of eligible travel during the term of this determination; and
   (ii) 18 cents per kilometre after the first 14,000 kilometres of eligible travel during the term of this determination:

(c) for an electric vehicle,—
   (i) 76 cents per kilometre for the first 14,000 kilometres of eligible travel during the term of this determination; and
   (ii) 9 cents per kilometre after the first 14,000 kilometres of eligible travel during the term of this determination.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations
   Refer to below comment.

5.2. Wider Community
   The Remuneration Authority is an independent Government Authority which sets the elected member remuneration.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications
   Remuneration has been provided for in the Long Term Plan and Annual Plan under the Governance budgets.

   At the beginning of the electoral term an increase in remuneration was sought for the 2016-19 term for Councillors for additional duties anticipated relating to the District Plan Review. This was rejected by the Remuneration Authority.

6.2. Community Implications
   Nil.

6.3. Risk Management
   Nil.

6.4. Health and Safety
   Nil.
7. **CONTEXT**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

7.3. **Community Outcomes**
Public organisations make information about their plans and activities readily available.

7.4. **Delegations**
The Council is required to endorse the Remuneration Authority determination.

Sarah Nichols
Governance Manager
COUNCIL AND COMMUNITY BOARD EXPENSES
(from 5 March 2019 covering 1 December 2018 to 30 June 2019)

1. Introduction

The Local Government Act 2002 has given the Remuneration Authority the responsibility for setting remuneration, approving expense rules and setting the mileage allowance for elected members.

2. Policy Context

2.1 Policy Principles

Elected members should be reimbursed for actual and reasonable expenses they incur in carrying out their official duties.

Reimbursement of expenses apply only to elected members personally and only while they are acting in their official capacity as elected members.

Elected members’ expense expenditure must have a justifiable business purpose, is moderate and conservative having regard to the circumstances, is made transparently and is appropriate in all respects.

2.2 Legislative Context


Local Government Members (2018/19) (Certain Local Authorities) Determination 2018
Local Government Members (2018/19) (Local Authorities) Amendment Determination 2018

3. Policy Objective

To establish guidelines on claiming of expenses by elected members.

4. Policy Statement

4.1 Remuneration, allowances and hearing fees

(1) A member of a local authority or a board is entitled to—
   (a) the applicable remuneration set out in the Schedule (adjusted in accordance with clause 9 if applicable):
   (b) the applicable allowances payable in accordance with clauses 10 to 13:
   (c) the applicable hearing fees payable in accordance with clause 14.

(2) If a member of a territorial authority is also elected or appointed to a board, the member is entitled only to the remuneration that is payable to the member as a member of the territorial authority.
COUNCIL AND COMMUNITY BOARD EXPENSES
(from 5 March 2019 covering 1 December 2018 to 30 June 2019)

4.14.2 Acting mayor or chairperson

(1) This clause applies to a member who acts as a mayor or chairperson during a period when, because of a vacancy or temporary absence, the remuneration or allowances that would usually be paid to the mayor or chairperson are not being paid.

(2) While acting as mayor or chairperson, the member must be paid the remuneration and allowances usually payable to the mayor or chairperson, instead of the member’s usual remuneration, allowances, and hearing fees.

4.24.3 RMA Resource Consent Hearing Costs

Where an elected member (Councillor or Community Board member*) is appointed to an RMA Resource Consent Hearing Panel by the Council, or one of its Standing Committees remuneration and allowances are payable as outlined in the Local Government Members (2018/19) (Local Authorities) Determination 2018, Section 7, 8, 10 and 145. (or subsequent Determinations)

- Chairperson of an RMA Resource Consent hearing is entitled to be paid a fee of up to $100 per hour of RMA hearing time.
- Panel member whom is not Chairperson of RMA Resource Consent hearing is entitled to be paid a fee of up to $80 per hour of RMA hearing time.
- For any period of hearing time that is less than one hour, the fee must be apportioned accordingly.
- RMA Resource Consent hearing fees are not payable to mayors.

- Any/all elected members whom Waimakariri District Council appoints to a RMA Resource Management hearing must be suitably qualified by holding a current accreditation on behalf of the Ministry for the Environment having successfully completed the “Making Good Decisions” programme.

4.34.4 Reimbursement of Conference Costs

Where an elected member attends a conference approved by the Council or a Community Board, all actual and reasonable costs associated with the conference or seminar will be met by the Council. This includes meal, accommodation costs and travel costs. The most cost effective means of travel must be used.

4.44.5 Accommodation and Meals

Accommodation and meals will be reimbursed based on actual and reasonable costs, as determined by the Mayor. In respect of the Mayor, assessment of actual and reasonable costs shall be determined by the Chair of the Audit and Risk Committee together with the Chief Executive. Where private accommodation is used a claim of $50 per night can be made.
COUNCIL AND COMMUNITY BOARD EXPENSES
(from 5 March 2019 covering 1 December 2018 to 30 June 2019)

Meals will be reimbursed based on actual and reasonable costs. Claims are to be supported by receipts.

4.54.6 Vehicle Mileage Allowance

Mileage will be paid in accordance with Remuneration Authority (April 2016–November 2018).

The maximum rate payable for mileage reimbursement is determined by the Remuneration Authority. Where mileage is claimed it will be paid in accordance with the current rate for reimbursement, which is: 74 cents per kilometre up to 5,000 kilometres per annum and 37 cents per kilometre above 5,000 kilometres.

Elected members may use the Rangiora, Kaiapoi or Oxford Service centres, whichever may be the closest, to commence their claim for mileage, subject to the claim not being in excess of the actual distance driven, effective from 1 April 2016.

Alternatively, a threshold of 30 kilometres for any one event applies (ie. round trip).

The allowance payable to a member for eligible travel on and after 1 December 2018 is,—

(a) for a petrol or diesel vehicle,—

(i) 76 cents per kilometre for the first 14,000 kilometres of eligible travel during the term of this determination; and

(ii) 26 cents per kilometre after the first 14,000 kilometres of eligible travel during the term of this determination:

(b) for a petrol hybrid vehicle,—

(i) 76 cents per kilometre for the first 14,000 kilometres of eligible travel during the term of this determination; and

(ii) 18 cents per kilometre after the first 14,000 kilometres of eligible travel during the term of this determination:

(c) for an electric vehicle,—

(i) 76 cents per kilometre for the first 14,000 kilometres of eligible travel during the term of this determination; and

(ii) 9 cents per kilometre after the first 14,000 kilometres of eligible travel during the term of this determination.

In the case of an elected member living outside the Waimakariri District, the mileage allowance will be payable only from their point of entry at the Waimakariri District boundary.

Transport costs other than mileage will be paid for on an actual and reasonable basis.
COUNCIL AND COMMUNITY BOARD EXPENSES
(from 5 March 2019 covering 1 December 2018 to 30 June 2019)

The Governance Manager will be responsible for monitoring mileage claims and agreeing with the elected member the most direct route reasonable in the circumstances.

4.64.7 Travel Time Allowance

Where authorised travel takes in excess of one hour an allowance of no more than $37.50 per hour is claimable but only in respect of the travel after the first hour of eligible travel time travelled in a day. The maximum payable in one year is 100 hours. The maximum amount of travel time allowance that a member may be paid for eligible travel in a 24-hour period is eight hours.

This travel time is only available for travel within New Zealand and is not available for the Mayor.

4.74.8 Computer, Internet and Associated Consumables Expenses (Communications Allowance)

To reimburse for the costs of an Internet connection to their residential address to provide computer access to the Council and related consumables, as follows:

- The Mayor and Councillors to receive an allowance of $33 per month
- Community Board Chairpersons to receive an allowance of $33 per month
- Community Board members to receive an allowance of $25 per month.

In lieu of the Council providing consumables such as paper, a monthly payment of $10.00 per month is claimable by the Mayor, Councillors and Community Board Chairs.

4.84.9 Telephone (Communications Allowance continued)

To reimburse for the costs of their telephones (including cellphones), as follows:

- The Mayor and Councillors to receive an allowance of $33 per month
- Community Board Chairpersons to receive an allowance of $30 per month
- Community Board members to receive $20 per month.

5. Approved by Council 5 March 2019 for receipt by the Remuneration Authority.

6. Review

This policy will be reviewed annually. Next review due July 2019.
**COUNCIL AND COMMUNITY BOARD EXPENSES**

(from 5 March 2019 covering 1 December 2018 to 30 June 2019)

**APPENDIX 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Meeting/Functions</th>
<th>Mileage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council meetings (ordinary, special, extra-ordinary and emergency)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing Committees and Subcommittees of Council (if appointed a member)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Board meetings (if an appointed member)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Consent Hearings (if an appointed member of the Hearings Panel)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Advisory Board meetings (if the Councillor represents that particular ward)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDC Advisory Group meetings (if appointed by the Council as its representative) (e.g. Ohoka Domain Advisory Group)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formally representing Council (as a result of resolution of Council) at a formal meeting of another local authority.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings of other outside organisations as the Council’s appointed representative (appointment pursuant to a Council resolution). (Note that meetings of Council Controlled Organisations and Trusts where Councillors and Community board members are otherwise remunerated do not qualify for payment.)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Council workshops or briefings (which have the prior approval of the Mayor and Chief Executive) at which no resolutions or decisions are made. These workshops are to be held solely to discuss major policy or strategic issues of interest to all Councillors.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and development courses, field trips, site visits, where authorised by the Mayor or formal resolution of Council or Community Board, in excess of four hours.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public meetings where the Council is officiating.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings with other statutory bodies to deal with issues which would be the responsibility of a Committee or Subcommittee of Council of which the Councillor attending is a member or which deal with issues directly affecting the Councillors Ward (attending pursuant to a Council resolution)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COUNCIL AND COMMUNITY BOARD EXPENSES
(from 5 March 2019 covering 1 December 2018 to 30 June 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Meeting/Functions</th>
<th>Mileage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Conferences/Seminars (if an appointed WDC representative)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note – Local being generally the Canterbury region. Mileage outside the region at the discretion of the Mayor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working groups or working parties</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field trips or site visits/inspections (including site visits for resource consent hearings where approved by Mayor or Committee Chairperson)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefings and discussions with the Mayor, Chief Executive, Senior Managers and Officers</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where Councillors, other than the Deputy Mayor, officiate at “official” functions as determined by the Mayor.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituency “meetings” (either with individuals or organisations) unless there is formal approval requiring official attendance</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social functions</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Local Government Conference

The Mayor, one Councillor, together with the Chief Executive Officer, may represent the Council at the Local Government Conference.

Approval for Members Attendance

The Mayor, or in his/her absence, the Deputy Mayor, will approve all training courses, conferences and seminars attended by members of the Council. This will be reported as part of the Mayor's monthly report to the Council.

Attendance at overseas conferences shall be approved by the Council.
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CONFERENCES AND TRAINING COURSE ATTENDANCE

1 Introduction

The Council is required to give effect to the purpose of Local Government which is described in the Local Government Act 2002 (the Act). The purpose enables democratic local decision-making and action, by and on behalf of, communities to meet the current and future needs for good quality local infrastructure; local public services; and performance of regulatory functions in a way that is most cost-effective for households and businesses.

2 Policy Context

Elected members are responsible for making decisions on matters such as the services council will provide, the standard they are provided to, how they will be paid for and what bylaws need to be made. Elected members have a governance role in council as well as being an elected representative of the community.

3 Policy Objective

To make a positive impact as an elected member a range of skills and qualities are needed. A number of opportunities are provided for professional development and it is important that elected members take advantage of these.

4 Policy Statement

Local Government Conference (LGNZ Annual Conference)

A report will be considered by the Council each March/April to determine attendance.

The Mayor, one Councillor, together with the Chief Executive Officer, may represent the Council at the Local Government Conference annually.

The Deputy Mayor must attend one LGNZ Conference during the triennium cycle.

The nominated Councillor can only attend one LGNZ Conference in any given triennium cycle (unless being held in Canterbury), to enable other members to attend.

When the LGNZ Conference is held in Canterbury, the Council will consider sending up to ten Councillors.

Approval for Councillor Members Training Attendance

The Mayor, or in his/her absence, the Deputy Mayor, will approve all training courses, conferences and seminars attended by members of the Council and notify the Governance Manager. This will be reported as part of the Mayor’s monthly report to Council.

Training courses (and conferences) can also be approved via a report to the Council.

Attendance at overseas conferences shall be approved by the Council via a formal report.

Trim 190224021129
CONFERENCES AND TRAINING COURSE ATTENDANCE

Community Board Members
Approval for Community Board Members to attend conferences or training within New Zealand (excluding in-house) will be via formal Community Board report, consideration and resolution.

Any Community Board member attending a conference is required to provide a written report on the learnings/highlights to be published in the next available Board agenda for public accountability, and circulated to all elected members.

LGNZ National Community Board Conference (held every two years)
At least one Community Board member from each Community Board may attend the Conference and represent their community. It is permissible for a Councillor appointed to a Community Board to attend the LGNZ Community Board Conference, however the related registration and expenses will come from the Community Board training budget and not the Council training budget.

5 Adopted by and date
Approved and adopted by the Council on 5 March 2019.

This policy shall be reviewed by the Council every six years or sooner on request.

The next review date is March 2025.
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 This report seeks to update the Elected Member Conference and Training Policy and extend it to formally include the Community Board members.

**Attachments:**

i. Current Conference and Training Course Attendance Policy S-CP 0905 October 2002 (Trim 02101400049)

ii. Proposed Elected Member Conference and Training Course Attendance Policy S-CP 0905 March 2019 (Trim 190224021129)

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190222020835.

(b) Adopts the Elected Member Policy for Conference and Training Course Attendance S-CP 0905 (Trim 190224021129).

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 The Conference and Training Course Attendance Policy was last reviewed and updated in October 2002. It is standard practice to review such policies every six years.

3.2 The Policy currently covers the Mayor and Council for attending Conferences, however the proposed policy also incorporates Community Board membership to formalise what has been current practice.

3.3 It has been the current practice to enable any Community Board member to attend a conference or training, requiring a formal report to be presented to the Community Board for consideration and approval prior to any training or conference occurring.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1 The Council have always been represented at the Local Government NZ Conference (LGNZ). This is an annual event held alternate years in the North Island and South Island.
4.2. Following the 2018 LGNZ Conference held in Christchurch, in which the Council resolved to send more councillors than the policy outlined as the event was local and therefore no accommodation or travel costs were associated, it was suggested that in future years if such a local opportunity occurs, then the policy should be flexible to enable more Council members to attend. The proposed policy captures and enables this desire.

4.3. The proposed policy clarifies the situation for Community Board membership attending training and conferences.

4.4. Conference attendance for Councillors/Mayor includes the LGNZ Conference in which it is recommended the Deputy Mayor attends at least once during the electoral term. Also conferences related directly to a Councillors Portfolio such as the NZ Local Authority Traffic Institute (Trafinz) Conference and the WasteMINZ Conference.

4.5. Councillor training can involve LGNZ courses throughout the year involving webinars or onsite attendance. Topics members have attended in the past include; Elected Member Induction, Financial Governance (101/201), Chairing Practice Workshop, Understanding Audit and Risk Committees. Some Councillors have also completed the RMA Good Decision Making Certification Programme. Specific training is provided to the District Planning and Regulation Committee in respect of the District Liquor Licencing Hearings.

4.6. Councillors have on various occasions represented the Mayor (when unavailable), by attending LG Rural Provincial meetings and LG Zone 5 meetings which has also enhanced knowledge. When Councillors attend conferences as part of their portfolio responsibilities or LG Rural Provincial / LG Zone 5 meetings they have circulated notes to the Council for reference and at times provided an update during a Committee meeting.

4.7. Community Boards members have attended the LGNZ National Community Board Conference held every second year, alternating between the North and South Island. Whilst the majority of training offered to community board members in held in-house and relates to meeting procedures, standing orders, managing community expectations, LGNZ webinars and training has been offered, often with very little participation. This low involvement in LGNZ training opportunities in part involves daytime participation and many members hold day employment or feedback from previous course attendance has preferred bespoke in-house training. Community Board Chairs are also in contact on a regular basis with each other and governance staff to share knowledge and skills. In the past a Small Town Conference occurred annually, however interest in recent years has seen a decline in its existence.

4.8. When Community Board members attend a conference they are required to provide a written report on learnings/highlights to their Community Board that is published in the next available Board agenda and circulated to all elected members.

4.9. The elected members also have opportunities to learn and engage with outside organisations and staff through the All Boards briefing sessions. Other in-house learning opportunities include participation in Te Reo classes and a Cultural Awareness programme at the Tuahiwi Marae. Governance staff continue to offer one-on-one in-house training and assistance for any elected member that requests it in relation to how Local Government works and meeting practices.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations
No consultation has occurred.
5.2. **Wider Community**
No consultation has occurred. Consideration has been given to balancing economic prudence with learning opportunities for elected members and ability to upskill and bring new knowledge to their local community.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**
A training budget for the Council and each Community Board is managed by the Governance Operational Budgets. For the 2018/19 financial year the Council has a budget of $30,530 (which includes overseas opportunities, noting overseas airfares come from a separate travel budget of $8,360). The Community Board training/seminar budgets includes airfares and accommodation.

The conference and training budgets for community boards are as follows:
- Rangiora-Ashley Community Board $15,280
- Woodend-Sefton Community Board $9,540
- Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board $9,540
- Oxford-Ohoka Community Board $11,450

The majority of training (in-house and external) tends to occur in the first 12 months following the triennium elections, with interest and opportunities tapering through the term. The NZ Community Board Conference occurs in year one and year three of the triennium cycle.

6.2. **Community Implications**
Enabling elected members to attend conferences and training enables knowledge sharing, upskilling and awareness of the latest trends and happenings in Local Government. All elected members have their own knowledge and skills that they bring to the table and are at different levels of enhancing life learnings through additional training opportunities.

6.3. **Risk Management**
All elected members are requested to report back to either the Council or their Community Boards on learnings from any training or conference attendance.

6.4. **Health and Safety**
Elected members are responsible for their own health and safety. They should ensure their health enables them to drive or fly to training destinations safely.

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**
Nil legislation, however LGNZ suggested best practice for learning opportunities.

7.3. **Community Outcomes**
There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that effects our District
Opportunities for collaboration and partnerships are actively pursued.

7.4. **Delegations**
The Council is delegated to set Council Policy.
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CONFERENCE AND TRAINING COURSE ATTENDANCE

1 Introduction
The Council is required to give effect to the purpose of Local Government which is described in the Local Government Act 2002 (the Act). The purpose enables democratic local decision-making and action, by and on behalf of, communities to meet the current and future needs for good quality local infrastructure; local public services; and performance of regulatory functions in a way that is most cost-effective for households and businesses.

2 Policy Context
Elected members are responsible for making decisions on matters such as the services council will provide, the standard they are provided to, how they will be paid for and what bylaws need to be made. Elected members have a governance role in council as well as being an elected representative of the community.

3 Policy Objective
To make a positive impact as an elected member a range of skills and qualities are needed. A number of opportunities are provided for professional development and it is important that elected members take advantage of these.

4 Policy Statement
Local Government Conference (LGNZ Annual Conference)
A report will be considered by the Council each March/April to determine attendance.
The Mayor, one Councillor, together with the Chief Executive Officer, may represent the Council at the Local Government Conference annually.
The Deputy Mayor must attend one LGNZ Conference during the triennium cycle.
The nominated Councillor can only attend one LGNZ Conference in any given triennium cycle (unless being held in Canterbury), to enable other members to attend.
When the LGNZ Conference is held in Canterbury, the Council will consider sending up to ten Councillors.

Approval for Councillor Members Training Attendance
The Mayor, or in his/her absence, the Deputy Mayor, will approve all training courses, conferences and seminars attended by members of the Council and notify the Governance Manager. This will be reported as part of the Mayor’s monthly report to Council.
Training courses (and conferences) can also be approved via a report to the Council.

Attendance at overseas conferences shall be approved by the Council via a formal report.
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CONFERENCE AND TRAINING COURSE ATTENDANCE

Community Board Members
Approval for Community Board Members to attend conferences or training within New Zealand (excluding in-house) will be via formal Community Board report, consideration and resolution.

Any Community Board member attending a conference is required to provide a written report on the learnings/highlights to be published in the next available Board agenda for public accountability, and circulated to all elected members.

LGNZ National Community Board Conference (held every two years)
At least one Community Board member from each Community Board may attend the Conference and represent their community.
It is permissible for a Councillor appointed to a Community Board to attend the LGNZ Community Board Conference, however the related registration and expenses will come from the Community Board training budget and not the Council training budget.

5 Adopted by and date
Approved and adopted by the Council on 5 March 2019.

This policy shall be reviewed by the Council every six years or sooner on request.
The next review date is March 2025.
1. SUMMARY

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

Attachments:

i. Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties

ii. February 2019 Health and Safety Dashboard Report

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 190220019443

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

2. BACKGROUND

2.1. The Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 requires that Officers must exercise due diligence to make sure that the organisation complies with its health and safety duties. Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties for WDC is outlined in Appendix 1.

2.2. An officer under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 is a person who occupies a specified position or who occupies a position that allows them to exercise a significant influence over the management of the business or undertaking. Councillors and Chief Executive are considered to be the Officers of WDC.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. There are 3 work-related incident in this report, 2 of which require further investigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Event description</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26/01/2019</td>
<td>Near Miss</td>
<td>Worker slipped on river bank outside coastguard Kaiapoi.</td>
<td>After taking a sample the worker turned back up the river bank and slipped on some silt. Contributing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2. The Health and Safety Team is currently conducting ‘deep dive’ audits in the following areas of critical risk:

3.2.1. Contractor management
3.2.2. Hazardous Substances documentation compliance
3.2.3. Confined space entry

These audits will be completed by end of February 2019, and results of all audits will be submitted to the Management Team and the Audit and Risk Committee.

