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**WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL**

A meeting of the **WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL** will be held in the **COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA** on **TUESDAY 30 JANUARY, WEDNESDAY 31 JANUARY, THURSDAY 1 FEBRUARY AND FRIDAY 2 FEBRUARY (RESERVE DAY) 2018** commencing at **9.00AM**.

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. **COUNCILLORS DECLARATION**

   The Waimakariri District Council adheres to the following legislation with regard to the swearing in of elected members

   **3.1 Local Government Act 2002 - Schedule 7 – Clause 14: Declaration by Member**

   (1) A person may not act as a member of a local authority until—
   (a) that person has, at a meeting of the local authority following the election of that person, made an oral declaration in the form set out in subclause (3); and
   (b) a written version of the declaration has been attested as provided under subclause
   (2), The written declaration must be signed by the member and witnessed by—
   (a) the chairperson; or
   (b) the mayor; or
   (c) a member of the local authority; or
   (d) the chief executive of the local authority; or
   (e) in the absence of the chief executive, some other officer appointed by the chief executive.
   (3) The form of the declaration must consist of the following elements:
The Mayor will receive and witness Councillor declaration from Kirstyn Barnett.

Declaration by member

"I, Kirstyn Jane Barnett, declare that I will faithfully and impartially, and according to the best of my skill and judgment, execute and perform, in the best interests of Waimakariri district, the powers, authorities, and duties vested in, or imposed upon, me as a District Councillor of the Waimakariri District Council by virtue of the Local Government Act 2002, the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, or any other Act.

Dated at Rangiora, on Tuesday 30 January 2018.

Signature:

Signed in the presence of: Mayor David Ayers, of Waimakariri District.

Furthermore, I Kirstyn Jane Barnett, acknowledge that extracts of the required legislative material being The Crimes Act 1961; Local Government Act 2002 (Members of local authority liable for loss); Local Government Act 2002 Amendment Act 2014 (Certain Members indemnified); and the Secret Commissions Act 1910 has been circulated to me, Kirstyn Barnett.

I have been made aware of the Local Government Official information and Meetings Act 1987, Local Authorities Members Interests Act 1968 and the Financial Markets Conduct Act 2013.

I also note that under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015, Officers (Councillors and the Chief Executive) are required to undertake due diligence activities to discharge their responsibilities under the Act and to ensure the Council has effective health and safety processes, procedures and culture in place.

4. OVERVIEW AND FINANCIAL STRATEGY

4.1 Overview - Jim Palmer - Chief Executive.

5. REPORTS

5.1 Risk Assessment and Financing Strategy relating to Major Natural Disasters – Jim Palmer (Chief Executive)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No 180112002169

(b) Adopts the Risk Assessment and Financing Strategy relating to Major Natural Disasters (Trim No: 180112002171).

(c) Notes that there is a 30% probability of an Alpine Fault rupture occurring within the next 50 years, and it is assessed as being the most damaging event for Council’s assets.
Notes that it is estimated to cost $210 million for the Council to recover from Alpine Fault rupture, which is nearly double the Council’s recovery cost from 2010-11 Canterbury Earthquake series.

Notes that, net of Government, NZTA financial assistance and insurance proceeds, the Council’s share of the recovery costs resulting from a major natural disaster could be in the order of $32 million, and if insurance was not available, for whatever reason, that amount could increase up to $104 million.

Notes that any shortfall in Council’s share of the funding requirement can only be funded through maintaining adequate borrowing ‘head-room’.

Provides in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan borrowing ‘head-room’ of $32 million, in the event of insurance being in place, and $84 million of borrowing ‘head-room’ in the unlikely situation of insurance not being available.

Notes the Strategy’s priority listing for the restoration of Council’s services and assets.

Circulates this report to all Community Boards.

5.2 Draft Revenue and Financing Policy to be used in the Draft LTP 2018-28 and Draft Funding Impact Statement – Jeff Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support) and Maree Harris (Customer Service Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No 180110001745
(b) Approves the Draft Revenue & Financing Policy as the basis for preparing the Draft 2018/28 Long Term Plan, and
(c) Approves the Draft Funding Impact Statement as the basis for preparing the Draft 2018/28 Long Term Plan, and
(d) Notes that the UAGC is recommended to be $120 in the Draft 2018/28 Long Term Plan and Impact Funding Statement, the same as in 2017/18 for the 2018/19 financial year.

5.3 Amendment to Treasury Policy – Jeff Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 180118003861.
(b) Approves the Treasury Policy (Trim 180118003863).
5.4 2018 – 2048 Infrastructure Strategy – Veronica Spittle (Senior Policy Analyst)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report: Trim Number 180119004562.

(b) Receives the attached Draft 2018-2048 Infrastructure Strategy: Trim number 171129129930.

(c) Notes that the 2018-2048 Infrastructure Strategy will be adopted as part of the process to finalise the Long Term Plan in June 2018.

5.5 Multi Use Sports Facility – Craig Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 180118003759

(b) Approves the provision of $27.85 million in the Draft LTP for the construction of a multi-use sports facility at Coldstream Road, scheduled for completion around September 2020.

(c) Notes that there will be a community engagement process during the consultation period for the Draft LTP specifically on the Multi Use Sports Facility, including the proposed site layout at Coldstream Road.

(d) Approves Staff working with the North Canterbury Sports and Recreation Trust on the development of a Heads of Agreement for the management and operation of the facility.

(e) Notes that the Draft Heads of Agreement will be available for Council’s consideration prior to the finalisation of the 2018 LTP.

(f) Circulates this report to the Boards.

Note: Following item 5.5 the Council will then consider Item 6.1 from 'Matters Referred' being Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2017.
5.6  **Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry – Stage 2 Report – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council

(a) **Receives** report No. 180118003751.

(b) **Notes** that key recommendations from the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry Stage 2 Report include the abolishment of the secure classification system of the current standards meaning that all water will need to be treated, the need for a residual disinfectant (chlorine) within the reticulation system, and for compliance with the standards to be mandatory.

(c) **Notes** that staff have allowed for the implementation of UV treatment on all schemes that currently rely on secure classification of their sources for compliance with the current Drinking Water Standards, based on the recommendations from the Stage 2 Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry.

(d) ** Approves** the implementation of UV treatment across the district’s water supply schemes at an estimated additional capital cost of $3.0M, which has been allowed for within the Council’s Draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan over the years 2018/19 through to 2022/23.

(e) **Approves** the approach of allowing for the cost of chlorination on all the currently unchlorinated schemes while not committing to implementation of this without Council being legislatively required to do so or without consultation with the public at the direction of Council.

(f) **Notes** the reasoning set out in Section 6.2 of this report for making financial provision for mandatory chlorination which is not consistent with current Council practice.

(g) **Notes** that due to the timing of the Havelock North Inquiry Stage 2 Report, the cost estimates that fed into the Draft Long Term Plan budget were carried out without detailed site specific analysis.

5.7  **Funding Options for Water Supply Rates – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council

(a) **Receives** report No. 180119004275.

(b) **Notes** that the current figures in the 2018-28 Draft Long Term Plan include rating increase in the order of $1,100 to $2,000 per standard connection (2 unit and 19 unit connections respectively) on both the Garrymere and Poyntz’s Road water supply schemes.

(c) **Notes** that the Utilities and Roading Committee recommended that Council consider funding options for the scheme upgrade as
part of the Draft Long Term Plan that could include partial funding from other water supply schemes, or the general rate.

**EITHER**

(d) **Approves** the capping of water rates at the current maximum water rate effective from the 2018/19 financial year, which would increase annually in accordance with the LGCI, and that any costs over and above this would be spread across all other properties with a water connection.

(e) **Notes** that the proposed capping of rates is estimated to increase all water rates by $2.10 per connection in 2018/19 and $6.20 per connection in 2019/20.

**OR**

(f) **Approves** funding of the Garrymere and Poyntzs Road scheme upgrades from within each scheme respectively, as per the current practice.

(g) **Notes** that the option to cap and spread water rates should be included for consultation as part of the Draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan Consultation Document.

(h) **Notes** that the 3 Waters rating structure is due to be reviewed in 2022 and that the proposed capping of water rates is considered to be an interim solution for the most significantly affected schemes in the medium term.

5.8 **Oxford Wastewater Treatment Plant Treatment Upgrade – request for additional budget – Chris Parton (Wastewater Asset Manager) and Mark Andrews (Civil Engineer PDU)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council

(a) **Receives** report No. 180109001310

(b) **Approves** additional budget of $282,500 in the Draft Long Term Plan for the 2018/19 financial year to enable the full scope of required aeration upgrades at Oxford WWTP to be completed as one construction package.

(c) **Notes** that the additional budget will have a rating increase of $27 per property per year over the next 15 years.

(d) **Notes** that staff will carry over the remaining budget of approximately $350,000 from the 2017/18 financial year to the 2018/2019 financial year, to provide a total budget of $632,500 for this work.

(e) **Notes** that this budget provision is included in the Draft Long Term Plan.
5.9 **Herbicide, Glyphosate use for Waimakariri District Council Weed Control Operations – Greg Bennett (Land Drainage Engineer) and Gerard Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council

(c) **Receives** report No. 180111001840.

(d) **Notes** that based on information to date, it is unlikely that the use of glyphosate by the Council would pose a risk to public health and the environment.

(e) **Notes** that the use of herbicide in Council operations is carried out strictly in accordance with the manufacturer’s instructions.

(f) **Notes** that herbicides, including glyphosate, for Council operations are only used where deemed necessary by Council staff and contractors, and other weed control options are used where they are deemed more appropriate.

(g) **Notes** that the budgets in the LTP have been based on continuing to use herbicides, including glyphosate, for weed control where deemed necessary by Council staff and contractors.

(h) **Circulates** this report to the Community Boards, Drainage Advisory Groups and the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee for their information.

Note: Following item 5.9 the Council will then consider Item 6.2 from ‘Matters Referred’ being Adoption of Utilities and Roading Activity Management Plans 2018.

5.10 **2018/19 Development Contributions Schedules – Kelly LaValley (Project Delivery Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council

(a) **Receives** report No. 180111002046.