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

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Groups and Organisations

4.1.1. The above reporting is shared with Management Team and the Health and Safety Committee in particular, for their review and comment.
4.2. **Wider Community**

4.2.1. The community has not been consulted with regard to this matter, as this is internal compliance reporting, relating to Health and Safety at Work.

5. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. **Financial Implications**

5.1.1. All financial implications for the upcoming year’s health and safety activities have been accounted for within approved project costs (such as Promapp implementation), or via departmental budgets already allocated to health and safety.

5.2. **Community Implications**

5.2.1. Community implications have not been included in this report as this is internal compliance reporting, relating to Health and Safety at Work.

5.3. **Risk Management**

5.3.1. Risk Management is one of the key performance requirements of a functioning Health and Safety system, therefore an updated version of the Health and Safety Register Action Plan is a key aspect of this monthly report (see Attachment 2).

5.4. **Health and Safety**

5.4.1. Continuous improvement, monitoring, and reporting of Health and Safety activities are a key focus of the health and safety management system. Attachment 1 indicates the health and safety monitoring and improvement activities that are in progress at WDC.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Legislation**

6.2.1. The key legislation is the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015.

6.2.2. The Council has a number of Human Resources policies, including those related to Health and Safety at Work.

6.2.3. The Council has an obligation under the Local Government Act to be a good employer.

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

6.3.1. There is a safe environment for all

   The Health, Safety and Wellbeing of the organisation, its employees and volunteers ensures that Community Outcomes are delivered in a manner which is legislatively compliant and culturally aligned to our organisational principles: ta mātou mauri.

6.4. **Delegations**

6.4.1. An officer under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 is a person who occupies a specified position or who occupies a position that allows them to exercise a significant influence over the management of the business or undertaking. Councillors and Chief Executive are considered to be the Officers of WDC.
## Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICER DUTIES</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF ACTIVITIES TO SUPPORT DISCHARGE OF DUTIES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KNOW</strong></td>
<td>• Updates on new activities/major contracts</td>
<td>Various Committee reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Council reports to include Health and Safety advice as relevant</td>
<td>Monthly, as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Audit Committee to receive minutes of Health and Safety Committee meetings</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Update on legislation and best practice changes to Audit Committee</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

**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

**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

**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

**VERIFY**

(To verify the provision and use of the resources and processes)

- Receive any external audit results and remedial actions (if any) reported to Audit Committee
- Worksafe audits, if undertaken
- Self-assessment against Canterbury Safety Charter and/or SafePlus reported to the Audit Committee

FREQUENCY:
- Various Committee reports
- Monthly, as required
- Quarterly
- As required
- Start of each new term and as required
- Six monthly, or where major change
- At least annually
- As required
- Annually
- As completed
- As required
- As completed
- Two yearly
- As completed
## Progress against 2018/19 Workplan – February 2019 (as at 20 February 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Projects</th>
<th>Current Progress</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1: Improve Health and Safety systems, to align with organisational objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Action 1:** Re-develop Safety Management System to ensure that all Policies align with SafePlus framework (see TRIM 180315027921), and all critical risk procedures are captured in Promapp. | **Green** | Policy structure has been drafted, and re-writing of policies has commenced. Policy structure has 3 key policies: Leadership & Commitment, Risk Management and Worker Engagement. There will be several sub-policies under the ‘Risk Management’ main policy, to address critical risks (e.g. Asbestos Management, Drug and Alcohol, Driver Safety etc.)
To date, the following number of health and safety procedures have been captured in Promapp:
*Published (finalised) = 31*
*Unpublished (in progress) = 8*

Additionally, the Water Unit are using Promapp to review and rewrite their Standard Operating Procedures, and have >130 procedures that have been developed. For the most part they have been finalised, with some in final draft phase.
Promapp training is scheduled for the Water Unit team and the Standard Operating Procedures will be available on their mobile devices. |
| **Action 2:** Implement Promapp training module to improve the management of all Health and Safety training. | **AS PER LAST MONTH** | The Promapp training module has been purchased, and key staff (including H&S Admin and Manager) are trained in how to use the module. Single sign-on has been confirmed, and all staff are creating their Promapp profiles.
Once all profiles are created, Health, Safety and Quality team will transfer current training data across to the Promapp Training Module. A full project plan for this activity has been created (yet to be approved) and will require resources from both the Health and Safety and the Quality functions. |
| **Objective 2: Maintain a fit-for-purpose internal health and safety auditing system to ensure that WDC is compliant with health and safety policies, procedures and legal requirements.** | | |
| **Action 3:** Review and re-develop internal health and safety auditing system, aligned with SafePlus. (see TRIM 180315027921). | **AS PER LAST MONTH** | The SafePlus Online Self-Assessment tool from WorkSafe has been issued. From there the team will complete the following actions:
- Assess the suitability of the tool (and determine any changes in approach – if required) **COMPLETE**
- Confirm audit timing and approach (report to Management Team) **COMPLETE**
- Arrange audit **COMPLETE**
- Complete audit and submit findings to Management Team **COMPLETE FOR ONLINE ASSESSMENT, IN PROGRESS FOR ‘DEEP DIVE AUDITS’**
- Develop action plan and monitoring schedule **IN PROGRESS**
- Review process and adjust if required |
### Objective 3: Ensure that all contractors are managed according to health and safety procedural requirements, and improve staff knowledge of those requirements.

**Action 4: Contractor management process improvement project (carry-over).**
- Deliver training to all staff once Promapp processes are complete (Oct 2018).
- Develop audit function based on PDU audit role.

**AS PER LAST MONTH**
- Contract Management training is complete as of 12th November. Training delivered to 55 contract managers from across the Council, and notes sent out to a total of 90 (including the staff that attended training). Timing of the training was determined by the Promapp rollout project (access to the system).

  Additionally:
  - Health and Safety Manager provides a H&S Contract Management overview to all new staff at their induction.
  - Health and Safety Manager also provided an overview of current procedures to U&R, Water Unit, Greenspace and Regeneration teams at a June workshop.
  - A 6-monthly reminder email was sent to staff on 24/08 to inform them of H&S processes and tools to manage contractors.
  - A ‘deep-dive’ audit of adherence to H&S aspects of contract management is in progress as part of SafePlus assessment (see above).

### Objective 4: Improve the Health and Wellbeing of staff, and create measures to ensure success.

**Action 5: Wellbeing strategy development and implementation project (carry-over).**

**COMPLETE**
- A Wellbeing Committee has been established, the wellbeing strategy is complete, and has been submitted to Management Team for their approval in early August. Additionally, the Management Team approved:
  - Wellbeing calendar of events
  - Wellbeing presence on intranet
  - Wellbeing branding
  - Wellbeing communications plan.

  The Wellbeing Committee has now issued the strategy and communications to all staff (September 2018), and will coordinate and communicate all wellbeing activities going forward.

**LEGEND**
- On track
- Slightly behind schedule (less than one month)
- Behind schedule (greater than one month)

In addition to the above workplan, there will be a particular focus on working with volunteers to manage their health and safety. This will include creating written agreements with high risk volunteers, and proactively engaging with all volunteers to ensure that health and safety expectations are aligned with all parties.
Lost Time Injuries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Injuries</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causes of LTIs are:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Body stressing x2 (manual handling) (63hrs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Falls, trips, slips x2 (231hrs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causes of LTIs are:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryover Injury – Falls, trips, slips x1 total 49 hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body stressing x1 (manual handling) (11.5 hrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEAD INDICATORS

Safety Inspections Completed (Workplace Walkarounds)


Training Delivered

2017/18: People Trained: 460

2018/19: People Trained: 333 (to January 2019)

Contractor Database (drawn from SiteWise Database)
## WDC Health and Safety Risk Register Action Plan (High Risk/High Consequence Actions Only) 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk rating</th>
<th>Risk type</th>
<th>Suggested Actions</th>
<th>Action Owner</th>
<th>Due date</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Armed Hold-up/Violent or Abusive Customers (on Council Sites) &amp; Site Security</td>
<td>*Develop and implement action plans based on Site Security Reviews.</td>
<td>Liz Ashton</td>
<td>Review at end 2018/19</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Boat Operations</td>
<td>*Practise rescue plan drills on regular basis</td>
<td>Phil Drozdowski</td>
<td>31/01/2019</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Confined space entry</td>
<td>*Review procedures for any work on Ocean Outfall Pipeline/drop-structure to ensure they are adequate.</td>
<td>Phil Drozdowski/Kalley Simpson</td>
<td>31/01/2019</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Confined space entry</td>
<td>*Review the records kept of permits to work, and contractor inclusion in permits to work.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>31/01/2019</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Contractor Health and Safety Management</td>
<td>*Train all contract managers in H&amp;S processes/requirements at time of induction.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Contractor Health and Safety Management</td>
<td>*Identify volunteer groups and leaseholders that engage contractors on behalf of WDC and train in contract H&amp;S management processes.</td>
<td>Chris Brown/Nick Harrison</td>
<td>31/03/2019</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>*Ensure that emergency response procedures (i.e. what do to in the event of incident/interaction with underground or overhead power lines) is available, and that all relevant staff are trained, in procedure.</td>
<td>Phil Drozdowski/Jeff Millward</td>
<td>31/01/2019</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Hazardous Substances</td>
<td>*Review the hazardous substances records and adherence to requirements.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>01/03/2019 (amended)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Mobile plant and machinery</td>
<td>*Check maintenance records and maintenance schedules are in place to ensure safety of equipment.</td>
<td>Unit Managers</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Mobile plant and machinery</td>
<td>*Improve competency records to include a schedule of levels of competency for each staff member/each piece of mobile plant.</td>
<td>Phil Drozdowski/Jeff Millward</td>
<td>31/01/2019</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk/Consequence</td>
<td>Activity/Unit</td>
<td>Action/Review Details</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Completion Date</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Volunteers conducting hazardous activities</td>
<td>*Undertake a review of operations to ensure that all activity and training is being carried out as per internal H&amp;S processes.</td>
<td>Liz Ashton</td>
<td>31/01/2019</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Volunteers conducting hazardous activities</td>
<td>*Develop Memorandum of Understanding with NZRT12, which will define accountabilities and expectations. May require some further operational and administrative support to implement the requirements. (TBC)</td>
<td>Liz Ashton/Nick Harrison</td>
<td>31/01/2019</td>
<td>COMPLETE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Water Safety</td>
<td>*Need to review the contractor's Job Safety Analysis when removing avian botulism bird carcasses.</td>
<td>Kalley Simpson</td>
<td>31/01/2019</td>
<td>COMPLETE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Water Safety (Public)</td>
<td>*Require review of security fencing of all Waste Water Treatment Plant sites (internal review - test against other organisations). Review Stormwater site security (internal review - test against other organisations).</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>31/03/2019 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Working at heights</td>
<td>Water Unit: *Review of all structures which require work at heights to determine the adequacy of the fall protection (in particular the harness systems) and any further procedure/training required to ensure safe use of systems.</td>
<td>Phil Drozdowski/Kalley Simpson</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence/High Risk</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Review and action of 3-Waters Sites Hazard Review (Dan McNally) and Water Unit Observation Report (Impac)</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary/Jeff Millward</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All actions are new since the September 2018 Risk Register review.
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide a regular activity summary to those parties overseeing the District Regeneration programme, to allow for monitoring of progress. This report covers progress to end of December 2018 (Q2 of 18/19 WDC financial year).

1.2 At present; of the 61 projects in the combined programmes, approximately 1/3 are complete, 1/3 are underway, and 1/3 are yet to start.

1.3 Total expenditure to date (as at Dec 2018) on the District Regeneration activity is approximately $2.7M. The current approved budget is $17.7M (excluding the Memorial Gardens project).

1.4 Total expenditure to date (as at Dec 2018) on the Kaiapoi River Wharf and Riverbanks activity is approximately $6.7M. The current approved budget is $9.0M.

**Attachments:**

i. 2017 Regeneration Calendar Year end summary
ii. 2018 Regeneration Calendar Year end summary (Trim 181210145530)
iii. Implementation Structure (Trim 17022101697675[v2])
iv. Projects summary sheet
v. Regeneration Project Timeline (summarised)

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Regeneration Steering Group recommends:

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190124007788.

(b) **Circulates** this report to Land Information New Zealand, as agents on behalf of the Crown, for the purposes of monitoring the implementation of the Recovery Plan.
3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The District Regeneration programme covers the implementation of the land uses and activities identified within the Waimakariri Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan (the ‘Recovery Plan’). The District Regeneration programme also includes the delivery of:

- Kalapoi River Wharf and Marine Precinct programme (including Riverbanks)
- Murphy Park and Rowing Precinct project
- Adjoining Council Reserves projects

3.2 The draft Recovery Plan was developed by Waimakariri District Council and presented to the Minister supporting Greater Christchurch Regeneration in August 2016, following extensive consultation with the community and strategic partners. The final Recovery Plan was issued by the government in December 2016 and adopted by Council in February 2017. The Waimakariri District Council is the key implementing party for the activities on the land identified to be divested to Council.

3.3 A requirement of the Recovery Plan was for the Waimakariri District Council to develop an Implementation Plan to outline how and when the land uses and activities from within the plan would be implemented. The Implementation Plan is a key document which contains key planning items and supplementary information, and is referred to throughout this report.

3.4 The District Regeneration programme delivery is overseen at a governance level primarily by the Regeneration Steering Group, and at an operational level by the by the District Regeneration Project Control Group (PCG) and the Marine Project Control Group. The membership of these groups is outlined within the Implementation Plan.

3.5 The District Regeneration programme includes coordination with other allied council projects such as:

- Kalapoi Town Centre Plan Review
- District Development Strategy
- District Plan Review
- Walking & Cycling Strategy
- Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation
- Policy Development
4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

**Programme Summary**

4.1. A summary of projects current status and progress for the whole programme is shown in Table 1 and Figure 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Ongoing/ recurring</th>
<th>On/ahead of programme</th>
<th>Behind programme/concerns</th>
<th>Not started</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operational Projects</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Projects (Regen)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Projects (Marine)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1**: District Regeneration programmes summary of current project progress/status

Refer to attachment iv) for the full project list.
4.2. Clarifications and endorsements to the preceding summary table and figures are as follows:

a) For the purposes of management and tracking, the overall Programme Management and General Operations management is treated as an ongoing project, as is the monitoring and reporting (including development of monitoring plan), and the land management and administration. The development of the Recovery Plan (from 2016) is included as a project, since the project costs are realised under the Regeneration activity budget.

b) The sports facility development in Kairapoi East is treated as one large project even though this is comprised of a number of individual developments and associated construction contracts and design commissions.

c) Rural areas is treated as a project, to allow for some investment in development of these areas to enable future land uses, and assess options and proposals for use of this land.

d) The Kaiapoi East Retained roads upgrades are treated as one large project, as all of these roads are anticipated to be designed and built under common contracts.

e) The above summary does not cover the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme projects, which are covered under separate reports from the Senior Engineering Advisor overseeing that programme.

f) Mixed use business areas development projects are not included in the summary at this stage, but will be added to the programme and project list as these arise over future years. The ongoing activation of the Town Centre and mixed use business areas, and oversight and management of the arising development projects, are not yet included in the District Regeneration programme; but are overseen primarily by the Kaiapoi Town Centre PCG who will report to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board and Council.

g) The development of the revised ‘Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan – 2028 and Beyond’, is not included in the above regeneration projects summary, as this was led by the Business and Centres Unit.
4.3. Key projects completed in the last reporting period include:
1) Kaiapoi River wall upgrade
2) Kaiapoi Wharf side Civil works
3) Kaiapoi River Library Steps and Decks
4) Reserves Master Plan
5) Implementation Plan
6) Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan
7) Dudley Drain enhancement
8) Feldwick Drive construction
9) Courtenay Drive rebuild, and utilities
10) Development of land and establishment of leases and licences to Occupy to Kaiapoi Food Forest, Wainakariri Sailing and Power Boat club, and AA Bees Club.

4.4. Key projects currently under construction include:
1) Riverview Terraces and Boardwalk
2) Boat ramp pontoon and interim dredging
3) Kaiapoi East Enabling Works (site clearances, utilities and roads decommissioning, bulk earthworks, stormwater management area and drainage)

4.5. Key projects currently at procurement stage include
1) Honda Forest (stage 1)
2) Riverview Pontoon, and river capital dredging
3) Jones Street upgrade
4) Community BMX track

4.6. Key projects currently at the design stage include:
1) Sports turfs
2) Softball diamonds
3) Sports Changing facilities
4) Recreation and ecological linkages – South of Cass
5) Dog Park
6) Kaiapoi East retained roads
7) Kaiapoi South/Raven Quay drainage
8) Feldwick catchment drainage & SMA
9) Signage strategy

4.7. Key projects currently on hold or delayed:
1) Murphy Park Rowing Precinct
2) Charles St WWPS viewing platform
3) Feldwick drain land exchange and linkage
4) Reserves naming process
5) The Pines Beach Entrance reserve
6) Land divestment transactions process

4.8. The diagrammatic summary schedule of planned key project completion dates is attached to this report, and is included in the Implementation Plan and published on the Regeneration website.
4.9. Key current capital projects scheduled to be completed in the current financial year are shown in Table 2.

**Table 2: Summary of current year capital projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enabling works and Beswick SMA</td>
<td>On track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community BMX</td>
<td>On track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Park</td>
<td>On track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones Street Upgrade</td>
<td>On track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat ramp Pontoon and interim dredging</td>
<td>On track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pines Beach Entrance</td>
<td>Behind programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honda Forest (stage 1)</td>
<td>On track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Street Viewing Platform</td>
<td>Behind programme (deliberately deferred)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing Precinct</td>
<td>Behind programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Actions or Items Requiring Resolution**

4.10. Other than the above, key items requiring resolutions are:

- Heritage & Mahinga Kai co-governance establishment and project plan
- Rural land uses establishment
- Project scoping for:
  - Landscaping of War Memorial Area
  - Landscaping of Williams Street Bridge corner (Riverside Church & 131 Williams St area)
- Rowing precinct
- Sports fields clubrooms business case
- Retained Roads upgrades – potential budget shortfall (separate report)
- Development of Kaiapoi River Wharf & Marine Precinct Operations Plan and Policy

**Financial**

4.11. A summary of current budget is shown below.

- **District Regeneration current programme value (all years)**: $17.7M (excl. Memorial Gardens)
- **District Regeneration programme value (all years)**: $19.5M (incl. Memorial Gardens)
- **Kaiapoi River Wharf & Marine Precinct programme value (all years)**: $9.0M
4.12. Recent additions to regeneration budgets (since 2018-2026 LTP) are shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Summary of additions to District Regeneration activity budget since 2018 LTP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Pines Beach Hall demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>Honoria Forest (multi-year, externally funded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Charlies Street Viewing platform (transfer from EQ Recovery – Wastewater)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>Kailapoi East Retained Roads Upgrades (transfer from EQ Recovery – Road)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.13. Overall Regeneration programme expenditure vs budget is tracking behind. This is due largely to the initial front-loading of planned expenditure arising from budgets established before the recovery plan was completed (2015 LTP) and before the District Regeneration full programme planning and budgeting was complete. Actual expenditure is expected to catch up to planned expenditure in the second half of 18/19 financial year as more physical works get underway and contracts payments begin to increase.

4.14. An updated summary of Kailapoi River Wharf and Marine Precinct programme financial tracking has not yet been completed and is not included in this report. This will be included in the next report, and will include updates of estimates for the key outstanding projects such as the Riverview pontoon and the Kailapoi River Capital dredging. The current Riverview Terraces and boardwalk project is forecast to be delivered on budget. The current Boat-ramp pontoon project is forecast to be delivered on budget.

4.15. A summary of the District Regeneration activity expenditure to date compared to budget, for all years to date (including current part year) is shown in Table 4.

Table 4: District Regeneration Activity Summary of Expenditure to date vs Budget (figures in $000’s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>18/19 YTD</th>
<th>Cumulative to date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Expenditure (to date)</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>1741</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(96%)</td>
<td>(104%)</td>
<td>(102%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Budget</strong> (incl carryovers)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>4470</td>
<td>2235</td>
<td>3738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditure (to date)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(12%)</td>
<td>(37%)</td>
<td>(27%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Budget</strong></td>
<td>768</td>
<td>2113</td>
<td>5113</td>
<td>2556.5</td>
<td>5437.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>734</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>2737</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(90%)</td>
<td>(40%)</td>
<td>(45%)</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.16. Current year expenditure compared to full year and year-to-date budget is shown in Table 5. This also shows the current planned carryovers at year end to the 19/20 financial year budgets. The proposed carryover includes forecast unspent/underspent amounts at financial year end, as well as carryover of full budget for any multi-year projects that aren’t planned to complete in the current year (per Finance department principles).

Table 5: District Regeneration Activity Summary of current year expenditure (figures in $000’s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Exp YTD</th>
<th>Forecast exp at year end</th>
<th>Planned carryover to 19/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Projects</td>
<td>4470</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>3140</td>
<td>2771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5113</td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>3794</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year to date figures</td>
<td>2557</td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.17. Some of the projects listed in the District Regeneration activity are currently un-funded / un-budgeted. These are:
- Memorial Gardens (beyond the term of the current Long term Plan so not in current approved programme budget)
- Cycle Training Track
- Community Studio Spaces
- Maritime Heritage Precinct
- Historic Railway Station Precinct
- Earthquake Memorial
- Pelanque Court and jetty

Regulatory

4.18. The delivery of the programmes require a number of regulatory approvals and authorities. These will potentially increase as more projects are delivered or new land uses and activities arise (e.g. in the rural areas and mixed use business areas). The summary of current resource consents are shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Summary of Resource Consents (quantity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Surrendered / complete</th>
<th>Issued - Active</th>
<th>Applied - in processing</th>
<th>Yet to apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regeneration - ECanc</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regeneration - WDC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (sports)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine ECanc</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine WDC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table above summarises only the resource consents WDC hold for District Regeneration programme, and excludes other Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery programme consents, or other bylaws / authorities.

4.19. WDC currently hold global archaeological authorities for the development works in the regeneration areas.

4.20. A cultural values report has been received, to inform the development projects. Cultural impact assessments and/or project reviews are also commissioned with Mahaanui Kuratalcio Ltd for specific projects.

**General Operational Matters**

4.21. Land Management

4.21.1. The regeneration areas land is currently owned by The Crown. Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) act as agents for the Crown in Waimakariri regeneration matters.

4.21.2. WDC currently hold an interim lease on all of the regeneration areas identified for eventual divestment from the Crown to WDC (approximately 80 hectares). This allows WDC to begin to implement the land uses and activities; and facilitates commencement of survey, investigation and construction activities, in advance of the land divestment.

4.21.3. WDC currently undertake the greenspace maintenance on this leased land. This includes the general vegetation control, security patrols, fencing, spraying and dealing with rubbish etc. From the 17/18 year onwards the vegetation control is undertaken as part of the Greenspace Activity. The general maintenance dayworks are funded from the District Regeneration Activity budgets.

4.21.4. A number of one-off events have utilised the regeneration area lands for events:
   - Kaiapoi Christmas Carnival
   - Kaiapoi River Carnival (forthcoming – February 2019)
   - St Bartholomews Church carnival

Permission for these interim uses is sought from LINZ under the terms of the WDC interim lease.

4.21.5. A number of sub-leases or Licences to occupy have been established by WDC under the terms of the WDC/Crown interim lease, to community groups:
   - Waimakariri Sailing and Power Boat Club
   - Kaiapoi Food Forest Trust
   - All About Bees Club (North Canterbury)

4.21.6. In addition there have been a number of unsolicited expressions of interest received for lease of land in the Private Lease areas at the Pines Beach, and the Rural areas in Kaiapoi. The Regeneration Steering Group has deferred decisions on granting leases until further decisions are made on the preferred land uses and activities in these areas.
Communications & Engagement

4.22. Communications and engagement activities are covered in the regular monthly report to the Regeneration Steering Group, which are included in the agendas and minutes circulated to Strategic Partners as well as being made available on the Regeneration website.

4.23. The regeneration core project team are responsible for the District Regeneration related communications and engagement matters, and maintain the Regeneration website.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Groups and Organisations

5.1.1. Views of key stakeholder groups and organisations are sought as applicable on specific projects, in line with the Participation Strategy and as referred to in the ongoing specific project design reports to the Regeneration Steering Group.

5.2. Wider Community

5.2.1. Community views were sought through the extensive consultation undertaken during the development of the Recovery Plan. Further consultation was undertaken on the regeneration activity proposals and budgets within the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan special consultative procedure.

5.2.2. Ongoing community consultation on specific projects is undertaken in line with the principles outlined in the Participation Strategy, and as directed by the Regeneration Steering Group.

5.2.3. Summaries of monthly communications and community engagement activity are included in the Monthly communications report to the Regeneration Steering Group.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1. Financial Implications

6.1.1. District Regeneration is a distinct Activity and Cost Centre in the Council Long Term Plan and management systems, sitting within the wider Significant Activity of 'Earthquake Recovery'.

6.1.2. The Kaiapoi River Wharf Riverbanks and Marine Precinct programme is included under the 'Earthquake Recovery – Recreation' Activity and Cost Centre in the Council Long Term Plan and management systems, sitting within the wider Significant Activity of 'Earthquake Recovery'.

6.1.3. Financial summaries are included in Section 4.

6.2. Community Implications

6.2.1. The community in general are keen to see the Regeneration programme implemented and the former red zone areas restored to active use.

6.2.2. In the course of the implementation phase, there will be some negative effects on parts of the community, principally arising from construction works effects, or changes to networks (e.g. road layouts, utilities temporary shutdowns). These potential effects will be managed through project management practices and implementation strategy.
Examples of this are early engagement, reverse sensitivity consideration, inclusion of buffer zones/strips, strategic planting, designated haul routes, restricted working hours, good project communications and opportunities for participation, careful contractor selection, environmental control measures for maintenance and construction activities, and wider implementation team buy-in.

6.2.3. A number of private properties remain within the former red zone areas. The core project team regularly interact with these parties.

6.2.4. The community are kept informed of progress through multiple communication means, as outlined in the Communications section of this report. This includes district-wide communications to ensure that the whole district is informed of high-level regeneration matters and updates.

6.2.5. The regeneration core project team maintain a local presence through the course of project site visits, which often provide the opportunity to meet and interact with the community.

6.3. Risk Management

6.3.1. Current main risks to the programme are:

a) Unknown/unforeseen ground conditions – contamination, geotechnical conditions uncertainty, water table, physical features

b) Environmental effects management – ongoing. High risk river works coming up on both Beswick SMA and the various river projects (particularly dredging). Dust control, traffic, runoff, construction noise. Risk of damage, public/external complaints, consent conditions breach.

c) Dredging resource consent – processing delay, multiple queries.

d) Budget risk on retained roads

e) Topsoil variations on enabling works sports fields – budget risk

f) Time pressure - Design and construction progressing in advance of assessment of full assessment of options for rural area land uses

g) Natural Hazards – fire, flooding, sea level rise, earthquakes and liquefaction risk of delay or damage to existing (including land and completed projects)

h) Public safety – uncontrolled access to regeneration areas increasing risk of harm

6.3.2. The regeneration core project team maintain a risk register which is reviewed for major risks on a monthly basis, and more fully at the Regeneration Project control Group on a quarterly basis.

6.4. Health and Safety

6.4.1. Core project team and staff health and safety is managed through adherence to the WDC Health and Safety policy and management systems. This includes considerations such as workplace safety and staff welfare, safe working in the field, training, safe driving, and contractor health and safety, among others.

6.4.2. Staff undertaking regular on-site construction monitoring or project management have specific safety training, including Site-Safe qualification.
6.4.3. Public health and safety is managed through maintenance of the land and provision of fencing and appropriate signage. The undeveloped regeneration areas are generally used as informal recreation space by the community.

6.4.4. As part of the Enabling works project, a campaign to educate the public to keep out of the working site area was undertaken.

6.4.5. Contractor health and safety is managed through project management principles, and WDC health and safety system policy, tools, and processes. This includes consultants working in the field, and contractors undertaking construction activities.

6.4.6. Contractors and consultants, including consulting project managers, undertake regular routine site inspections and provide site auditing reports, and incident reports as necessary.

6.4.7. In the last reporting period, no serious harm related incidents have occurred. Future reports will include a more detailed breakdown of any accidents or incidents reported.

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

- Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act 2016
- Local Government Act 2002

7.3. Community Outcomes

- Effect is given to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi
- There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that affects our District
- There is a safe environment for all
- There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all
- There are areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats for indigenous fauna
- The community’s cultures, arts and heritage are conserved and celebrated
- Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality
- Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable and sustainable
- Businesses in the District are diverse, adaptable and growing

7.4. Delegations

7.4.1. The Regeneration Steering Group has governance oversight for the District Regeneration programme. The delegated authority of the Regeneration Steering Group is outlined in the Terms of Reference for the Steering Group and the associated Functional relationships and Decisions Making Framework (included within the Implementation Plan).
Implementation of the Waimakariri Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan

Progress Summary January to December 2017

Governance / Partners / Operations

- Established the Regeneration Steering Group (which includes the full Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board) for governance of implementation phase of the Waimakariri Recovery Plan. The Regeneration Steering Group have also assumed the governance responsibilities of the former Kaiapoi Riverbanks Steering Group (now disestablished).
- Established the Regeneration Project Control Group comprising of Council Asset Managers. The PCG’s purpose is to guide, enable and monitor the implementation of the Recovery Plan and provide asset management oversight and cross-Council buy-in.
- Established the Kaiapoi Marine Precinct Project Control Group to guide, enable and monitor the implementation of the Kaiapoi River Wharf and Marine Precinct programme.
- Formed Regeneration Core Project Team, responsible for implementation of the Recovery Plan and Marine Precinct programme (comprising Programme Manager, Project Administrator, 2 x Landscape Architects / Planners, Communications and Engagement Advisor).
- Developed the Participation Strategy, which sets out the framework for community participation for the implementation of the Recovery Plan.
- Interim lease agreement signed with LINZ for early access to 68 hectares of Crown-owned regeneration area land (mainly in Kaiapoi West, East and South), to enable Council to progress water and sewer repairs, and roading projects.
- Development of operational programme and land management systems e.g. land information management, service requests from the community for maintenance of the regeneration areas.
- Maintenance (e.g. mowing) of the land in the regeneration areas (in Kaiapoi West, East, South, and parts of The Pines Beach). This was previously undertaken by LINZ.
- Engagement with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga through Mahaanui Kurataia Ltd and the Matapopore Charitable Trust. This includes seeking a Cultural Values Statement for the regeneration areas and specific projects.
- Establishment of a project team to refresh the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan. The Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan 2028 will include the proposed mixed-use business areas in Kaiapoi West, East and South.
- Council approved a $20,000 grant to Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust to enable the Trust to undertake business planning in anticipation of the divestment of land in The Pines Beach and Kairaki.
- Council granted a Licence to Occupy to the Kaiapoi Food Forest Trust to establish and maintain a food forest in Kaiapoi East. Council approved $30,000 for 2017/18 to enable the Trust to implement year 1 of their management plan. Assisting the Trust with development plans and works on site.
- Council granted a Licence to Occupy to the Waimakariri Power Boat and Sailing Club for the use of regeneration land next to their facility in Kairaki, for boat rigging and storage.
- Engaged with other non-Council utility providers on the decommissioning of redundant services within the regeneration areas (e.g. power and telephone infrastructure).
- Engagement with Heritage New Zealand and an archaeologist for seeking an authority for works in the Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area.
Planning and design

- Development of an Implementation Plan (ongoing) - comprising the strategies and plans outlining how the Council will implement the land uses and activities in the Recovery Plan.
- Development of a District Plan Strategy (ongoing), which forms part of the Implementation Plan, and informs future District Plan zones for the regeneration areas (due for consultation in 2018).
- Design and consultation progressing on providing permanent infrastructure services to the private properties in the regeneration areas.
- Working on the design for the Kaiapoi East sports fields development, including engagement with Kaiapoi Rugby League and Kaiapoi Softball Clubs.
- Reserves Master Plan - planning work continues, including the design of the new reserves and activities (e.g. the dog park, walking and cycling tracks), the vesting of reserves and reserve naming (all due for consultation in 2018).
- Development of a Horizontal Infrastructure Strategy which details the roads to be stopped and built, plans for decommissioning utilities no longer needed, a stormwater management strategy, and earthquake repair works in the regeneration areas (e.g. the repair of Courtenay Drive scheduled for early 2018).
- Developing concept plans for a dog park (for consultation 2018).
- Working on establishment of leasing and interim uses framework for private leases of rural areas.

Infrastructure rebuild

- Two new wastewater pumping stations were completed in Kaiapoi South.
- New water mains were installed in Kaiapoi East.
- Repair of the wastewater mains in Kaiapoi East and Kaiapoi South.
- Design and consultation on the rebuild of Courtenay Drive in Kaiapoi South, and the new road link in Kaiapoi East. Contracts for these works will be awarded in 2017, and the physical works are due to begin in January 2018.
- Master-planning of the stormwater scheme is underway. In conjunction with this a bulk earthworks package will be developed including a terrain plan and soil budget.

Consultations and communications

- Community consultations undertaken for;
  - the road design of the new road link in Kaiapoi East
  - the road design for the rebuild of the earthquake damaged parts of Courtenay Drive, Charters Street and Wyber Place
  - Road access options to the Kaiapoi East sport and recreation reserve
- Regular Regeneration public communications;
  - website – a key source of Regeneration information
  - videos
  - advertorials and advertisements - in the Kaiapoi Advocate and Northern Outlook
  - e-newsletters – online sign up to receive the newsletter
  - information signboard in Kaiapoi – located in a public space in the town centre
  - digital screen installed in Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre – a mix of static slides and video
  - facebook
  - editorials – Kaiapoi Advocate, Northern Outlook, North Canterbury News
- Updating the Minister for Greater Christchurch Recovery and the Greater Christchurch Partnership each month with Waimakaririri Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan Implementation Updates.
Budgets and funding

- Development of overall programme budget and expenditure plan for input into Council’s Long Term Planning LTP 2018 – 2028 process.
- Honda TreeFund – application submitted for native trees in the recreation and ecological linkages in the Kaiapoi East and South Regeneration Areas.

Kaiapoi Marine Precinct Plan:

- Reinstatement of the Kaiapoi Wharf riverbank area, including roads, services and landscaping, incorporating the newly built Coastguard building.
- Development of riverbanks adjacent to Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre – steps, seating, fishing platforms.
- Design and planning of the Kaiapoi riverbank from Williams Street to Kaiapoi Wharf – Riverview Terraces, boardwalk and floating pontoons. Geotechnical testing, surveys and applications for necessary archaeological authorities, resource consents and permits under the river protection bylaws.
- Riverview private development – ongoing communications with the developers and their consultant team to coordinate timeframes and construction staging with Council-led projects.
- Developing concept plans for a new rowing base at Murphy Park.
District Regeneration

Progress Summary January to December 2018

Governance, Partners, Operations Management

- Continued programme governance through 2018 from the Regeneration Steering Group, Council and relevant Committees, and the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board
- Ongoing management supervision from the Regeneration Project Control Group, the Marine Precinct Project Control Group, and the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Steering Group
- Ongoing monthly reporting to the Minister for Greater Christchurch Regeneration, and the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy Implementation Committee (UDSIC)
- Land Divestment agreement between Waimakariri District Council and the Crown was developed and signed by all parties
- Ongoing engagement with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga and project engagement with Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd and Matapopore Charitable Trust
- Licence to occupy agreed with AA Bees Club for establishment of bee-hives in the Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area
- Ongoing support to the development and maintenance of the Kaiapoi Food Forest (operated by the Kaiapoi Food Forest Trust)
- Greenspace maintenance and management of the regeneration areas under the interim lease terms; including mowing and vegetation control, security, fence management, and service requests resolution
- General programme and project management duties including procurement, progress tracking, risk management, financial tracking, contract administration, construction observation and quality control, health and safety management, training and skills development.

Planning and Design

- Implementation Plan first-draft issued to the strategic partners
- Reserves Master Plan for Kaiapoi Regeneration Areas developed, consulted on, and adopted
- Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan '2028 and Beyond'; developed, consulted on, and adopted
- Further detailed site geotechnical and contamination investigations completed; Site Management Plans (for earthworks) developed and adopted for each regeneration area
- Global Archaeological Authorities obtained from Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga for all regeneration areas
- Global earthworks and stormwater resource consents obtained
- Working on development of a rural land use assessment framework and process, to ensure appropriate use of the rural areas
- Design underway on a number of key projects:
  - Sports fields, softball diamonds, changing rooms, car-parking and landscaping
  - Community BMX track
  - South of Cass recreation and ecological linkages, including the Honda Forest
  - Murphy Park rowing precinct
  - Charles Street pump station viewing platform
Infrastructure Rebuild

- Planning and design for permanent repairs to Jones Street, including provisions for future mixed-use business activities
- Planning and design for Kaiapoi East retained road upgrades (Charles, Jollie, Cass and Hall Streets)
- Planning for Feldwick catchment stormwater management
- Commencement of repairs to Kaiapoi South mixed-use business area stormwater network
- Infrastructure projects completed:
  - Water network earthquake recovery programme now completed
  - Wastewater network earthquake recovery programme now completed
  - Permanent infrastructure services provision to private property owners in the regeneration areas completed
  - Kaiapoi East access road (Feldwick Drive) completed, along with associated works in Gray Crescent Reserve
  - Courtenay Drive road rebuild and associated redundant roads decommissioning
  - Repairs to Moore Street, Blackwell Crescent, and Bracebridge Street completed
  - Dudley Drain enhancement works completed

General Construction Works

- Enabling works and Beswick Stormwater Management Area contract works underway – including site clearances, earthworks, buried infrastructure decommissioning, redundant road removals, construction of a stormwater wetland area and drainage

Communications and Engagement

- Regular Regeneration public communications:
  - Website content updates
  - E-newsletters (monthly)
  - Print advertorials (quarterly)
  - Local signboard
  - Videos (quarterly)
  - Weekly updates to Councillors and staff
  - Dedicated digital information slide display at Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre
  - Project information updates on district-wide digital displays at service centres and libraries
  - Project information updates, newsletters, start work notices, and drop-in sessions
- Community consultations undertaken for:
  - Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan, 2028 & Beyond
  - Kaiapoi Reserves Master Plan
  - Murphy Park rowing precinct concept design
- Participation at Kaiapoi Christmas Carnival
- Opening events and celebrations:
  - Feldwick Drive road opening
  - Signing of the divestment agreement with the Crown
  - Establishment of the Honda TreeFund Agreement with Honda New Zealand
**Kaiapoi River Wharf & Marine Precinct Development**

- Kaiapoi Riverview Terraces and Boardwalk construction well underway, due for completion February 2019
- Kaiapoi river wall upgrade works and pontoons piling works completed
- Contract let for boat-ramp pontoon installation, due for completion February 2019
- Procurement activities and resource consent applications for Riverview pontoon and capital dredging contracts, for construction mid-2019.
**RECOVERY PLAN - IMPLEMENTATION STRUCTURE - Done/In Progress**

**IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK**

**IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

**MONITORING PLAN**

**PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT PLAN**

**OUTCOMES**

---

**STATUTORY PLANNING STRATEGY**

**HORIZONTAL INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGY**

**LAND INFORMATION COLLECTION**

**PROGRAMME/STAGING SCHEDULE**

**GOVERNANCE STRATEGY**

**PARTICIPATION STRATEGY**

**MIXED-USE BUSINESS STRATEGY**

**RESERVES & NAMING STRATEGY**

**COMPLEMENTARY PROJECTS**

**FUNDING STRATEGY**

**LEASING, INTERIM USE & MAINTENANCE STRATEGY**

**OUTCOMES**

**REGENERATION STEERING GROUP**

**PARTICIPATION MATRIX**

**STORMWATER STRATEGY**

**RESERVE MANAGEMENT PLANS**

**RESERVE MASTER PLANS**

**MIXED-USE BUSINESS MASTER PLAN**

**LEASES & INTERIM USES**

**DISTRICT WIDE/STRATEGIC COMMS & ENGAGEMENT PLAN**

**MIXED-USE BUSINESS ACTIVATION STRATEGY**

---

**PROJECTS THAT INFLUENCE RECOVERY PLAN IMPLEMENTATION**

- KAIPOLI TOWN CENTRE 2028
- DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES
- DISTRICT PLAN REVIEW
- NATURAL HAZARDS PLAN CHANGE
- RIVER REHABILITATION
- EQ INFRASTRUCTURE RECOVERY PLAN
- LEASING PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

---

**PROJECT DATABASE**

**RISK REGISTER**

**PROJECT EXECUTION PLANS**

**COMMUNICATION & ENGAGEMENT PLANS**

**QA PROCESSES**

**CONTRACT DOCUMENTATION**

---

**PHYSICAL WORKS**

---

**EXTERNAL**

**INTERNAL**

---

**Attachment iii**

**Key**

- **Done**
- **In Progress**

---

**DR MARKUP 9 NOVEMBER 2018**
RECOVERY PLAN - IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (EXPLANATION)

IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK
Required by the Recovery Plan. To be jointly prepared - Crown and Council. A framework setting out joint objectives and actions, and clarifying roles and responsibilities for the different parties.

LAND DIVESTMENT
The process through which the Crown transfers the land affected by the Recovery Plan to Council and the Te Kōhaka Tūhihata Trust.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
Required by the Recovery Plan. To be prepared by Council. This is a public, 'living' document. A plan detailing how Council will implement its agreed actions from the Implementation Framework and the agreed land uses in the Recovery Plan.

OTHER COUNCIL PROJECTS
These projects are not part of the Recovery Plan but have synergies with the Recovery Plan. These projects will be delivered via the Recovery Plan programme.

PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT PLAN
An internal plan that sets out how the Recovery Plan programme will be managed.

PROJECT TEAM STRUCTURE
Sets out the structure for the Council project team responsible for implementing the Recovery Plan.

WORK BREAKDOWN STRUCTURE
Identifies the individual projects required to implement the Recovery Plan.

PROGRAMME SCHEDULE (DETAILED)
Sets out the detailed programme schedule (timing) for each of the individual projects identified in the work breakdown structure.

RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN
Sets out how Council will manage the risks arising from implementing the Recovery Plan. This includes addressing health and safety.

DOCUMENT CONTROL PLAN
Sets out how Council will manage the documentation associated with implementing the Recovery Plan.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT PLAN
Sets out Council budgets for individual recovery plan projects identified in the work breakdown structure.

INTERNAL
Internal management processes/documents

EXTERNAL
External (public) implementation processes/documents

PHYSICAL WORKS

STATUTORY PLANNING STRATEGY
Sets out how Council will determine the most appropriate District Plan provisions to enable the implementation of the Recovery Plan.

FUNDING STRATEGY
Sets out how Council will fund the implementation of the Recovery Plan. This includes alternative funding sources and future applications to the Long Term Plan.

LEASING STRATEGY
Sets out Council process for leasing land within the Recovery Plan area, and how these will be managed.

INTERIM USE AND MAINTENANCE STRATEGY
Sets out how Council will manage interim uses in the and the maintenance of regeneration areas once they are divested from the Crown.

DELIVERY & PROCUREMENT PLAN
Sets out how Council will deliver the implementation of the Recovery Plan including the procurement of goods and services.

COMPLEMENTARY PROJECTS
Council projects that are not being delivered as part of the Recovery Plan programme. These projects could influence, or be influenced by, the implementation of the Recovery Plan.

MONITORING PLAN
Sets out how Council will monitor the implementation of the Recovery Plan.

RESERVES AND NAMING STRATEGY
Sets out how Council will implement the reserve aspects of the Recovery Plan. It will include aspects such as Reserves Act 1977 processes including declaring land as reserve, preparation of reserve management plans, and the process for reserve naming.

ROADING & UTILITIES STRATEGY
Sets out how Council will implement the road and utilities aspects of the Recovery Plan. It will include aspects such as the decommissioning of utilities, road stopping, any new roads, stormwater management, and management of underground services.

MIXED-USE BUSINESS STRATEGY
Sets out how Council will plan the mixed-use business areas including determining the make-up of mixed use, options for lease or sale to third parties and integration with other town centre activities. This strategy will be prepared in conjunction with the Kaiapo Town Centre Plan refresh.

GOVERNANCE STRATEGY
Sets out the decision making structure for the implementation of the Recovery Plan.

PROGRAMME SCHEDULE/STAGING
A schedule setting out the implementation stages and timing for the Recovery Plan.

PARTICIPATION STRATEGY
Sets out how the community can be involved in the implementation of the Recovery Plan. This includes communications and community engagement.

INTERNAL
Internal management processes/documents

EXTERNAL
External (public) implementation processes/documents
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# Regeneration Projects Summary

**23/01/2019**

### Operational Project List/Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
<th>On/ahead of Programme</th>
<th>Behind Programme/Concerns</th>
<th>Not Started</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recovery Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Management &amp; General Operations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Framework</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Divestments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Reporting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Management and Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Reserves Master Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage Strategy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not included:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTC plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Capital Project List/Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
<th>On/ahead of Programme</th>
<th>Behind Programme/Concerns</th>
<th>Not Started</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area wide reports/investigations/consents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling works packages</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private lease areas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural areas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec and eco</td>
<td>Fieldwick Drain linkage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec and eco</td>
<td>Gray Crescent reserve reconfiguration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec and eco</td>
<td>North of Cass/community event space</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec and eco</td>
<td>South of Cass (ex Honda forest)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec and eco</td>
<td>Fieldwick rural area linkage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec and eco</td>
<td>Courtney Esplanade link</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec and eco</td>
<td>Courtney West Linkage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec and eco</td>
<td>Courtney North Linkage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec and eco</td>
<td>Dudley Drain Linkage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec and eco</td>
<td>The Pines Beach/Garms Ave Linkage Reserve</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Pines Beach Hall Demolition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec and eco (unbudgeted/separate budget)</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Boat Club Carpark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec and eco (unbudgeted/separate budget)</td>
<td>Honda Forest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec and eco (unbudgeted/separate budget)</td>
<td>Cycle Training Facility / Blackwell Crescent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Studios</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake Memorial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Food Forest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUMCA Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Trailer Parking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community BMX Track</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing Fields and Facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk Street Removal and uplift</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi West Sport and Recreation Reserve</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage and Mahinga Kai</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Gardens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi East Retained Roads Upgrades</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decommissioning 3rd party utilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj reserves</td>
<td>Charles St WWPS Viewing Platform</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj reserves</td>
<td>Maritime Heritage Precinct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj reserves</td>
<td>Railway Station Precinct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj reserves</td>
<td>Pentanque Court &amp; Jetty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not included:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUBA development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Kaiapoi River Wharf & Marine Precinct Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
<th>On/ahead of Programme</th>
<th>Behind Programme/Concerns</th>
<th>Not Started</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous Workstages</strong> (e.g. EQ Repairs, scoping, investigations, wharf shed demo, coastguard building/stopbank, original marina concepts)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downstream Wharf Deconstruction (3rd railway platform &amp; playground), rock revetment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upstream Wharf Strengthening</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Precinct / Trousselot Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV Tuhoe Wharf Demolition &amp; rock revetment extensions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharf side Geh and Landscaping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Steps and Decks (CEAT funded &amp; direct charged)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing Precinct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverview Terraces &amp; Boardwalk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontoon 1 [Riverview] &amp; Marine Precinct Dredging</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River wall Upgrade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontoon 2 (Boat Ramp) - (CEAT funded) and interim dredging</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverbanks Walkways</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams St Bridge Western Corner Landscaping Design (War Memorial)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West Corner Landscaping (Trousselot/Riverside church/131 williams)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BMX track excluded from this particular list to avoid double up
Regeneration Project Timeline

For further information on the Recovery Plan visit waimakariri.govt.nz/regeneration

Regeneration Kaiapoi Raceway

Updated November 2018

Attachment v
# MINUTES OF YOUTH COUNCIL (YC) MEETING

**Held in the Committee Rooms, Rangiora Service Centre, WDC, High Street, Rangiora at 7pm Tuesday 29 January 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Present:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sam Redman (WDC), Arabella Jarman, Ellie Tizzard, Olivia Silby, Benya Ickenroth, Caitlin Tipping, Jacob Harford, Olivia Silby, Stella Graydon, Katie Lange, Kirstyn Barnett (WDC Councillor), Dan Gordon (WDC Councillor), David Ayers (WDC Mayor), Grant Stephens (WDC Greenspace Community Engagement Officer), Eris Le Compte (Minute Secretary).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Apologies:</th>
<th>Alex Jackson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Dudley Park Presentation Grant Stephens</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant circulated plans, costings and options for the Dudley Park area and answered relevant questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As the Queen Street power poles are situated on the other side of the street, other options would have to be looked at should power be required to the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate costings are as follows:</td>
<td>ACTIONS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astro turf - $7-8000</td>
<td>Grant/Sam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar charging seat - $8,000 approx. – depending on where sited away from trees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding applications can be made to WDC Annual Plan which could possibly be spread over a two year financial period and there is the possibility of additions to be added to the site when funding becomes available. The WDC Annual Plan hearing is set for 8-10 May and funding applications would need to be submitted by 11 April. Also look at community funding – Rata Foundation etc. Perhaps approach local businesses for materials and labour?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sub group was decided on comprising Jacob, Bella, Caitlin, Sam who plan to meet before the next Youth Council meeting.</td>
<td>Sub Group: Bella, Caitlin, Jacob, Sam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Report from Mayor David Ayers and Dan Gordon</th>
<th>ACTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The WDC met for Annual Plan discussions earlier today.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big costs are expected in relation to rural water supply schemes. The tennis club is looking at selling some land for future sporting venues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDC are looking at various ways of resolving the flooding problem in East Belt near the High School.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The new Age Friendly community group have arranged a public meeting in February and suggested that a representative from Youth Council attend. Caitlin offered to act in this role. Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
are currently running an online survey which will be released in approximately three weeks.

Caitlin

5. Election of Co-Chair
It was agreed by all present that Jacob Harford be elected to this position.

6. Waimakariri Youth Council Strategy
Sam will advise when the official online Strategy launch will take place along with a recruitment drive. It is planned to also produce a short video clip interviewing current members of Youth Council and Sam asked for volunteers to come forward who are happy to take part.

There are around 2-3 positions to be filled and it is preferred that this resembles a good representation from across the district. David Ayers suggested approaching both High Schools – Rangiora and Kaiapoi and all other youth networks.

Youth Strategy is to be worked on throughout the current year with attention to the following:

1. Youth network and youth centres.
2. Improving transition from school to workplaces, employment training etc. The awareness of available jobs and preparing young people for employment. Supporting young people with working and education. Perhaps look at funding from the Government Provincial Fund. Ellie Tizzard in her capacity as Waimakariri District Youth MP will present a talk at Parliament in July on youth development/happenings in the Waimakariri region.
3. Communication, especially fostering wellness and mental health.
4. The Local Government Elections are being held in October this year. The aim is to try to get younger people interested in local government.

Ellie

7. Terms of Reference and Expectations
This document needs updating. Sam has distributed the current Terms of Reference document and will put together a draft and send out for discussion.

Sam

8. General Business
Hoodies
The hoodies have arrived and ready for those who have ordered to collect.

**Kaiapoi River Carnival**
This carnival is being held on Sunday 17 February. The Waimakariri Youth Council has been invited to participate in the raft race. Names for those interested in participating to Sam please.

**Traffic Safety Meeting**
Youth Council has been invited to sit in at the Traffic Safety Meetings which are held one morning each month, usually between 10-12noon. Caitlin expressed an interest in attending these meeting on behalf of the Youth Council.

Rangiora Police have chosen a new Police Youth Officer who is keen to work with the Youth Council and will therefore be invited to a future meeting.

**Rangiora Colour Festival**
This is being held Sunday 24 February and volunteers are required to help with the set up and evening activities. Contact Sam if interested.

---

**Meeting closed at 8.44 pm**

**Next meeting** on Tuesday 26 February 2019 at 7pm in the Rakahuri Room, at the Rangiora Service Centre.
MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE REGENERATION STEERING GROUP HELD IN THE RUATANIWHA KAIAPOI CIVIC CENTRE ON MONDAY 4 FEBRUARY 2019 AT 4.00PM

PRESENT:
A Blackie, J Watson, P Redmond, C Greengrass, R Blair, J Meyer, S Stewart.
Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri representative A Reuben, Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust representative C McMillan, Environment Canterbury representative C McKay, D Ayers (Mayor), J Palmer (Chief Executive), C Brown (Manager Community and Recreation), D Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager - District Regeneration).

IN ATTENDANCE:
M Flanagan, WDC, S Lodge, WDC, F Scales, WDC.

1. APOLOGIES
An apology was received and sustained from M Pinkham and N Atkinson for absence.
An apology was received and sustained from D Ayers for lateness.
Moved: C Greengrass Seconded: J Meyer
CARRIED

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
Moved: A Blackie Seconded: J Watson
THAT the Regeneration Steering Group:
Confirms as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting held on Monday 3 December 2018.
CARRIED
3. **MATTERS ARISING**

S Stewart noted in regard to the matters arising from the previous meeting that a letter has since been received from Piet Oudolf and he has advised he is unable to undertake the garden design but has recommended a colleague. S Stewart advised a new letter will come to the next Regeneration Steering Group meeting.

4. **DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS**

There were no deputations and presentations.

5. **TE KŌHAKA O TŪHAITARA TRUST UPDATE**

C McMillan advised there have been some discussions with Council, and a workshop is scheduled with Council to work through some of the details around definitions with regard to land uses and activities on Trust Regeneration land around what things mean.

J Palmer noted a meeting was held pre-Christmas to look at some definitions and what outcomes are being sought, and what the best means within the statutory framework and Trust framework are to achieve that.

6. **REPORTS**

6.1 **District Regeneration Communications Report – December 2018 – Sarah Lodge - (Communications Advisor – District Regeneration), Duncan Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager – District Regeneration)**

S Lodge advised there has been quite a lot of response to the posts on Facebook in regard to the Kaiapoi Community BMX track.

S Lodge noted that a time lapse camera is to be installed on a power pole in the Kaiapoi East area. This has been approved by MainPower.

S Lodge noted that the 2018 Regeneration summary has been uploaded onto the Regeneration web page if anyone would like to look at this.

The invitations for the Kaiapoi Riverview Terraces official opening have been sent out today. A Blackie noted that the opening will take place whatever the weather conditions are.

A Blackie noted that the “Frequently Asked Questions” on the Regeneration web page are out of date and need to be updated. S Lodge advised that this is underway and will be updated as soon as possible.

Moved: A Blackie

Seconded: P Redmond

**THAT** the Regeneration Steering Group:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190115003383.

**CARRIED**
6.2 District Regeneration – Progress Report to December 2018 – Duncan Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager – District Regeneration)

D Roxborough noted the purpose of this report is to provide a regular summary of the activity the staff team have been undertaking.

This is the first of these reports that has been brought to the Regeneration Steering Group, and the plan is to issue these quarterly. The purpose is to update on how we are tracking with the various projects and how we are tracking against our planned spend and our actual spend, and any key issues that the Steering Group need to be thinking about in future meetings.

D Roxborough advised the report covers the Regeneration projects as well as the Kaiapoi Riverbanks and Marine Precinct projects. This first report does not include a details financial summary for the marine projects. There are two key projects that are currently out for tender and these will close at the end of February so have deferred this update until the prices have been received. These relate to the contracts for the main pontoon and the main dredging works in the river, and combined will be just over $1M.

D Roxborough advised the intent is to bring this report to the Steering Group and it will then be referred to Council for their information. Also as per Recommendation (b) this report will be circulated to Land Information New Zealand as one of our strategic partners and essentially forms part of the Monitoring Plan.

D Roxborough noted that in terms of the expenditure on the Regeneration programme, the budget from the LTP is $17.7M, this excludes the Memorial Gardens project. Of the budget to date we have spent around $2.7M; some of the capital expenditure to date has been tracking slightly behind and is expected to catch up over the next six months and over the following financial year as there are a lot of projects on-site or to be on-site soon.

D Roxborough noted that in terms of Communication and Engagement reporting and progress, we will continue for now to bring through the monthly report. In terms of the projects that we are reporting progress on, these do not currently include the mixed-use business area. As these projects come to light they will potentially be added as we go.

D Roxborough advised that from the Council Annual Plan budget meetings held last week, there have been no significant changes to the budget. There has been a slight adjustment to the balance of the operational and capital spend. This is due to the fact that when staff are working on projects their time now gets coded towards the project and is capitalised and becomes part of the value of that asset.

D Roxborough referred to Clause 4.10, noting there are some key actions that require resolution. This is a watching list that we need to be setting our mind to. These are some of the things that will be coming through to the Steering Group over the next few months. The top of the list is the Heritage and Mahinga Kai area and establishing the co-governance arrangements. This is being worked on presently, and we will need to get along-side our partners as soon as possible to start to establish how that area is going to develop.

D Roxborough noted for the rural land uses establishment, there was a meeting held today to look at how to assess the rural land use propositions. There are a couple of projects in the Riverbanks programme that need to commence shortly such as 137 Williams Street and the corner by the War Memorial. The corner on 137 Williams Street will have the scope and design underway soon.

D Roxborough noted that work has been started on the Sports fields’ clubrooms business case and a Request for Proposal is underway.

D Roxborough referred to the development of the Kaiapoi River Wharf and Marine Precinct Operations Plan and Policy, and noted with all of the work that is being completed in the marine precinct, a new operations plan will need to be developed on how the activity will be managed, and how to manage requests for berthing etc. This will need to be brought back to the Steering Group and the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board soon.

D Roxborough noted the Riverview Pontoon went out for tender today and we anticipate on getting the marina basin dredging request for tender issued tomorrow. The Jones Street Upgrade works is currently out for tender.
P Redmond asked if the transfer of the land has occurred from LINZ yet.

D Roxborough replied that the road stoppings are all complete. The survey work has been done, and is currently sitting with LINZ to finish the e-dealing. D Roxborough noted he will be attending a meeting with LINZ next week and this can be raised at this meeting.

P Redmond asked in regard to Clause 4.17 in relation to the un-budgeted projects if there are any timeframes and what is happening with those, in particular the Maritime Heritage Precinct, and the Historic Railway Station Precinct.

D Roxborough noted these projects are identified projects within the Reserves Master Plan. In terms of timeframes, there has not been a specific timeframe other than they sit in the medium timeframe of the 4 - 10 year horizon at this stage. These projects are something we need to set our mind to, planning what they are and when they might happen. At present there is no specific budget earmarked for these projects, so how we fund those projects will need to be worked through.

A Blackie noted with the Regeneration Steering Group probably going out of existence at the end of this year, this will be a decision with the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board in years to come.

Moved:     J Palmer   Seconded:     P Redmond

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group recommends:

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190124007788.

(b) Circulates this report to Land Information New Zealand, as agents on behalf of the Crown, for the purposes of monitoring the implementation of the Recovery Plan.

CARRIED

6.3 Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area Road Upgrades – Fraser Scales (Senior Project Engineer)

F Scales noted the purpose of this report is to seek a recommendation from the Regeneration Steering Group to the Utilities and Roading Committee on the proposed concept design for the upgrade (permanent repairs) of the remaining roads in the Kaiapoi East Regeneration area.

F Scales advised the proposed concept designs have been prepared for the following roads; Cass Street West, Charles Street East and West, Jollie Street, Old Feldwick Drive, Cass Street East and Hall Street. Jones Street has not been included as part of this concept design.

The concept designs have been guided by the primary purpose of the road. The current project estimate for the proposed concept designs is $2.6M and the current Regeneration programme budget allocation for this work is $2M. Approval is currently being sought from Council to re-allocate up to $600,000 from within the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery programme activity to the District Regeneration programme. The current Regeneration programme budget allocation of $2M includes budgeted NZTA subsidy of $770,000. The current NZTA Activity List includes a scheduled subsidy total of $545,700 for both Charles Street and Jollie Street. This leaves a shortfall of $224,300.

F Scales advised, if the recommendations are adopted, the detailed design and tendering for the road upgrades would commence with a view to starting construction in September. It is expected the construction would be complete by March 2020.

In reply to the questions previously raised in writing by M Pinkham on the parking on Charles Street.

F Scales replied that in response to the points raised on parking on the riverside, this was considered, however if there was to be parking on both sides of Charles Street, the transition zone on the carriageway between the two are as would intrude into quite a significant portion of the car parking which would mean the scheme may only end up with 10 spaces on the riverside. Secondly some of the points raised are more appropriate for Williams Street side of Charles Street and the parking in front of the New World, and this area is outside of the scope of this report.
Thirdly, in the Reserves Master Plan, there is provision for trailer parking. We have discussed the possibility for the potential to allow for car parking there as well.

A Blackie asked in regard to Jollie Street parking noting there is parallel parking on both sides rather than angle parking. This is a very wide road, and asked if angle parking was considered for Jollie Street.

F Scales replied the option for angle parking was considered for Jollie Street, however the aim is to achieve a tree lined boulevard along Jollie Street. F Scales noted that angle parking did not align with that objective, secondly, the numbers have been assessed and there is a large number of car parks already, and coupled with Cass Street carpark this will be more than adequate.

J Meyer asked if the trees that are currently there will be staying, and asked if the parking will be at 45 or 90 degrees.

F Scales replied the trees will be staying in. F Scales noted that all of the options have been explored and we need to try and achieve value for money. One of the driving factors is to try to fit everything within the existing road corridor and to also work within a very tight budget. If a full reconstruction of the pavement outside of the existing road corridor is undertaken this would significantly increase the costs. The current proposed approach provides parking on both sides whereas angle parking would only provide parking on one side of the road; if the new road is to sit within the existing pavement area.

A Blackie asked in regard to the berm in Cass Street where it turns into Feldwick Street there is a semi-circular area so the rubbish truck can turn around. The cost of this was queried and whether there are any cost savings to be made by not installing this.

D Roxborough noted this allows for a general turn-around area. Due to the way the roads are configured this will allow people who may go there looking for a car park and can’t find one, turn around and to find their way back to other car parking areas. This turn-around area is also for the use of other vehicles including emergency services etc.

F Scales replied that on a high demand day there may be quite a high amount of vehicles using this area looking for parking and we are keen to avoid bottle necks.

P Redmond noted that M Pinkham written questions also mentioned Hall Street and the absence of the footpath.

F Scales replied that the intention from the Reserves Master Plan is that Cass Street provides a link through to Moore Street. For people wishing to assess the Askeaton boat park, they can use the stop bank walkways.

P Redmond noted there is currently a footpath down Cass Street to Hall Street.

F Scales replied the Cass Street footpath has a proposed link through to the Feldwick drain. Access along the Feldwick Drain will also link to the stop bank walkway.

R Blair asked in regard to Askeaton noting that the Council were going to look at how much the boat ramp is used and how often the Coastguard boat ramp is being used. Has there been any progress on this, or any survey undertaken.

C Brown replied he is not aware that this survey has happened. C Brown noted there has been money identified in next year’s annual plan to update the Askeaton boat ramp. C Brown noted he recalls at one time the Askeaton boat ramp was discussed being moved to the Coastguard area, and that there was a lot of negative feedback in the community around the distance between the two ramps and the five knot speed limit travelling between the two boat ramps, so there was some money allocated to upgrade the access track into Askeaton, bearing in mind that it is very low and floods. The $60K for the upgrade of the Askeaton boat ramp is to be used to put in some bollards, put in a small amount of car parking space, and to do some repairs to the boat ramp. This will take place in the next financial year.

A Blackie advised from a meeting held with Gary Manch from Environment Canterbury, they have agreed to reinstate the 5 knot speed limit signs on the bridge as there have been reports of boats travelling at 20 knots along this part of the river. Environment Canterbury will be making three signs at their expense. The Council will maintain the signs.
THAT the Regeneration Steering Group recommends:

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No. 181123137888.

(b) **Approves** the proposed concept design for Cass Street west (between Jones Street and the Kaiapoi East sport and recreation reserve) as shown in Figure 1 of this report.

(c) **Approves** the proposed concept design for Charles Street west (between Jones Street and Beswick Street) as shown in Figures 2 and 3 of this report.

(d) **Approves** the proposed concept design for Charles Street east (between Beswick Street and Jollie Street) as shown in Figures 4 and 5 of this report.

(e) **Approves** the proposed concept design for Jollie Street as shown in Figure 6 of this report.

(f) **Approves** the proposed concept design for Old Feldwick Drive (between Jollie Street and the private property at 10 Feldwick Drive) as shown in Figure 7 of this report.

(g) **Approves** the proposed concept design for Cass Street east (between old Feldwick Drive and Hall Street) as shown in Figure 8 of this report.

(h) **Approves** the proposed concept design for Hall Street as shown in Figure 9 of this report.

(i) **Notes** the current project estimate for the proposed concept designs is $2,652,274.

(j) **Notes** the estimate includes professional fees and a project contingency of 30%.

(k) **Notes** the current Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme and Regeneration Programme budget allocation for this work is $2,060,000.

(l) **Notes** Council approval is currently being sought to reallocate budget of up to $600,000 from within the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery programme activity (Project 48 for the purposes of decommissioning roads) to the District Regeneration programme activity, for the new purpose of rebuilding some of those roads within the Kaiapoi East Regeneration area.

(m) **Notes** if Council approves the budget reallocation, the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme and Regeneration Programme budget allocation for this work would increase to $2,660,000.

(n) **Notes** the current Regeneration Programme budget allocation of $2,060,000 includes a budgeted NZTA subsidy of $770,000. The current NZTA Activity List includes a scheduled subsidy total of $545,700 for both Charles Street and Jollie Street only. This discrepancy between the WDC budgeted and NZTA scheduled subsidy figures indicates a net shortfall of $224,300 (assuming Council accepts the aforementioned budget reallocation from the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme).

CARRIED

7. **CORRESPONDENCE**

There was no correspondence.
8. MATTERS REFERRED

8.1 Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area Retained Roads, proposed reallocation of Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme Budget – Duncan Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager – District Regeneration), Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager)

Received for information.

9. GENERAL

A Blackie advised he attended a meeting along with N Atkinson, Cr P Williams and Simon Hart with Ian Fox, the Harbour Master, to discuss the river carnival and the house boat moorings. A Blackie noted this meeting went very well, and the Harbour Master is happy with the concept of house boats on the Kaiapoi River as long as the boats are securely tied to the stop bank and that there are no navigation issue. With three of the six investigated house boat sites being upstream of the Williams Street Bridge, this will be less of an issue as the navigation factor drops away the further upstream they are located.

A Blackie noted the meeting also discussed the precinct operation plan, as with the River Queen coming on schedule in a month or two, we will need to upgrade the safety and navigation on the river. This could have an impact on the three current moorings; as to whether they can stay where they are or if they may need to be moved. This could be problematic as the Council do not own the three moorings and would need to persuade them to move, as there are also Grandfather clauses.

10. NEXT MEETING

The next scheduled meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group commences at 4.00pm on Monday 4 March 2019 at the Ruataniwha Centre, Kaiapoi.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS THE MEETING CLOSED AT 4.45PM.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE AUDIT AND RISK COMMITTEE HELD IN THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 12 FEBRUARY 2019 COMMENCING AT 3.30PM.

PRESENT

Councillor N Atkinson (Chairperson), Mayor D Ayers, Deputy Mayor K Felstead, Councillors A Blackie, K Barnett and P Williams

IN ATTENDANCE

Councillors D Gordon, S Stewart, J Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support), G Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading), C Brown (Manager Community and Recreation), L Ashton (Manager Organisational Development and HR), G Meadows (Policy Manager), P Christensen (Finance Manager), K Simpson (3 Waters Manager), J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager), D Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager, District Regeneration), M Harris (Customer Services Manager) (for public excluded part of meeting), C Browne (Health, Safety and Quality Manager), K LaValley (Project Delivery Manager), H Street (Corporate Planner), S Morrow (Applications for a Rates Remission) (for public excluded part of meeting) and A Smith (Governance Coordinator)

1 APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest noted.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee held on Tuesday 20 November 2018

Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead seconded Councillor Blackie

THAT the Audit Committee

(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee, held on the 20 November 2018, as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising.

5 PRESENTATION/DEPUTATION

There were no presentations or deputations.
6 REPORTS

6.1 Audit New Zealand Management Report for the year ended 30 June 2018 – Jeff Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)

J Millward presented this report and the Audit New Zealand Management Report for the year ended 30 June 2018. The Auditor identified three areas for improvement in the annual report –

Vested assets – improvements in the processes suggested in recognising vested assets that come to the Council. This will be incorporated into the improvements to the Strategic Asset management System that is being developed. The process will require a Project Manager to be appointed for each of the projects and assets that are accepted into the system.

Development contributions – this has been brought to the Council in a separate report. J Millward noted that there has been changes in processes since the Auditors Report and more staff are able to get alerts and reports on developments that occur now.

Harvesting of Council forests. J Millward advised the processes have been reviewed and assessments will be done in future advising how much capital has been removed or added to the Council.

There were some other quite minor issues that have been dealt with and Mr Millward considers this was a good Audit Management Report.

Moved Councillor Barnett seconded Deputy Mayor Felstead

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) Receives report No. 190111002184
(b) Receives Audit New Zealand’s Management Report for the year ending 30 June 2018;
(c) Notes there are no significant matters arising from the management letter. Audit New Zealand have made a number of recommendations where systems could be improved and these improvements have been made or are programmed to be completed.

CARRIED

6.2 Non-Financial Performance Measures 2nd Quarter Results as at 31 December 2018 – Helene Street (Corporate Planner)

H Street presented this report which provides an update on the Long Term Plan non-financial performance measures for the second quarter of the 2018/2019 financial year. There was a marked improvement compared to the same period last year and good explanations for any matters that haven’t met target.

Councillor Barnett asked about monitoring on wastewater and drainage and issues with customer service. What happens when there is requests/complaints that involve matters with shared responsibility of both this Council and with Environment Canterbury?. G Cleary noted that if there is anything that is a service request relating to roading and 3 Waters Team Leaders in the respective departments are managing these requests, which are followed up and if it is appropriate, these are directed to the agency concerned. It was confirmed that if a request is handed over to another
agency, the customer is advised and the matter closed off appropriately with the Council.

Moved Councillor Barnett seconded Councillor Williams

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) Receives the report Non-Financial Performance Measure 2nd Quarter Results as at 31 December 2018, TRIM No. 190123006733

CARRIED

Councillor Barnett commented on the favourable results and the improvements in percentages. Also noted the reporting is easy to follow and it is pleasing to see improved results in areas where resources have been directed.

6.3 Results of WorkSafe SafePlus Online Assessment Questionnaire – Charlotte Browne (Health, Safety and Quality Manager)

C Browne presented this report which provides results of the organisation-wide WorkSafe SafePlus Online Assessment questionnaire which was completed by WDC in December 2018. Councillors who completed the assessment were thanked for doing so and any comments made. This questionnaire confirmed that the council is at a ‘performing’ level which is the median performance level for any organisation participating in the programme. There was a relatively high participation rate of 245 out of 413 requests, which was pleasing. Specific results highlighted were that 81% of staff either strongly agreed or agreed with the statements regarding the effectiveness of Health and Safety Leadership within WDC; 70% of staff either strongly agreed or agreed with the statements regarding the effectiveness of Health and Safety Worker Engagement within WDC; and 84% of staff either strongly agreed or agreed with the statements regarding the effectiveness of Health and Safety Risk Management within WDC. Staff also provided feedback to WorkSafe on how they can improve their Questionnaire in future.

Moved Deputy Mayor Felstead seconded Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) Receives report No. 190109001638.
(b) Notes the results of the WorkSafe SafePlus Online Assessment for 2018 (Level = Performing)
(c) Notes the future emphasis that will be placed on Worker Engagement and three key risk areas
(d) Notes the Online Assessment data moderation process and associated feedback to WorkSafe regarding questionnaire design

CARRIED
6.4 Financial Report for the period ended 31 December 2018 – Paul Christensen (Finance Manager)

P Christensen presented this report and the financial result for the quarter ended 31 December 2018. Three key financial indicators:

- Surplus was $6.2 million against the budget of $2.8 million – this is mainly as a result of revenue being larger than expected - $1.1 million from forestry revenue and $3.5 million from development contributions revenue
- Debt is still at $145 million, which is the same as at the end of the last quarter
- Capital Expenditure is $31 million which is 30% of the full year budget.

Following a question from Councillor Barnett on the liquidity ratio, P Christensen and J Millward provided an explanation.

Moved Councillor Barnett seconded Councillor Blackie

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) Receives report No. 190128008390.
(b) Notes that progress is tracking favourably in comparison to budget.

CARRIED

6.5 Capital Projects Report for the period ended 31 December 2018 – Paul Christensen (Finance Manager), Kalley Simpson (3 Waters Manager) and Chris Brown (Manager Community and Recreation)

Presenting this report were P Christensen, C Brown (Manager Community and Recreation), G Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading) and K Simpson (3 Waters Manager).

G Cleary noted that it is the intention of both himself and C Brown to be present at future Audit and Risk Committee meetings to keep the Committee informed on the delivery of the capital works programme.

P Christensen advised that as at the end of December $31.1 million of the capital works programme has been spent, which is 36% of the full year revised budget. At this time also, 318 of the 341 projects are expected to be completed, though 47 of this completed figure have been identified “at risk” of being completed for various reasons.

At this time K Simpson provided an overview of the information in the report on capital projects progress, including those on time, those programmes at risk, and those behind programme for each of the Council’s activities. There was also explanation given on the additional information being provided as part of this report on projects.

Councillor Atkinson asked if further information could be available to the Council on the “at risk” portion of projects. K Simpson advised that there is a summary of the risk provided in this reporting, which indicates if a project is “on programme”, or if it is “programme at risk” meaning there is a risk it will go to carry over at the end of the year, or a project being “behind programme” means it is already anticipated to be a carry over. Currently the details of the risk for projects is being analysed at a staff management level. Councillor Atkinson asked if this level of risk could be available in the reporting and this
would be advantageous to be available to the Council. This would provide some reassurance if this is a low risk or otherwise. G Cleary noted the comments beside each of the projects noted as “project at risk” do provide some detail to the Council and questioned whether there would be any benefit in providing more detail than this. C Brown noted that for each of the projects that are “at risk” in the Recreation activities, the comments section should identify exactly why that project has been put “at risk”.

Councillor Gordon asked if the information available on carryovers that is provided to Standard and Poors is going to be satisfactory for them and meet what they are looking for and will be understood clearly. J Millward noted that this information is just one of eight items that will be given to Standard and Poors for them to understand the capital programme; they will also be given a capital comparison to the LTP to show that there has been no increase in capital, showing the loan profile, treasurer report from Bancorp which will state the Council is in a good position relating to other Councils, and also show the forecasting capital spend going out to future years. They will also receive a liquidity ratio to determine if the Council is in a good position or bad which is much improved. Standard and Poors will also have good discussion with the Mayor and Chief Executive to determine their views. All this information is providing them what they are looking for.

G Cleary said that what staff have tried to achieve is to give the Council a broad view of how projects are tracking across the entire organisation and also to then allow a view of any of the services separately to get a broad view there. It is also then possible to have a look on a project by project basis. There is also more work being undertaken to be able to include the effects of seasonality in capital projects. This information is a really useful tool for staff as well to keep track on projects.

Councillor Stewart asked is there a large amount of resource required to provide this additional information? K Simpson said there has been a change in how the information from managers is tracked. This is done through the Asset Management system.

Councillor Barnett suggested that information could be included in the recommendation on the predicted money that would be spent on the expected total capital spend for the financial year. J Millward said it would be appropriate to show projects that may not be completed and this information could be provided.

Mayor Ayers noted there is always projects which are partially completed. A project can be underway but may not be completed. Regarding accuracy of reporting, for multi-year projects listed as carryovers, it was advised that the Council is obligated to carry this budget over in its entirety for accounting purposes because the item is still not being used. It was agreed these could be identified separately also.

Moved Councillor Atkinson seconded Councillor Blackie

**THAT** the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) **Receives** report No. 190128008548.

(b) **Notes** that staff are to add further refinements to the information provided in future reports.

(c) **Notes** that progress of the capital projects with $31.1 million (36%) of the full year revised budget spent.
(d) **Notes** that 318 (93%) of the 341 projects are expected to be completed or on time this financial year

(e) **Circulates** the report to the Boards

CARRIED

Councillor Atkinson noted there will be benefits of the refinements that have been discussed today. It is important that this is also a tool for staff to use. It is the responsibility of this committee to continue refining this information and this can come through suggestions from both the staff and from the committee.

Councillor Blackie agreed that this is a living document.

Councillor Barnett said it is important that information is available in the summary and the area of carryovers is a difficult but important area. Councillor Barnett would like staff to give the committee the overall picture in the report and back it up with the data.

7 **PORTFOLIO UPDATES**

7.1 **Audit, Risk, Long Term Plan and Excellence Programme** – Deputy Mayor Kevin Felstead

Deputy Mayor Felstead advised that the Annual Plan process is currently on track and this will come to Council at the next Council meeting on 19 February.

7.2 **Communications** – Councillor Neville Atkinson

The Communications department is now fully staffed. Staff are reviewing strategies and looking at the marketing tools currently being used.

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 Atkinson 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>Report of Scott Morrow (Rates Officer Land Information)</td>
<td>Applications for a Rates Remission</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons</td>
<td>A2(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

CLOSED MEETING

See In Committee Agenda

OPEN MEETING

There being no further business, the meeting closed a 5.20pm.

CONFIRMED

__________________________________________
Chairperson

__________________________________________
Date
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL


PRESENT
Councillor K Barnett (Chairperson), Mayor D Ayers, Councillors A Blackie, R Brine and D Gordon.

ATTENDING
Deputy Mayor Felstead, Councillors S Stewart, J Meyer and P Williams C Brown (Manager Community and Recreation), M Greenwood (Aquatic Facilities Manager), M O’Connell (Acting District Libraries Manager), S Kong (Community Facilities Coordinator), J Clements (Learning Connections Coordinator), K Walker (Kaiapoi Aquatic Centre & Facilities Asset Manager), T Sturley (Community Team Manager), N Paterson (Community Development Facilitator), A E Smith (Governance Coordinator)

1 APOLOGIES
Moved Councillor Barnett seconded Councillor Gordon,

THAT an apology for absence be received and sustained from Councillor W Doody.

CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
No conflicts of interest were reported.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee held on Tuesday 18 December 2018

Moved Councillor Blackie Seconded Councillor Gordon

THAT the Community and Recreation committee:

(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee, held on Tuesday 18 December 2018, as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
There were no matters arising.

5 DEPUTATIONS
There were no deputations.
6 REPORTS

6.1 Community Facilities – User applications for exemption from fees – Simon Kong (Community Facilities Coordinator)

C Brown spoke to this report which presents the requests for exemptions from fee increases from five different groups who use community facilities. The report also seeks a decision on dealing with future applications. This is the fourth report that has come to the committee with requests for exemptions. This report does include options for the committee to consider and C Brown provided an explanation for each of these options. There has been a suggestion for a Working Group to be established to look at how a Policy could be established for any applications for exemptions going forward.

Councillor Stewart noted that there have been 15 applications for exemptions received previously and with these being approved, has this set a precedent for any future applications? C Brown noted that previous applications have been determined by individual agreement with each of the groups – some have been 50% of the fee and some are a fixed fee for a 12 month period.

Following a question from Councillor Williams on the fixed fee of $500 that the Fernside Indoor Bowling Club pays, it was confirmed the group has been paying this fixed fee for the past four to five years.

Councillor Barnett noted that there was an application from a school, and questioned what the arrangements were for other schools in the district for using community facilities. S Kong advised that Woodend School have a standard no charge to use the Woodend Community Centre. The original approval for Fernside School to use Fernside Hall for a flat annual fee. These schools have standing bookings to use the community facilities for overflow of school activities. Current arrangements could be seen as inconsistent across the district.

Councillor Barnett asked had there been any discussions with these five applicants on their groups ability to pay the fees set in the following year, noting that the recommendation covers the current 12 month period. C Brown noted that when there have been discussions with groups and asked them if they could accommodate an increase in the fees, all have said no. It is difficult for staff to know if these groups actually can afford these increases, and whether they have sought funding to cover operational costs, or canvassed their members to discuss possible increases in fees/subs. C Brown said that it is important to note that fees have not increased for seven years. So over that time, the groups have been paying a fixed fee and the value for operational costs has essentially decreased.

Moved Councillor Barnett Seconded Councillor Gordon

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190129009698

(b) **Notes** the submissions for exemption from fees received from users.

(c) **Approve** a fixed fee of $500 per annum for Fernside Indoor Bowls. This annual fee is for the 2019 calendar year.

(d) **Approve** a 50% fee waiver for Pegasus Plus for their regular reoccurring booking. That the waiver applies for twelve months from the approval date.
(e) **Approve** a fixed annual fee of $500 to cover standard annual activities run by the school at the Oxford Town Hall for the 2019 calendar year. Activities include; School Production, School Prize Giving, Community Workshops.

(f) **Approve** a 50% fee waiver for Night Writers for their regular reoccurring booking at the Rangiora Town Hall.

(g) **Approve** the application of the standard fee of $10 per hour for Ballet with Bex bookings at the Pegasus Community Centre That the waiver applies for twelve months from the approval date.

(h) **Notes** that if all approvals for this report are accepted the financial implications are an estimated total of $1826 for the 2018/19 financial year.

(i) **Notes** that the total financial implications of fee exemptions that have already approved is estimated at $9200 for the 2018/19 financial year.

(j) **Notes** that fees increases are split over two years with the final increase occurring on the 1st July 2019.

(k) **Notes** that a working group including staff and elected members be established to discuss process for the waiver of fees for community facilities, with Terms of Reference to be discussed at the March 2019 Community and Recreation Committee meeting.

(l) **Circulates** the report to the Boards for their information.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Barnett noted that this situation has become confusing for the different groups and with the establishment of a Working Group is a way of getting some consistency going forward. This would get groups paying the level that they need to pay for the Council to operate these community facilities at the appropriate rates and that they attach the appropriate subsidy for it. Councillor Barnett would like to see some consistency for any waivers approved in the future.

Councillor Gordon noted the issue of the increase in fees for hiring community facilities has been difficult to put in place and there have been significant impacts on some of the groups in the district. Regarding the Fernside Indoor Bowls group, which is a small group, Councillor Gordon suggested over time having a stepped increase could be negotiated with the group could be a better outcome. Increases in the fees are required, and these need to be considered on a case by case basis. The Working Party with staff and councillors is the right way forward.

Councillor Brine is concerned with the situation and the amount of staff time that is taken up with looking at these applications. There needs to be increases in fees, especially with fees not having been increased for seven years and community groups need to have that communicated to them. Councillor Brine supports the establishment of a Working Group and this recommendation.

Mayor Ayers supports the setting up of the Working Group and what was set up previously has potential for inconsistent decision making. Different groups have different capacities and noted that groups can apply grants for covering
operating costs, but these are not always approved. Mayor Ayers noted the situation with schools that sometimes need to hire bigger facilities than they have, to accommodate large members of their school community for one off events such as school prize giving events. There is no charge for people to attend these events. This is in contrast to other groups who may hire a council community facility and people attending have to pay to attend. This is something that a Working Party will need to consider.

Councillor Barnett replied that this is costing staff time and having a Policy in place will make the process more streamlined.

6.2 Aquatic Facilities Update – Matthew Greenwood (Aquatic Facilities Manager)

M Greenwood presented this report and introduced staff members Keith Walker, the Kaiapoi Aquatic Centre and Facilities Asset Manager. Highlighted the closing days for scheduled maintenance, which will be from Monday 8 April to Thursday 25 April, which coincides with the last week of the Term one WaiSwim programme and the first week and a half of school holidays. Those closure period includes Easter weekend, but this is traditionally a low volume period with customers using the public holidays to travel. The Kaiapoi Aquatic Centre will be closed on Friday 3 May, due to Mainpower undertaking some work which will affect the power supply of the facility and surrounding area.

N Greenwood spoke on the funding for running the Learn to Swim Schools Programme and that due a transition of WDC staff the grant which would have provided approximately $38,000 income in the current financial year was unfortunately not applied for. Some options were investigated to try to secure additional funding and M Greenwood highlighted these. One of these options is that there is existing equity in the aquatic budget which could fund the shortfall for the Learn to Swim Schools programme.

Moved Councillor Brine Seconded Councillor Gordon

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 190116003969
(b) Notes Aquatic Facilities progress against its key performance indicators for Water Quality and Facility Attendance.
(c) Notes closure dates of 8th to 25th April for programmed maintenance at Dudley Park Aquatic Centre and 3rd May for infrastructure works at Kaiapoi Aquatic Centre.
(d) Notes that staff did not apply as they usually would for a Water Safety New Zealand grant for the Learn to Swim School Programme for the current financial year.
(e) Notes that any shortfall in income as a result of not applying for the Water Safety New Zealand grant is able to be funded from existing equity in the Aquatics account.
(f) Circulates the report to the Boards for their information.

CARRIED
6.3 **Library Update to 31 January 2019 – Mark O-Connell (Acting District Libraries Manager)**

M O’Connell presented this report, with Jason Clements (Learning Connections Coordinator) also in attendance. Highlights of recent events in the Libraries including the annual function held prior to Christmas to acknowledge the contribution of the library volunteers and the Summer Reading Challenge, which is aimed at preschool, school-aged children, and youth to keep them reading over the summer holidays. This was very successful and saw a record number of registrations (a total of 611). The Library has also been involved in a “Hell Reading Challenge” which is to encourage reluctant readers to become interested in books with the bonus of free pizza rewards. This is the third year the Waimakariri libraries have offered this reading challenge.

M O’Connell acknowledged the recent appointment of Paula Eskett as the new District Libraries Manager, who commences with the Council on Monday 4 March.

Moved Councillor Gordon Seconded Mayor Ayers

**THAT** the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190131011192

(b) **Notes** the customer service improvements, customer feedback, and activities offered by the Waimakariri Libraries in December 2018 and January 2019.

(c) **Notes** the appointment of Paula Eskett as the new District Libraries Manager

(d) **Circulates** the report to the Boards for their information.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Gordon noted how well supported the library is by the keen passionate group of volunteers and what a great resource that our libraries are for the district.

Mayor Ayers offered congratulations to Mark O’Connell on his recent appointment as Libraries Manager at Hurunui District Council and thanked him for his 30 years of service to Waimakariri District Council. Fellow Committee members also conveyed their thanks to Mark for his years of service to the Council’s libraries and wished him well.
6.4 Family Violence Prevention – Tessa Sturley (Community Team Manager)

Natalie Paterson, Community Development Facilitator presented a PowerPoint presentation on Family Violence. This noted that family violence can be abuse towards spouse or partner, former partner, family or household member or other close relationships. The kinds of abuse, harm or violence can be physical, psychological, sexual, financial or neglect. There are many reasons why victims put up with abuse in a relationship and find it hard to talk to someone else about it. Important statistics in the presentation included:

- It is estimated that only 20% of family violence is report to the Police.
- In 2014 the Police responded to 100,000 family violence incidents.
- On average each year 14 women, seven men and eight children are killed by a family member.
- New Zealand has the highest reported rate of intimate partner violence in the developed world.

Family violence can impact on the work place with decreased productivity (the victim can be distressed, depressed, distracted or fearful), increased risk to the employer, absenteeism, employee discord (in carrying the workload of victims, covering for colleagues, upsetting behaviour unsettling for others, or being workmates of an abuser) and also violence in the workplace.

The presentation highlighted the benefits of a workplace response and the part that employers can play. This can include an increased understanding of family violence, providing information and training for staff, developing workplace policies and procedures and involvement in community projects.

In concluding the presentation, N Paterson spoke on the colour pyramid – Spectrum of Prevention - which is a representation of internationally recognised best practice in creating social change for the prevention of intentional or unintentional harm. Local initiatives provide this best practice were highlighted, which included providing knowledge through social and printed media, billboards and displays at events; promoting community education through White Ribbon Seminars and Keeping up Appearances; providing local education; Violence Free North Canterbury which fosters coalitions and networks; changing organisational practices with Family Violence Leave and offering peer support; and influencing policy and legislation with a Family Violence Leave Policy.

N Paterson was thanked for her presentation.

T Sturley advised that it is planned to provide a report to this committee for the 2019 year on a specific priority area, including:

- Family violence
- Suicide Prevention
- Age Friendly Communities
- Alcohol and Addiction
- Migrants
- Volunteering
- Social Inclusion

T Sturley spoke on the planned initiatives for 2019 for family violence. The support of the Council for recognising family violence was acknowledged and the collaboration of agencies in the Violence Free North Canterbury.
Councillor Blackie expressed some concern with Council staff being responsible for picking up any matter relating to family violence and these being people who are not experienced in this field and providing the appropriate response. T Sturley responded that if people are aware there is an issue with a fellow staff member, they can suggest the appropriate agencies where people can get help. It is not best practice that staff are expected to offer counselling.

Councillor Barnett asked how is the success the Council’s family violence programme is measured and the impact that it is having. T Sturley said it is important to note the difference between population indicators and performance indicators. Regarding community led prevention, performance indicators are a change in culture or a change in understanding. People are surveyed both before and after an intervention and anecdotal information is gathered from the Police. Increased reporting is a good thing and indicates a good job is being done. A measure in this area is are people speaking to others about it, do people know where to ask for help, and do they have the confidence to ask for someone for help. These are some of the questions asked in the survey. The measurement is based on are people better off?

Regarding representation in the rural sector, Councillor Barnett asked if Federated Farmers were involved at all. T Sturley noted that currently the Rural Support Trust are not represented in this network and it was noted that this group has been significantly pulled into the Hurunui response.

Moved Councillor Blackie Seconded Councillor Gordon

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:

a) Receives report No. 190131010856
b) Circulates report No. 190131010856 to the Community Boards
c) Notes Council’s ongoing commitment to facilitating a community-led response to this issue.
d) Notes that Family Violence Training for Waimakariri District Council managers and team leaders aligns with this commitment.
e) Notes that, in line with item 1.1 above, this report replaces the usual Community Team Update report.

CARRIED

Councillor Gordon noted his full support for anything that can be done to reduce the instances of family violence and thanked Natalie for her presentation. Councillor Gordon noted similar reservations as Councillor Blackie in work places and how it is managed and keeping the process safe for people.

Mayor Ayers noted the actual levels of family violence and reported levels are quite different. Changes in culture and understanding and also changes in definition can have an impact on reporting levels as well. From both a work place point of view and out there in the community this is enabling more recognition of the signs and being more aware.

Councillor Barnett also endorsed the comments above. Noted a generational shift and a change of messaging that is coming through in the current generation – “It’s not ok”. Councillor Barnett applauded the work that is being done to keep people safe.
7 PORTFOLIO UPDATES

Greenspace (Parks Reserves and Sports Grounds) – Councillor Robbie Brine

Nothing to report.

7.1 Community Facilities (including Aquatic Centres, Halls, Libraries and Museums) – Councillor Wendy Doody

Councillor Doody was not present.

7.2 Community Development and Wellbeing – Councillor Kirstyn Barnett and Councillor Wendy Doody

Councillor Barnett spoke on the COGS funding, with a change in calculation removing the isolation index and being more reliant on deprivation. This means that 22 areas will receive a decrease in COGS funding, including Waimakariri, Selwyn and Hurunui which are grouped together as one area. For Waimakariri this is indicating a 43% decrease of funding available in our area. This formula has also been highlighted to lottery funding. This is a big issue for rural New Zealand, it is proposed that this be phased in over a three year period. Once further information is available this will be brought back to the committee. Following a question from Councillor Brine, Councillor Barnett added that many districts nationwide are unhappy with this proposal and are endeavouring to start a conversation about the impact of that.

8 QUESTIONS

There were no questions.

9 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

There was no urgent general business.

As there was no further business, the meeting closed at 2.06pm.

CONFIRMED

_______________________
Chairperson

________________________
Date

WORKSHOP – NORTH CANTERBURY MINI BUS TRUST

At the conclusion of the meeting, a workshop was held to discuss the North Canterbury Mini Bus Trust storage of vehicles.
MINUTES OF THE DISTRICT PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 19
FEBRUARY 2019 AT 1.00PM.

PRESENT
Councillor D Gordon (Chair), Councillors N Atkinson, W Doody, J Meyer, S Stewart and
Mayor Ayers (ex officio).

IN ATTENDANCE
Councillors A Blackie, K Barnett, K Felstead and P Williams
N Harrison (Manager Regulation), T Ellis (Development Planning Manager), J McBride
(Manager Transport and Roading), B Wiremu (Emergency Management Advisor),
M Johnston (Environmental Services Manager), W Taylor (Building Unit Manager),
G Kempton (Engineering Technician), C Fowler-Jenkins (Governance Support Officer) and
E Stubbs (Governance Support Officer).

1. APOLOGIES
Moved Councillor Myers seconded Councillor Atkinson

THAT an apology for lateness be received and sustained from Councillor Stewart.

CARRIED

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
No conflicts of interest were recorded.

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee held on 11 December 2018

Moved Councillor Myers seconded Councillor Doody

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee:

(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting of the
District Planning and Regulation Committee held on 11 December 2018.

CARRIED

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES
Councillor Gordon referred to Item 6.2 regarding improving Council’s approach to
biodiversity and commented it would be useful to see how the identified patch of
Kanuka was tracking. N Harrison confirmed that M Bacon would provide an update
on the Contestable fund in March.

Councillor Stewart arrived at 1.02 during item 4.
5. **DEPUTATION**

There were no deputations.

6. **REPORTS**

6.1 **Notification of Private Plan Change 45 – Rangiora Airfield – Matthew Bacon (Planning Manager)**

N Harrison provided an apology for the absence of M Bacon.

N Harrison advised the report was a pro-forma report seeking the Committee to take a procedural step with a Private Plan Change which proposed new and amended District Plan provisions in relation to the Rangiora Airfield. During the process it was important to maintain a degree of separation with Council as the applicant.

The purpose of the private plan change was to identify new air noise boundaries and protect airfield operations from reverse sensitivity. It put in two contours, 65dba and 55 dba. It sought to put in approach and take-off surfaces or 'Obstacle Limitation Surface' for the Rangiora Airfield. N Harrison explained the idea of gradient of the surfaces to provide a threshold for height.

N Harrison outlined the three options available to the Committee, being to not approve of the notification of the plan change, to proceed and notify accordingly, or to hold the plan change and incorporate as part of the District Plan review. The private plan change was the more expeditious approach. District Plan change revision was more cost effective however had the main disadvantage of not advancing the plan change as quickly as would be useful.

Councillor Doody referred to the circuits and noted they crossed several times over buildings and asked was it acceptable to do that? N Harrison advised that they were the circuits for aircraft using the particular runways, in flight the circuits came under Civil Aviation rules while the approach paths came under District Plan rules.

Councillor Williams asked what would happen if a person objected under the private plan change or the district plan review process. N Harrison replied the process would be the same, under notification, and through a District Plan change, both could go to the Environment Court.

Councillor Gordon asked if it would be a full consultation to the whole district and N Harrison replied it would.

Moved Councillor seconded N Atkinson

**THAT** the District Planning and Regulation Committee

(a) **Receives** report No. 190204012204

(b) **Directs** staff to notify Private Plan Change 45

(c) **Circulates** this report to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board for their information.

**CARRIED**
Councillor Gordon commented there had been a lot of process on the issue over a number of years and recently. A number of meetings had been held with residents including with the modelling. There would be interest from the public but the way in which the process has been developed so far meant there was better and more robust information. Councillor Gordon commented on the importance of the Rangiora Airfield to the district and noted its potential. For it to reach further aspirations this would be an important part of the process. There would be some cost involved but it was a valuable operation.

Councillor Atkinson reiterated the importance of the airport to the district especially in light of the earthquakes. He believed the thresholds were right in this case and commented on the importance of public understanding.

Mayor Ayers commented the issue had been hanging around for a long period. There had already been much consultation with neighbours. While there was a risk someone could object now and in the revised District Plan could object also. An objection at that point would lack weight if otherwise would have.

7. **MATTER REFERRED FROM THE RANGIORA-ASHLEY COMMUNITY BOARD MEETING OF 12 DECEMBER 2018**

7.1 **Request for Loading Zone alterations and carpark removal – Good Street and Gables Arcade, Rangiora** – Glenn Kempton (Engineering Technician), Kieran Straw (Civil Projects Team Leader), Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager)

G Kempton spoke to the report noting that it requested removal of a loading zone outside of the Gables Arcade and the removal of three existing carparks and installation of another loading zone on Good Street. The project would also provide safer pedestrian links. The report also proposed to reduce the time limit on the loading zone outside the Gables from 20 minutes to 5 minutes following consultation with business owners.

Councillor Atkinson asked if better policing was required in the loading zone outside the Gables Arcade and J McBride advised that while it could be difficult to enforce restricted parking, the reduction from 20 minutes to 5 minutes would improve the situation.

Councillor Doody referred to the rubbish from the Loading Bay off Good Street and asked if there would be better control of waste. G Kempton commented on the improvements to the loading bay including fencing and noted he could pass that concern on.

Moved Councillor Meyer seconded Mayor Ayers

**THAT** the District Planning and Regulation Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No. 181026125716

(b) **Approves** the removal of three existing carparks and loading zone as shown in Figure 1.

(c) **Approves** the time limit reduction for parking within the 16.00m loading zone shown in Figure 1 from 20 minutes to 5 minutes.

(d) **Approves** the installation of a new approximately 9.00m long loading zone on Good Street as shown in Figure 1.
CARRIED

Councillor Meyer noted the detail provided in the report.

Mayor Ayers noted it was the required step to finish the job of the physical work.

Councillor Gordon commented the topic had been robustly discussed at the Rangiora Ashley Community Board meeting.

8. PORTFOLIO UPDATES

8.1 District Planning Development - Councillor Neville Atkinson

Councillor Atkinson commented that the Committee was up to date with where the District Plan was heading. He noted there were three staff moving on, however the matter was in hand.

8.2 Regulation and Civil Defence – Councillor John Meyer

Councillor Meyer passed on congratulations to the Civil Defence team for their assistance and performance during the Nelson fires.

Councillor Meyer noted the recent dog hearing.

8.3 Business, Promotion and Town Centres – Councillor Dan Gordon

Councillor Gordon noted the upcoming meetings with the three promotions organisations and Enterprise North Canterbury. He noted his regular contact with S Hart with regard to what was happening in the town centres.

Councillor Gordon praised all those involved in the recent Kaiapoi River Carnival for putting on a fantastic event. He noted the upcoming Rangiora Promotions Eats and Beats event in April.

Councillor Gordon commented on the work of Rangiora Promotions Association to try host an event on High Street with Muscle Car Madness. Unfortunately they had not been able to achieve that, and they and Council had received negative feedback. Councillor Gordon explained that the lack of event had not been for lack of trying by the Promotions Association or Council. Councillor Atkinson asked if in the future the event could take a ‘weekly’ show to other areas around the district as a form on enhancing and promoting the event. Councillor Gordon commented that was a good suggestion to take on board.

9. QUESTIONS

There were no questions.

10. URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

There was no urgent general business.
There being no further business, the meeting closed at 1.25pm.

CONFIRMED

____________________
Chairperson

____________________
Date

**Update**

- At the conclusion of the meeting, there was an update from department managers.
  - M Johnston (Environmental Services Manager),
  - W Taylor (Manager Building Unit)
  - Anyone else?
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE OXFORD-OHOKA COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN THE OHOKA COMMUNITY HALL, MILL ROAD, OHOKA ON THURSDAY
7 FEBRUARY 2019 AT 7.00M.

PRESENT
D Nicholl (Chair), M Brown, W Doody, J Ensor, S Farrell, K Felstead, and T Robson.

IN ATTENDANCE
D Ayers (Mayor), S Markham (Manager Strategy & Engagement), E Cordwell
(Governance Team Leader), and K Rabe (Governance Adviser).

1 APOLOGIES
Moved M Brown seconded S Farrell
An apology for absence was received and sustained from John Lynn.

CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Item 7.1 (b) M Brown as Board member of the Mandeville Sports Club
Item 7.1 (d) S Farrell as Secretary/Treasurer of Oxford Promotions Action Committee

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board – 6 December 2018
Moved S Farrell seconded M Brown
THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
Confirms the circulated minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting, held 6 December 2018, as a true and accurate record subject to the following amendment:

“Item 11 ‘Members Information Exchange – S Farrell’ (bullet point 1)
Oxford Promotions Action Committee had been asked by ENC where they thought the charging stations should be and the Committee indicated the Oxford Farmers Market carpark.

Item 11 ‘Members Information Exchange – S Farrell’ (bullet point 3)
Attended Pearson Park Advisory Group meeting – A member of the Oxford Farmers Market commented to one of the Pearson Park Advisory Group members some time ago they would like a representative but were told that was unnecessary.”

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
K Felstead gave an update on the meeting with concerned residents regarding various drinking water issues raised by the deputation to the Board at its November 2018 meeting.

D Nicholl also mentioned meeting with a resident in regard to concerns over the Council’s charges for water.
S Farrell requested feedback on the query regarding the LED street lights in Oxford which had been raised with staff at the December 2018 meeting.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

5.1 Mandeville Residents’ Association – Karen Jackson and Richard Jackson were present and spoke on behalf of the Association raising concerns around safety issues and lack of parking in the Mandeville Village shopping precinct. The Association tabled its presentation and a suggested plan for an additional carparking area.

K Jackson informed the Board that a local land owner had indicated a possible willingness to sell land adjacent to the business area to increase parking to mitigate safety issues for pedestrians in the area.

The Mandeville Residents’ Association requested a formal report to come to the Board within a month to clarify the situation and so that a decision could be made.

Staff advised the Board that staff were working of the matter but were unaware of this potential offer of land. The landowner had not approached the Council and this would be needed before any assessment would be undertaken.

K Jackson also advised that the carparks appeared too narrow and residents were reluctant to use them especially if they had large 4WD vehicles.

D Nicholl informed K Jackson that staff had been out to check the size of the carparks and had confirmed that they were compliant with the District Plan.

S Farrell asked whether there were any footpaths to the side of the presented potential parking area and it was confirmed that there was not.

M Brown requested clarification that the additional area under discussion was in fact of private land.

J Ensor requested clarification on the number of carparks shown on the original resource consent and commented on the lack of provision for staff carparking.

It was confirmed that all relevant conditions of the District Plan were complied with.

D Nicholl also commented that the village had proved much more popular than anticipated.

It was intended that an update or report would be presented to the March meeting.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

There was no adjourned business.

7 REPORTS

7.1 Application to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2018-2019 – Kay Rabe (Governance Adviser)

K Rabe spoke to the report.

Moved T Robson seconded W Doody

THAT the Oxford - Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 181220151474.

(b) Approves a grant of $500 to Aimtru Archers Club Incorporated towards the cost of specialised equipment (arrows) to introduce new programmes for people with intellectual disabilities.
CARRIED

W Doody commented that the Archery group was extremely pro-active for people with disabilities and had won the Peter Allen Sports Award.

Moved W Doody seconded T Robson

(c) Approves a grant of $500 to Oxford Promotions Action Committee Inc towards the cost of signage for the Oxford Winter Lights Festival.

CARRIED

W Doody commented on the hard work of the Committee and her support for the event.

7.2 New Zealand Community Boards’ Conference 2019 – Kay Rabe (Governance Adviser)

K Rabe spoke to the report.

Moved W Doody seconded K Felstead

THAT the Oxford - Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190109001708.

(b) Approves three (3) members, being S Farrell, J Ensor and T Robinson to attend the New Zealand Community Boards’ Conference to be held in New Plymouth from 11 to 13 April 2019.

(c) Notes the attendees will write an individual report on the conference sharing ideas/knowledge gained and present the report at their respective Board’s May 2019 meeting.

(d) Notes that the total cost for each attendee is approximately $1,821 (including GST).

S Farrell requested, that the Board consider any recommendations emerging from the conference feedback.

CARRIED

7.3 Summary of Discretionary Grant Accountability 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018 – Kay Rabe (Governance Adviser)

K Rabe spoke to the report.

Moved S Farrell seconded T Robson

THAT the Oxford - Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 190110001832.

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

CARRIED

K Rabe clarified that Waimakariri Arts Trust – Kaiapoi Art application included advertising in the Northern Outlook and North Canterbury News.

7.4 Summary of Discretionary Grant Accountability 1 July 2018 to 31 December 2018 – Kay Rabe (Governance Adviser)

K Rabe took the report as read.

Moved M Brown seconded W Doody
THAT the Oxford - Ohoka Community Board:
(a) Receives report No 190110001846.
(b) Circulates a copy of this report to all of the Community Boards.

CARRIED

8 CORRESPONDENCE
Moved W Doody seconded M Brown

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
(a) Receives the memo regarding Bay Road Footpath Renewal Works (Trim 181212146968) (as previously circulated).
(b) Receives the tabled memo responding to the Chair’s question as regards access to the subdivision at the 404 Mill Road development (TRIM 190204012525)

CARRIED

S Farrell asked for the background to the memo and D Nicholl advised that a query had been raised by a resident. There could be a potential issue in the future.

W Doody queried the designation of the land and any resource consent restriction.

D Nicholl replied that these were originally four hectare blocks which was subdivided into smaller sections on condition of only one access to Mill Road and would contain possibly 81 houses. There is a right of way but not a Council vested road.

S Farrell asked if this was Kintyre Road.

J Ensor queried drainage and floor levels and K Felstead advised that the resource consent had been approved in 2017.

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT
9.1 Chairperson’s Report for November 2018
Moved M Brown seconded J Ensor

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
(a) Receives report No 190115003214.

CARRIED

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION
10.1 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 12 November 2018 (Trim No 181122137148).
10.2 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 10 December 2018 (Trim No 181205142989).
10.3 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 13 November 2018 (Trim No 181106130190).
10.4 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 13 November 2018 (Trim No 181206144348).
10.5 Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 19 November 2018 (Trim No 181114134202)
10.6 **Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 17 December 2018** (Trim No 181211146279)

10.7 **Youth Council meeting minutes – October 2018**

10.8 **Waimakariri Stockwater Race – Closure Policy and strategy – report to Utilities and Roading Committee 11 December 2018** (Trim No 181024124336)

10.9 **Rangiora-Woodend Road, Gressons Road, Boys Road and Northbrook Road Speed Limit Review Consultation – report to Council 4 December 2018** (Trim No 181121136994).

10.10 **Zone Implementation Programme Addendum (ZIPA) implementation – WDC role and funding options – report to Council 29 January 2019** (Trim No 181217148924).

10.11 **Library Update to 30 November 2018 – report to Community and Recreation Committee 18 December 2018** (Trim No 18113014223).

10.12 **Aquatic Facilities Update Report – report to Community and Recreation Committee 20 November 2018** (Trim No 181030126776).


10.14 **Waimakariri Youth Strategy Review – report to Community and Recreation Committee 18 December 2018** (Trim No 181206144197).

10.15 **Community Team Update – report to Community and Recreation Committee 18 December 2018** (Trim No 181206144578).

Moved J Enser seconded S Farrell

**THAT** the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.15

**CARRIED**

S Farrell raised her concerns regarding the closure of some water-races in the area, saying that in some cases landowners had filled in the water-race channels and this had subsequently caused flooding during wet weather.

Staff confirmed that in closing any water-race there was a procedure that was followed and that if any landowner wanted to fill the channel he had to gain permission from the Council, as some water-races had other channels which could, in some cases, allow for the land owner to infill land while others were vital to be kept open.

K Felstead confirmed this was the policy and was adhered to.

W Doody commented, that while she understood the need for some closures to occur, it was a loss to heritage of by gone days of farming.

D Nicholl advised that in the instance of the recent closure, there was an alternative route. K Felstead also noted that maintenance is costly. D Nicholl had concerns that some stockwater races were being used to manage drainage/flooding and that proper drainage was needed.

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.
J Ensor
- Successful year for Surf Lifesaving and that the extra week of duty for Woodend and Pegasus had been beneficial.

T Robson
- Youth Development Strategy update
- Attended the Oxford Christmas Carol event which was a great success.
- Attended All Boards Briefing

S Farrell
- Also attended the Oxford Christmas Carol event
- Snap, Send Solve impressive and good response
- Great Bay Road outcome – thanked staff for the work done
- Canterbury Landscapes compost site – request for monitoring report on contents of compost as an increase in feral cats in the area, possibly feeding off rats and mice etc drawn by the compost. Staff would seek an information memorandum on the matter.

M Brown
- In the last stage of completing the Mandeville Sports Club application to RATA
- Meeting of the West Eyerton Advisory Group – request regarding the timeline for finishing the fencing and planting round the second well. At present just temporarily fenced. Staff to follow up.
- Thanked staff for the monitoring of nitrate reports and requested that these be shared on a regular basis.
- Swannanooa Domain looking very good and thanked staff for the excellent work done to achieve such a successful result.
- Noted the retirement of the West Eyerton School Principal – Gillian Gallagher
- Noted an overflowing culvert requiring maintenance. Staff to follow up.

K Feldstead
- NZ Order of Merit Awards – recipients honoured. One recipient unable to attend.
- Presentation of Community Service Award to Michael Patterson who had been unable to attend the formal event.
- Notice of Motion by D Gordon regarding maintenance to empty sections, requesting a possible By-law to be introduced to mitigate dry grass fire hazards. Outcome to be known in March.
- Pegasus Bay By-law monitoring – great work done but acknowledgement that more enforcement would need to be budgeted in the next Annual Plan.
- Update on Rural No 1 Well
- Adopted the new Procurement and Contract Policy
- Health and Safety report

W Doody
- Roading reseals and resurfacing
- All fords in and around the area open
- Sicon replacing timber handrail on Cust River bridge
- Jaycee Room at the Museum open for the weekend
- Ohoka Domain programme update
- Earthquake sensors installed in district including Oxford Service Centre – monitoring in real time and information visible to Public
- Summertime reading at the library a success
- Pools very busy and a successful Swim School
- Email from Charlotte Church (Oxford Area School) wanting projects in the community. W Doody meeting with her on 20 February to see what ideas they have on community clean up/gardening etc
- Confirmed that she requested traffic counters – one in Harewood Road

M Brown asked which fords had been closed and for how long
12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS
- Age Friendly survey out – anyone can complete
- Annual Plan deliberations and a reminder that the All Boards Briefing on 6 March 2019 will be devoted to the Annual Plan. A reminder that public consultation starts on 11 March and runs to the 11 April 2019.

13 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE
13.1 Board Discretionary Grant
   Balance as at 31 January 2019: $1,727.

13.2 General Landscaping Fund
   Balance as at 31 January 2019: $1,060.

14 MEDIA ITEMS
Good news stories regarding the Board funding allocations.

15 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
There were no questions under standing orders.

16 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
There was no general business under standing orders.

NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board is scheduled for Thursday 7 March 2019 commencing at 7.00pm, in the West Eyreton Hall.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED 8.12pm.

CONFIRMED
________________
Chairperson
________________
Date

Workshop
- Members Forum
  Discussion of Oxford A & P Show on 30 March 2019 and arrangements for members to have a stand there.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WOODEND-SEFTON COMMUNITY BOARD  
HELD IN THE PEGASUS COMMUNITY CENTRE, MAIN STREET, PEGASUS ON  
MONDAY 11 FEBRUARY 2019 AT 7.00PM.

PRESENT
S Powell (Chairperson), A Thompson (Deputy Chair), A Allen, J Archer, R Mather and J Meyer.

IN ATTENDANCE
C Brown (Community and Recreation Manager), G Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading), J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager), K Rabe (Governance Advisor) and E Stubbs (Governance Support Officer).

1 APOLOGIES
Moved J Archer seconded A Allen
An apology was received and sustained from A Blackie for absence. CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
There were no conflicts of interest.

3 CONFIRMATION MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board – 10 December 2018
Moved J Meyer seconded J Archer
THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
(a) Amends the circulated minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting, held 10 December 2018. Item 11.4, page 5 should advise R Mather attended the Pegasus Community Watch end of year function.
(b) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting, held 10 December 2018, as a true and accurate record. CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
A Thompson raised item 7.1 General Landscaping with regard to staff taking three sign concepts to the community for public consultation. He asked about the opportunity for the public to put forward sign concepts. J Meyer commented he did not believe that should be a problem. J Meyer asked if there was a consultation session for signage, would there be an opportunity for the public to also speak to staff about drainage issues. C Brown and G Cleary advised that they would liaise regarding staff availability for that. C Brown commented that in terms of the location of the sign, staff were talking to the roading team as there were restrictions to its location depending for example existing road signs and sight lines.

J Archer asked what the drainage issues in Waikuku were. G Cleary explained that it was a combination of factors. The entire district had lowered around 40mm since the Kaikoura earthquakes as well as additional settlement following the Christchurch earthquakes in general. Also the twelve months previous had been a wet period. There were isolated deficiencies in the drainage network which had been addressed.
with maintenance. In addition the Taranaki Stream outlet channel had silted up and was not operating efficiently. There was some discussion around the timing of the work by ECan on the outlet. Some of the issues were solvable but some such as ground settling and sea level rise were not. There would be ongoing challenges.

J Meyer raised the deputation from the previous meeting regarding the entrance to Pegasus. C Brown advised that the contract had been moved across to Delta and the cost difference was minimal. It was noted that there was generally positive feedback on the improved level of service. C Brown advised that the improved level of service was not a reflection of the companies, rather the different contracts that those companies were on.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS FROM THE COMMUNITY

There were no deputations.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

There was no adjourned business.

7 REPORTS

7.1 Applications to the Woodend-Sefton Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2018/2019: Kay Rabe (Governance Adviser)

K Rabe spoke briefly to the report.

R Mather noted that the event would be replacing the Pegasus Residents Group function and that the Residents Group were supportive of the Pegasus Bay School PTA taking on the event and would be contributing funding also.

Moved R Mather seconded A Thompson

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190123006874.

(b) Approves a grant of $445 to Pegasus Bay School PTA for a candy floss machine and a bouncy castle.

CARRIED

R Mather commented the event was positive for the community and it would be open to the wider community.

7.2 New Zealand Community Boards’ Conference 2019: Kay Rabe (Governance Adviser)

K Rabe advised that the conference was available for up to three members of the community board. She noted that all attendees, including Councillors, would be funding from the Community Board budget for any costs relating to the conference and there were other training opportunities available such as LGNZ webinars.

A Thompson asked if those attending would report back and K Rabe advised that would be a requirement of those attending.
THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190109001692.

(b) Approves two members, being J Archer and R Mather, to attend the New Zealand Community Boards’ Conference to be held in New Plymouth from 11 to 13 April 2019, subject to confirmation of availability.

(c) Notes the attendees will write an individual report on the conference sharing ideas/knowledge gained and present the report at their respective Board’s May 2019 meeting.

(d) Notes that the total cost for each attendee is approximately $1,821 (including GST).

CARRIED

7.3 Summary of Discretionary Grant Accountability 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018: Kay Rabe (Governance Adviser)

K Rabe commented that the report was for information purposes.

A Thompson asked if staff were happy with the accountabilities received and K Rabe replied that they were.

Moved A Allen seconded J Archer

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 19010001833.

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

CARRIED

S Powell commented that it was good to see the community groups and organisations use of the funding. She noted the Welcome to Waimakariri bags had good feedback in the board’s area.

7.4 Summary of Discretionary Grant Accountability 1 July 2018 to 31 December 2018: Kay Rabe (Governance Adviser)

K Rabe noted that there were few accountabilities received in this period as it had been from the previous 6 months.

A Allen asked about the process and K Rabe advised that staff followed up with groups who had not sent in an accountability form, in addition if a group put in a new application without having sent in their accountability form then they would be advised the application could not be considered until their accountability had been received.

Moved A Allen seconded J Meyer

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 190110001871.

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

CARRIED
8 CORRESPONDENCE

Moved S Powell seconded J Archer

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives the note of thanks from the Pegasus Residents’ Group for contribution towards the Christmas on the Lake event (Trim 190131010978).

(b) Receives the tabled Woodend Lions War Memorial Report February 2019 (Trim 19221020066).

CARRIED

C Brown noted that an agreement with Woodend Lions had been drafted and that the Waimakariri District Council would be project manager the War Memorial project which would involve Health and Safety and management of contractors and volunteers on site. There was a tight timeframe for the project.

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chairperson’s Report for January 2019

S Powell advised that the previous month she had been involved with the follow-up to the storm, the fire at Pegasus roundabout and the question of emergency access, and the Waikuku water supply.

Commented that she had had a discussion with Mike Kwant (Community Projects Officer) regarding the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw Implementation Plan. It was good to see the signage review was happening and it was also important to keep up the education message.

Moved S Powell seconded R Mather

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190204012241.

CARRIED

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 6 December 2018 (Trim No. 181128139880).

10.2 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 13 November 2018 (Trim No 181106130190).

10.3 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 13 November 2018 (Trim No 181206144348).

10.4 Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 19 November 2018 (Trim No 181114134202).

10.5 Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 17 December 2018 (Trim No 181211146279)

10.6 Youth Council meeting minutes – October 2018.

10.7 Rangiora-Woodend Road, Gressons Road, Boys Road and Northbrook Road Speed Limit Review Consultation – report to Council 4 December 2018 (Trim No 181121136994).

10.8 Zone Implementation Programme Addendum (ZIPA) implementation – WDC role and funding options – report to Council 29 January 2019 (Trim No 181217148924).
10.9 **Library Update to 30 November 2018 – report to Community and Recreation Committee 18 December 2018** (Trim No 181130141223).

10.10 **Aquatic Facilities Update Report – report to Community and Recreation Committee 20 November 2018** (Trim No 181030126776).

10.11 **Youth Development Annual Report 2018 – report to Community and Recreation Committee 18 December 2018** (Trim No 181205143969).

10.12 **Waimakariri Youth Strategy Review – report to Community and Recreation Committee 18 December 2018** (Trim No 181206144197).

10.13 **Community Team Update – report to Community and Recreation Committee 18 December 2018** (Trim No 181206144576).

Moved R Mather seconded A Allen

**THAT** the Woodend-Sefton Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.13.

**CARRIED**

11 **MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

11.1 **December/January Diary for R Mather** (Trim No. 190201011288)

11.2 **A Thompson**

- Attended and was impressed with the Pegasus Residents Group Christmas by the Lake event.
- Attended Christmas Carols
- Attended Board Christmas dinner.
- Attended All Boards and noted a number of items were useful to be aware of.
- Assisting with follow-up regarding Waikuku beach, it was good to see action with regard to drainage and he was keen to see communication around drainage go to the community.

11.3 **A Allen**

- Attended All Boards which was beneficial.
- Attended Board Christmas dinner.
- Attended meeting regarding fire.

11.4 **J Meyer**

- Commented this time of year was busy around the budget particularly with staff, and commented positively on work by staff. While it would be nice to keep rate increases to 2.5% it was not possible and was disastrous if Councillors tried to keep increases to zero. There had been the need for huge spending following the earthquakes.
- S Powell asked about the potential for a Property Maintenance and Nuisance Bylaw, to address overgrown sections, that had been raised at Council. R Mather commented that she had been present for that discussion and that it had the go ahead for the next stage of investigation.
- C Brown advised that if it did proceed to a bylaw then it would need to go to full public consultation. A Allen asked with the current grass growth and possible fire risks could the bylaw be fast tracked and J Meyer replied that in terms of timing it would be winter before it would be brought back to Council.

11.5 **R Mather**

- Commented that it had been an active time for the Pegasus Facebook Page with concerns around the fire, it was important to keep people calm.
- She was looking forward to hearing the outcome of the recent report regarding Community Facilities and Libraries.
11.6 **J Archer**
- Attended All Boards.
- Attended Board Christmas dinner.

12 **CONSULTATION PROJECTS**

**About an Age-Friendly Community**
Consultation closes Thursday 28 February 2019.

K Rabe noted that the age-friendly consultation was underway and it was a survey for everyone to engage with – young and old.

The Annual Plan would be out for consultation 11 March – 11 April. There was a discussion around setting a workshop date.

13 **FOSTERING COMMUNITIES**

14 **BOARD FUNDING UPDATE**

14.1 **Board Discretionary Grant**
Balance as at 31 January 2019: $2,627.45.

14.2 **General Landscaping Fund**
Balance as at 31 January 2019: $5260.

15 **MEDIA ITEMS**

Bylaw discussion.

16 **QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

17 **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

**NEXT MEETING**
The next meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Monday 11 March 2019 at the Woodend Community Centre.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 7.56pm.
CONFIRMED

________________
Chairperson

________________
Date
Workshop
- Members Forum - Information regarding the Sefton Public Meeting being held to discuss options for the Sefton Hall.

Briefing
(a briefing is public excluded)
- Roading Update – Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager)
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 13 FEBRUARY 2019 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
D Ayers (Mayor), J Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support), G Cleary (Manager
Utilities and Roading), J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager), K Straw (Civil Projects
Team Leader), Glen Kempton (Engineering Technician), E Cordwell (Governance Adviser) and
E Stubbs (Governance Support Officer).

1 APOLOGIES
There were no apologies.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Item 7.5 P Williams, J Gerard and R Brine.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board – 12 December 2018
Moved D Gordon seconded P Williams
THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Community
Board meeting, held on 12 December 2018, as a true and accurate
record.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
There were no matters arising.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
There were no deputations.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
There was no adjourned business.
7 REPORTS

7.1 Application to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2018/2019 – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Team Leader)

E Cordwell advised she would take the report as read. It was an event the Board had supported the previous year.

J Hoult queried whether the Accountability Form had been received and E Cordwell confirmed that it had.

Moved G Miller seconded R Brine

THAT the Rangiora Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190129009861.

(b) Approves a grant of $500 to Presbyterian Support Upper South Island towards the cost of running the event: An Expo of Ideas to Live Well and Give Well.

CARRIED

G Miller commented that it was a worthy cause, and there was a need for events like this to allow those, particularly on their own, to have the ability to communicate and meet with others.

R Brine noted that the group had put in a large amount of money to hold the event themselves.

7.2 New Zealand Community Boards’ Conference 2019: – Kay Rabe (Governance Adviser)

E Cordwell commented that the Conference was in New Plymouth and up to four members of the Board could attend. The Board could also choose not to send a member. If a Councillor wished to attend that would also be funded from the Board training budget.

E Cordwell noted that the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board were sending two or three members and Woodend-Sefton Community Board were sending one or possibly two members (dependant on availability).

Members J Gerard, C Prickett, K Barnett and J Hoult expressed interest in attending.

P Williams asked if it was necessary to send four delegates expressing his concern and suggested that one person could attend and brief the board on the conference when they returned. E Cordwell confirmed that it was a requirement that Board members would report back to the Board.

Moved D Gordon seconded R Brine

THAT the Rangiora Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190109001716.

(b) Approves J Gerard, C Prickett, K Barnett and J Hoult to attend the New Zealand Community Boards’ Conference to be held in New Plymouth from 11 to 13 April 2019, subject to confirmation of availability.

(c) Notes the attendees will write an individual report on the conference sharing ideas/knowledge gained and present the report at their respective Board’s May 2019 meeting.

(d) Notes that the total cost for each attendee is approximately $1,821 (including GST).

CARRIED

P Williams against
D Gordon commented that the conference costs were within the Governance budget. He believed there was value in members attending. There was an opportunity for members to network. He fully supported members attending and believed it was important for the district to be represented.

R Brine explained that some years ago he had attended a conference with five staff from Council. At the conclusion of the conference they had discussed their ideas and found that they had different perceptions on multiple things. The information that came back to the board would be more complete if more than one member attended. R Brine noted he was comfortable supporting four members.

7.3 Summary of Discretionary Grant Accountability 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018: – Kay Rabe (Governance Adviser)

E Cordwell noted it was a report for information.

Moved K Galloway seconded G Miller

THAT the Rangiora Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 190109001505.
(b) Circulates a copy of this report to all of the Community Boards.

CARRIED

7.4 Summary of Discretionary Grant Accountability 1 July 2018 to 31 December 2018: – Kay Rabe (Governance Adviser)

Moved K Galloway seconded D Lundy

THAT the Rangiora Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 190110001941.
(b) Circulates a copy of this report to all of the Community Boards.

CARRIED

K Galloway commented the reports were an excellent presentation of a lot of information. He was interested in those who had and hadn’t completed accountabilities.

D Lundy noted the reports were informative and it was good to see the funding was spent well.

Prior to item 7.5, J Gerard, R Brine and P Williams sat back from the table and D Lundy assumed the position of chair.

7.5 Ratification of the Board’s Objection to the Off-licence Application by Rangiora Liquormart Limited: – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Team Leader)

E Cordwell commented that the Objection had been restricted to what was permissible in the Act.

D Lundy noted that the content of the objection had been emailed to members (excluding J Gerard, R Brine and P Williams) late the previous year prior to submission for comment.

Moved G Miller seconded D Gordon

THAT the Rangiora Ashley Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 190115003414.

(b) Retrospectively ratifies the Board’s objection to the Off Licence application by Rangiora Liquormart Limited (Trim 181129140823).

CARRIED

D Gordon believed the objection had been well put and thanked E Cordwell for bringing it together.

Following item 7.5, J Gerard, R Brine and P Williams returned to the table and J Gerard resumed the position of chair.

8 CORRESPONDENCE

Moved G Miller seconded R Brine

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives the letter of thanks from James Paterson for funding towards his attending Band Camp (Trim 190130010584).

(b) Receives the tabled Memo from Ian Carstons (Senior Planner) regarding status of resource consent application for proposed quarry (Trim 190208014216).

CARRIED

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chair’s Diary for December/January

Moved J Gerard seconded K Barnett

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190207013749.

CARRIED

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 6 December 2018 (Trim No. 181128139880).

10.2 Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 10 December 2018 (Trim No 181205142989).

10.3 Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 19 November 2018 (Trim No 181114134202)

10.4 Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 17 December 2018 (Trim No 181211146279)

10.5 Youth Council meeting minutes – October 2018.

10.6 Rangiora-Woodend Road, Gressons Road, Boys Road and Northbrook Road Speed Limit Review Consultation – report to Council 4 December 2018 (Trim No 181121136994).

10.7 Zone Implementation Programme Addendum (ZIPA) implementation- WDC role and funding options – report to Council 29 January 2019 (Trim No 181217148924).

10.8 Library Update to 30 November 2018 – report to Community and Recreation Committee 18 December 2018 (Trim No 181130141223).

10.9 Aquatic Facilities Update Report – report to Community and Recreation Committee 20 November 2018 (Trim No 181030126776).
10.10 Youth Development Annual Report 2018 – report to Community and Recreation Committee 18 December 2018 (Trim No 181205143969).
10.11 Waimakariri Youth Strategy Review – report to Community and Recreation Committee 18 December 2018 (Trim No 181206144197).
10.12 Community Team Update – report to Community and Recreation Committee 18 December 2018 (Trim No 181206144576).
10.14 Report to Annual Plan on Town Centre Feature Lighting and Decorations – report to Council 29 to 31 January 2019 (Trim No 190111002267).
10.15 Southbrook Pond C stormwater management area– Vegetation die-off investigations, sediment sources, and catchment management. – report to Utilities and Roading 11 December 2018 (Trim No 180717079505)

Moved D Lundy seconded J Hoult

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.15.

CARRIED

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

11.1 K Barnett

- Noted that at the Community and Recreation Committee meeting they had been advised that COGs were changing their funding mechanism to link to deprivation. This meant groups in the Waimakariri and Hurunui would lose 41% of funding phased in over three years. There was concern regarding the impact this would have on community groups and the community team had been asked to report. A letter would be sent to COGs to request further discussion especially highlighting issues around isolation and mental health.
- The Community and Recreation Committee had also requested that a group of elected members and staff discuss the policy direction around exemptions for fees and charges on community facilities to address the current ad hoc method of assigning exemptions.
- Noted objection of neighbour to Cust Rural Recycling depot.

11.2 D Gordon

- Noted that the Draft Annual Plan proposed approximately a 4.2% increase in rates in Rangiora Urban and across the district it would be 4.5%. The big issues were:
  - $1million in the Draft Annual Plan to support a move of the Rangiora Tennis Clubs courts to a new site adjacent to the Multipurpose Stadium on Coldstream Road. The clubs were also contributing a $1million.
  - Proposal to rationalise UV filtration across the district. It would provide some rates relief for smaller schemes such as the Garrymere Scheme.
- There had been a proposal to establish a working party for feature lights to work with staff, he suggested that members of Rangiora Ashley Community Board and Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board as the boards where most effected.
- Staff had discovered that the Cust Community Centre did not have a compliant fire alarm system and the centre now had a maximum allowable
capacity of 50 people. Urgent work was proceeding. Some additional budget was required.

- He thanked those who attended the Rangiora Racecourse site visit and noted that it provided an ability to understand the issues more broadly.
- The Rangiora Croquet Club had a plan to develop a further two pitches. The total cost of the project was $100,000 and they would submit to the Annual Plan for a contribution.
- Suggestion that the Youth Council be invited to present to the Board regarding their ideas for a ‘Youth Space’ in Dudley Park.
- Noted upcoming meeting with Ryman residents regarding proposed road changes.

11.3 **D Lundy**
- Attended Civil Defence dinner at the RSA.
- Attended Rangiora Racecourse meeting.

11.4 **K Galloway**
- Followed up whether letter of thanks had been sent to Rangiora Hire for assistance with time and equipment for water piping at Rangiora Dog Park as requested.
- Attended All Boards Briefing.
- Attended Good Street Neighbourhood even.
- Tabled letter from resident concerned about road repairs on Ashley Street.
- Pipes were now laid in the dog park and water would be connected soon.
- Raised issues with Snap/Send/Solve and commented on the lack of feedback from issues raised at the November meeting. E Cordwell advised that M Harris was specifically following up and she would raise with her. It was requested that M Harris provide an update to the Board. K Barnett noted that Snap/Send/Solve now highlighted that it was not a 24 hour service.
- K Galloway requested a report on what was happening with the relocated buildings at the Rangiora Hospital. There appeared to be misinformation in the public and clarity was required. E Cordwell advised this would be followed up.

11.5 **R Brine**
- Advised of informal discussions on how to maximise the potential of the Kaiapoi River. There were three swing moorings with complicated ownership. There were exciting opportunities for Kaiapoi and the district.

11.6 **M Clarke**
- Attended WHAG meeting. There had been discussion around support for young school leavers. Concerns around liquor outlets. It was a very narrow area that opponents could submit on.
- Attended Rangiora Racecourse meeting.
- Had good feedback from residents regarding parking outside Southbrook Park and getting cars off the road.
- Noted good reply to his Question under Standing Orders for information regarding the rescaling of the road at Silverstream.
- Advised Ophthalmology specialists would use the Rangiora Health Hub for clinics.
- Had spoken with residents of Charles Upham regarding concerns around no bus service to Rangiora.

11.7 **J Hoult**
- Timebank – had put in Rata application for further funding for coordinator to continue momentum. Event planned for Saturday 23 February for those signed up to look at options for the Learning Exchange.
- Attended Community Team Picnic barbeque at Bush Street Reserve on behalf of the Board and Neighbourhood Support.
• North Canterbury Netball Association – resurface of netball courts and addition of path. Issues with light spill from tall LED towers. Exceptionally good support from WDC - Greg Barnard to assist in raising concerns with the netball association about the light spill.

11.8 **S Lewis**

• Wished everyone a happy new year and commented on her learnings from her first term as a board member.
• Attended Wai Art Exhibition in Waikuku.
• Attended Rangiora Racecourse meeting.
• Attended the Coldstream Victorian Gardens Tour where the funds were donated to the Salvation Army.
• Attended Tuahiwi Fun Run at Tuahiwi Marae, it was the first event held of this kind and showcased the Tuahiwi area. Interesting discussions about Council.
• Learner Licence Driver Programme – was restarting this year and S Lewis encouraged Board members to support.
• Coordinated a social bike ride of the Passchendaele Memorial Path. The event would continue to be held monthly and was a good way to showcase a Council owned and operated track. The next ride was Sunday 24 February.

11.9 **G Miller**

• Attended Rangiora Racecourse meeting.
• Recently visited the Yaldhurst soccer facility and commented on how good it was for that community. Was looking forward to establishment of the Coldstream Road facilities.

11.10 **C Prickett**

• Assisted with water pipe at Dog Park.
• Attended Racecourse meeting.
• Garrymere Water Group progressing slowly.
• Commented he had been disappointed with response after reporting a wrecked car in the riverbed to Police and ECan. D Gordon suggested that he follow-up with Environmental Health and WDC Malcolm Johnstone.
• Asked if Waimakariri had considered initiatives to encourage solar power generation by residents.

11.11 **P Williams**

• Noted presence of Lime scooters in Rangiora.
• Noted positive and negative comments about festive lights and work with staff for resolution.
• Noted concern raised by resident with respect to long grass and that Council also needed to ensure its own properties were not a fire hazard.
• Attended Bush Street Park Neighbourhood event.
• Attended meeting of Waimakariri and City Councillors to share ideas, there were some positives and negatives.
• Muscle Car Show – noted blame attributed to Council to discourage display however commented that this was wholly incorrect and that there had been a large effort from Council and Rangiora Promotions to bring cars to the main street.
• Attended Kaiapoi Waitangi Day celebrations.

12 **CONSULTATION PROJECTS**

**About an Age-Friendly Community**

Consultation closes Thursday 28 February 2019.
E Cordwell noted the upcoming Annual Plan consultation. The next All Boards Briefing would be dedicated to that and the Draft Annual Plan would be out for consultation on 11 March closing 11 April. A possible workshop date to be discussed via email.

13 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

13.1 Board Discretionary Grant
Balance as at 5 December 2018: $4423 plus estimated carry forward of $1451.

13.2 General Landscaping Fund
Balance as at 5 December 2018: $26,160 (including carry forward).

14 MEDIA ITEMS

15 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

Board member K Galloway submitted the following questions for response as per Standing Orders sections 20.4, 20.5 and 20.6.

Town Centre Feature Lighting

Question:
After it was agreed that Council would proceed with Coloured Festoons and 'Fairy' Lights was a consultant engaged to advise on the lights to be purchased? If not why not?

Response:
The Lighting Designer who carried out the peer review provided staff with a recommended fairy light supplier. Advice received was that this was a reputable supplier who has supplied and installed lights in many locations including the Viaduct Basin in Auckland. The recommendation to use this supplier was followed.

Question:
After it was agreed that Council would proceed with Coloured Festoons and 'Fairy' Lights' were various Festoon Lights and 'Fairy' lights considered? If not Why not?

Response:
The festoon lights were sourced from the same supplier that provided the lights for the eastern end of High Street. These lights have functioned well and we have had no issues with the lights themselves. By staying with the same supplier we were able to ensure that the festoon lights matched the existing festoons and did not look different. These lights are also able to be connected directly to the street light circuit and do not require larger transformer boxes on the street light poles to convert the supply to a lower current. When the original festoon lights were sourced, Mainpower carried out a significant amount of research to ensure the lights were suitable and met required criteria.

As outlined above, the Fairy Lights were recommended by the Lighting Designer who carried out the peer review. A trial was carried out with the Board on the 4th October 2018. At the trial it was agreed that the fairy lights
provided the desired effect and the instruction was given to go ahead with the lights. The lights trialled are exactly the same as those which have been installed.

**Question:**
After it was agreed that Council would proceed with Coloured Festoons and ‘Fairy Lights’ was a design Consultant engaged to plan the layout of the ‘Fairy’ lights in the trees? If not why not?

**Response:**
The recommendation to light clusters of trees at the build outs was provided by the peer reviewer and it was recommended that the fairy light supplier was very experienced in lighting trees and was the appropriate person to provide guidance on how the trees should be lit. The fairy lighting supplier recommended that the fairy lights in the trees be installed in an “Umbrella” style as it would provide the best visual effect. As these trees are covered in leaves for a large portion of the year, lights up higher on branches would not be visible when the tree is in leaf. This was discussed at the fairy light trial.

The advantage of this fairy light system is that more strings can easily be added to the existing installation in the future if this was desired.

**Question:**
If no consultant/s was/were engaged, how were the decisions made regarding the 3 questions above.

**Response:**
This has been answered above.

**Question:**
Will Council be undertaking a review of this lighting project, especially given that some lights were not operational, and in some people’s minds were not as effective as they possibly could have been, and will members of the Rangiora Ashley Community Board be included in that review?

**Response:**
Staff are continuing to work with Mainpower and the lighting supplier to address the outstanding operational issues with the fairy lights. We have had an undertaking from Mainpower to get the lights working as a priority and we are confident the issues can be worked through and addressed. However, if these issues are not resolved to our satisfaction then an independent review of the light installation will be undertaken.

We will also be visiting the Boards in February to recap on the work undertaken to date and start talking through the next steps. It is proposed to develop an implementation plan for any future phases of work and a specialist lighting designer will be involved in these discussions. It was also requested at the January Council meeting, that a terms of reference be developed for a working group to take the feature lighting and decorations forward.

Board member M Clarke submitted the following questions for response as per Standing Orders sections 20.4, 20.5 and 20.6.

Road Carpet at Silverstream

**Question:**
“It has been noted that a section of the new bypass road through the Silverstream subdivision has had an overlay of road carpet on the chip seal...
surface. Could staff please explain the justification for this work and the sources of funding?"

Response:
A report was taken to Council Long Term Plan Deliberations in May 2018 regarding noise concerns which were raised by residents in the Silverstream Subdivision, primarily along the Butchers Road frontage.

A number of complaints had been received along with submissions as part of the Long Term Plan consultation process. Attached is a copy of Report No. 180511051676 which presented the issues and options for Council consideration. The report was considered and approved.

As detailed in Report No. 180511051676, the asphalt surfacing was funded by the reallocation of $250,000 from the Waikuku to Pegasus Connection budget, which was surplus budget.

In November 2007 a report was taken to Utilities and Roading recommending levels of service for where asphaltic concrete (hotmix) be considered. Attached is a copy of Report No. 071108035864 which outlined the changes.

In summary the surface treatment for a road is chosen on technical grounds to ensure the lowest lifecycle cost is achieved, while at the same time taking into account environmental factors such as noise and vibration effects on residential properties. Asphaltic concrete or similar surfacing is appropriate on strategic or arterial roads in residential areas and in areas of high turning areas (such as roundabouts, cul-de-sacs and some intersections with high heavy vehicle movements). Included in the report are maps showing roads where this treatment should be considered.

Report Nos. 180511051676 and 071108035864 are shown in full on pages 109-120.

16 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Wednesday 13 March 2019 in the Loburn Domain Pavilion.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 8.00pm

CONFIRMED

________________
Chairperson

________________
Date
Workshop: 8pm to 9.30pm
- Oxford Road Urbanisation – Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager)
- Cones Street Upgrade - Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager)
- Members Forum

Briefing: 9.30pm to 9.45pm
(Note a briefing is public excluded)
- Feature Lighting - Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager)
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 18 FEBRUARY 2019
COMMENCING AT 4.00PM.

PRESENT
J Watson (Chairperson), N Atkinson, R Blair, C Greengrass, M Pinkham, P Redmond and
S Stewart.

IN ATTENDANCE
D Ayers (Mayor), G Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading), G Barnard (Parks Community
Assets Officer) and K Rabe (Governance Adviser).
Councillors A Blackie and J Meyer

1 APOLOGIES
Moved J Watson seconded N Atkinson
An apology for lateness was accepted for J Meyer who arrived at 4.02pm and was
absent for clauses 1-4.
CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
M Pinkham advised of a conflict of interest regarding item 7.2 a funding request from
Karanga Mai Early Learning Centre as he is a Trustee.
CARRIED

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board – 17 December 2018
Moved J Watson seconded R Blair
THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community
Board meeting, held 17 December 2018, as a true and accurate record
subject to the amendment in clause 11 Members’ Information Exchange
– P Redmond Barkers Park should read Bakers Park.
CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
No matters arising.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
No deputations or presentations.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
No adjourned business
7 REPORTS

7.1 Requested removal of the Oak Trees in Adderley Terrace Reserve, Kaiapoi – Greg Barnard (Parks Community Asset Officer)

G Barnard spoke to the report and informed members of the measures taken to mitigate the problems raised by D Blackwell which included mowing the reserve with catchers to pick up excess leaves weekly when needed, providing bags for leaves in D Blackwell’s property and an arrangement to remove bags when full.

G Barnard also informed the Board that the report had been given to D Blackwell and that he had met with him prior to the Board meeting. D Blackwell had reiterated that all five Oak trees be removed but would accept a compromise that at least the largest middle tree of the three closest to his property be removed.

D Blackwell’s concerns were the large amount of leafing, and the shading effect when coming from sunlight into the shadow whilst driving. He perceived this as a safety risk as it was difficult for one’s vision to adapt quickly.

G Barnard also mentioned that the public consultation with other residents in the area overwhelmingly showed support for retaining all the trees in the reserve.

J Watson acknowledged that the biggest issue for D Blackwell was the amount of leaves in his property, especially when there was a nor wester and wondered if this could be addressed by getting community groups involved in helping with periodic clean ups on the property.

S Stewart commented that oak leaves made very good compost and could be utilised and suggested the community garden may be able to compost the leaves.

P Redmond noted that D Blackwell had cut down one of the trees on his own property recently. This was confirmed. P Redmond then asked about the problem of acorns with regards to health and safety risk of slipping on crushed acorns or having the acorns rolling underfoot. G Barnard confirmed that the Council had arranged for weekly sweeping of the area to mitigate the problem but this was hampered by parked cars.

N Atkinson told the Board that a local farmer regularly collected the dropped acorns for feeding his pigs.

N Atkinson empathised with D Blackwell but felt there were other ways of mitigating the problems raised rather than removing beautiful trees.

S Stewart said it would be a tragedy to remove the trees and agreed that the community gardens could utilise the leaves for composting and that the recently formed Waimakiriri Student Army might be able to help with regular clean ups.

R Blair requested clarification on a proposed compromise of removing the one tree that D Blackwell had suggested. G Barnard agreed that it would improve the light in the area and as this was the largest tree in the group would mean that fewer leaves fell in the short term. However with the biggest tree removed the other two would grow substantially bigger and quicker given the room and light and in the long term there would be very little difference in the leaf and acorn litter.

Moved N Atkinson seconded S Stewart

THAT the Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 181205143817

(b) Approves the retention of the English Oak (Quercus robur) trees located in Adderley Terrace reserve
7.2 Application to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board’s Discretionary Grant Fund 2018/2019 – Kay Rabe (Governance Adviser)

Moved P Redmond seconded J Watson

THAT the Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190119000217.

(b) Approves a grant of $415 to Karanga Mai Early Learning Centre towards the cost of a washing line and a wireless speaker.

J Watson commented on the great work that this group does.

CARRIED

Moved J Watson seconded N Atkinson

(c) Approves a grant of $500 to Kaiapoi Baptist Church towards the cost of upgrading the Public Address system.

CARRIED

J Watson mentioned that this was a wonderful facility that was well used by the community.

S Stewart requested that consideration be given to advertising in local papers to encourage community groups to apply for funding from the Board. Staff advised of recent adverts place in the Chatter community newsletter.

7.3 New Zealand Community Boards’ Conference 2019 – Kay Rabe (Governance Adviser)

Moved P Redmond seconded J Watson

THAT the Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190109001650.

(b) Approves two members, being J Watson and R Blair attend the New Zealand Community Boards’ Conference to be held in New Plymouth from 11 to 13 April 2019.

(c) Notes the attendees will write an individual report on the conference sharing ideas/knowledge gained and present the report at their respective Board’s May 2019 meeting.

(d) Notes that the total cost for each attendee is approximately $1,821 (including GST).

CARRIED

P Redmond stated that earlier in the term there had been mention made of training through webinars and other forms of training which could be accessed but as yet no further information on that had been received. Staff to follow up.
7.4 **Summary of Discretionary Grant Accountability 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018 – Kay Rabe (Governance Adviser)**

Moved J Watson seconded P Redmond

THAT the Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 190109001449.

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

CARRIED

7.5 **Summary of Discretionary Grant Accountability 1 July 2018 to 31 December 2018 – Kay Rabe (Governance Adviser)**

Moved J Watson seconded N Atkinson

THAT the Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 190110002007

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

CARRIED

8 **CORRESPONDENCE**

There was no correspondence.

9 **CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT**

9.1 **Chair’s Diary for January/February 2019**

Moved J Watson seconded P Redmond

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190211014638.

CARRIED

10 **MATTERS REFERRED FOR INFORMATION**

10.1 **Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 6 December 2018** (Trim No. 181128139880).

10.2 **Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 10 December 2018** (Trim No 181205142989).

10.3 **Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 12 December 2018** (Trim No 181206144348).

10.4 **Youth Council meeting minutes – October 2018**

10.5 **Zone Implementation Programme Addendum (ZIPA) implementation-WDC role and funding options – report to Council 29 January 2019** (Trim No 181217148924).

10.6 **Library Update to 30 November 2018 – report to Community and Recreation Committee 18 December 2018** (Trim No 181130141223).

10.7 **Aquatic Facilities Update Report – report to Community and Recreation Committee 20 November 2018** (Trim No 181030126776).

10.8 **Youth Development Annual Report 2018 – report to Community and Recreation Committee 18 December 2018** (Trim No 181205143969).
10.9 Waimakariri Youth Strategy Review – report to Community and Recreation Committee 18 December 2018 (Trim No 181206144197).

10.10 Community Team Update – report to Community and Recreation Committee 18 December 2018 (Trim No 181206144576).

10.11 Report to Annual Plan on Town Centre Feature Lighting and Decorations – report to Council 29 to 31 January 2019 (Trim No 190111002267)

Moved J Watson seconded C Greengrass

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.11.

CARRIED

Note: Items were circulated to Board members separately.

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

S Stewart
  - Update on the Water Zone Committee
  - Minutes of the Cam River Enhancement Committee available
  - Crime and anti-social behavior in Kairaki Beach area

P Redmond
  - Concern regarding Police Stations not available to residents who need to report crime. Request that the Police be asked to report to the Board on crime statistics in Kaiapoi and surrounds. Staff advised of regular Police updates to All Boards.
  - Enjoyable Board Christmas function
  - Attended All Boards Briefing
  - Attended Age Friendly workshop at Silverstream – good turn out
  - Attended the Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group meeting
  - Attended Waitangi Day celebrations, Pines Beach Gala and River Carnival – all great events and well attended

M Pinkham
  - River Carnival – does not think it should be an annual event
  - Working on You Me We Us fun run to be held on 17 March 2019

J Meyer
  - Draft Annual Plan should be much easier to understand
  - Roading in the Kaiapoi regeneration land area and update on dust issues
  - Met with residents regarding their concern about the social housing on Butchers Road

A Blackie
  - Attended Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group meeting
  - Also agrees on the improvement of the Annual Plan process
  - Silverstream Advisory Group update

C Greengrass
  - Attended Pines Beach Gala, Waitangi Day celebrations and River Carnival
  - Attended Kaiapoi Signage meeting
R Blair
- Darnley Club meeting and update
- Attended Historical Association meeting

N Atkinson
- River Carnival – great to see people out enjoying the river
- Portfolio Update – Communications Team now at full strength
- Submission opportunities on the Draft Annual Plan and Draft District Plan
- Update on Greater Christchurch Transport Plan
- Roading issues – large number of potholes encountered in a newly completed road

J Watson
- Kaiapoi Signage Group – interpretive signs in design stage
- Thanked A Blackie and C Greengrass for their work on a successful River Carnival

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

About an Age-Friendly Community
Consultation closes Thursday 28 February 2019.

Staff advised the Board that public consultation on the Draft Annual Plan starts on 11 March and runs until 11 April 2019. The All Boards Briefing to be held on 6 March 2019 will focus on the Draft Annual Plan.

The Board decided to hold a Board workshop to formulate its submission on Monday 1 April 2019 at 3pm in the Meeting Room, Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre.

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 4 March 2019. This meeting is open to the public.

14 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

14.1 Board Discretionary Grant
Balance as at 10 December 2018: $3,048 (including carry forward).
14.2 General Landscaping Budget
Balance as at 12 September 2018: $46,420 (including carry forward).

15 MEDIA ITEMS
A suggestion was made that allocations from the Discretionary Funding should be emphasized in the publicised outcomes of the meeting so as to advertise the fund to possible community groups.

16 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
Nil.

17 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
Nil.

NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board is scheduled for 4pm, Monday 18 March 2019 at the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 5.07pm.

CONFIRMED

________________________________________
Chairperson

________________________________________
Date
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR INFORMATION

FILE NO: GOV-18 / 190226022809

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 5 March 2019

FROM: David Ayers, Mayor

SUBJECT: Mayor's Diary 29 January to 25 February 2019

1. SUMMARY

Conventional Media

For your information, my regular media commitments are a weekly interview on Compass FM, which I record in my diary, and a weekly meeting with the North Canterbury News, which is also recorded in the diary. I write a number of columns in the print media: every three weeks in the North Canterbury News and monthly in the Woodpecker and Essence. I write occasional columns for the Northern Outlook when they ask for them and I do occasional radio interviews, usually for Newstalk ZB, most recently about the Kiwibuild programme in Kaiapoi.

Social Media

I have been accepted into Facebook groups for Waikuku, Pegasus, Ohoka, Mandeville-Swannanoa, Silverstream and Oxford and generally keep an eye on them in an unsystematic way. I run a Facebook page in my official role and try very hard (not always successfully!) to confine my Twitter posts to council or community-related matters. I also use my personal Facebook page for similar sorts of “official” matters as well as personal stuff (although I don’t post photos of meals or cats).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 29 January</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Council Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 30 January</td>
<td>Attended Age-Friendly Cuppa, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 31 January</td>
<td>Openings of CDHB Manawa and Outpatients buildings, Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Transport Committee Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury Mayoral Forum working dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 1 February</td>
<td>Canterbury Mayoral Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury Civil Defence Emergency Group Joint Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 4 February</td>
<td>Joint meeting with Christchurch City Council, Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Met Japanese Students visiting Rangiora new life School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regeneration Steering Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended the Phil Collins Concert as guest of Christchurch Stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 5 February</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 6 February</td>
<td>Waitangi Day Celebration, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 7 February</td>
<td>Misco Joinery Visit and Tour, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting at Pegasus to discuss emergency access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting, Ohoka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 8 February</td>
<td>Productivity Commission Visit – interview, along with Deputy Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kevin Felstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waikuku Artists Incorporated Annual Art Exhibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 9 February</td>
<td>Attended ordination and installation ceremonies for Rev Dr Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carrell as Anglican Bishop of Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 10 February</td>
<td>Attended Pines-Kairaki Gala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 11 February</td>
<td>Assisted with interviews for Wellbeing North Canterbury Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury Museum Trust Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 12 February</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 13 February</td>
<td>Waimakariri Road Safety Co-ordinating Committee Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENC Board Meeting, Amberley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 14 February</td>
<td>Met Brian Hoult, Waimakariri Art Collection Trust, regarding artwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for Council Chamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 15 February</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill - North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended staff Mad-Tri, Dudley Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 17 February</td>
<td>Opening of terraces, Kaiapoi River, and Kaiapoi River Carnival and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boat Show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 18 February</td>
<td>Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 19 February</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 20 February</td>
<td>Springbank Honey Resource Consent Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waimakariri-Passchendaele Advisory Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 21 February</td>
<td>Joint WDC / Rūnanga Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citizenship Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art on the Quay opening, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 22 February</td>
<td>Interview with David Hill - North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended and laid wreath, Earthquake Anniversary Service, Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended Youth Concert, Victoria Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 23 February</td>
<td>Attended reopening of Christchurch Town Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 25 February</td>
<td>LGNZ Governance and Strategy Advisory Group meeting, Wellington</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THAT** the Council:

a) **Receives** report No.: 190226022809.

David Ayers
MAYOR