(b) **Approves** the Draft 2018/19 Development Contributions Schedule for consultation with the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

(c) **Notes** that the methodology for the neighbourhood reserves land purchase has been reviewed and updated.

(d) **Notes** that staff will be assessing the options for development contributions when existing properties connect to reticulation. A report will be brought to Council with a recommendation based on this assessment.

(e) **Notes** that proposed updates to the Development Contribution Policy are presented in a separate report (TRIM 180111001799).
5.11 **Draft Development Contributions Policy 2018/19 – Mike O-Connell**
(Senior Policy Analyst)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No 180111001799

(b) Approves the Draft Development Contribution Policy 2018/19 for consultation as a Special Consultative Procedure as part of the 2018-2028 Long-Term Plan.

(c) Notes that this update has been undertaken through the Development Contribution Internal Review Group.

5.12 **Fees and Charges for Community Facilities and Airfield Ground Rental – Craig Sargison**
(Manager Community and Recreation)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 180117003266

(b) Approves the fees and charges for community facilities as attached in Appendix 1 (P6) for inclusion in the Fees and Charges Section of the Draft LTP.

(c) Approves the community facilities fees and charges applying to all users.

(d) Approves the airfield land rent charge of $4.00 per sq metre for inclusion in the Fees and Charges section of the Draft LTP

5.13 **Draft Community Green Space Activity Management Plan 2017 – Chris Brown**
(Community Green Space Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 171107120943.

(b) Notes that a preliminary version of the Draft Community Green Space Activity Management Plan was presented to the Community and Recreation Committee in November 2017.

(c) Notes that the Draft Community Green Space Activity Management Plan has been sent to an external consultant for peer review.

(d) Adopts the Draft Community Green Space Activity Management Plan (TRIM 171110122373).

(e) Approves the Community Green Space Manager to make minor amendments if required as a result of the peer review.
Notes that the final Activity Management Plan will be adopted by Council in conjunction with the adoption of the Final LTP.

NOTE: A copy of the Draft Community Green Space Activity Management Plan 2017 has been circulated to members separately. This document is available to the public on request.

5.14 Waimakariri Public Art Advisory Trust – Craig Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 180118003966

(b) Receives the Art in Public Places Policy and Waimakariri Public Arts Trust Deed.

(c) Approves the inclusion in the Draft LTP of the Proposal to establish a Waimakariri Public Art Advisory Trust.

(d) Notes that the expectation is that the Trust will externally source funds for art installations

(e) Approves funding of $5,000 in the Recreation Account for the Servicing of the Art Trust. – Note that this is included in the Draft LTP Recreation Budget.

5.15 Cones Road Proposed Walkway Link to Boundary Road - Chris Brown (Community Green Space Manager) and Mike Kwant (Community Projects Officer)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No.180104000506

(b) Notes that the Rangiora / Ashley Community Board supported the construction of a walkway between Cones Road and Boundary Road at its March 2017 meeting subject to a number of safety initiatives being implemented including the reduction of the speed limit to the unsealed portion of Cones Road.

(c) Approves funding of $11,800 being included in the draft Long Term Plan for the construction of a track from Cones Road to Boundary Road.

(d) Notes that a budget of $11,800 for the track construction has already been included in the draft budget sheets in the 2018/19 financial year.

(e) Notes that the Roading report Trim # 170822090365 regarding the reduction of the speed limit on Cones Road and other safety related changes to Cones Road is still lying on the table and will be considered when the Long Term Plan is finalised.
5.16 **Te Kohaka o Tuhaitara Trust Management Plan – Jeff Millward**  
(Manager Finance and Business Support)

*Note: This report will be presented by Catherine McMillan (Chairperson) and Greg Byrnes (General Manager) of the Trust at 3.30pm Wednesday 31 January 2018.*

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council

(a) **Receives** report No 180119004236;

(b) **Receives** the Summary Business case for Te Kōhaka ō Tūhaitara Trust;

(c) **Approves** an annual Grant of $150,000 plus GST to Te Kōhaka ō Tūhaitara Trust that would contribute towards the additional operations cost of the conservation areas.;

(d) **Notes** that budget provision is to be funded from the Governance Grants account and that this amount has tentatively been included within the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan. Excluding contributions in kind, the total amount provided within the 2018-28 LTP for grants and leases is $243,391 p.a.;

(e) **Notes** Te Kōhaka ō Tūhaitara Trust are also receiving land as a result of the Regeneration Plan and is be funded from a number of other external sources.

(f) **Notes** that Te Kōhaka ō Tūhaitara Trust is to incorporate into the Reserve Management Plan and the Statement of Intent additional objectives and measures in relation to the recently acquired ECMA & WCMA.

5.17 **Rangiora Service Centre Refurbishment Project – Rob Hawthorne**  
(Property Manager)

*Note: A staff briefing (public excluded) will occur prior to the presentation of the report to the Council.*

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council

(a) **Receives** report CPR-05-04 / 180119004578

(b) **Approves** The Rangiora Service Centre Refurbishment Project at 215 High Street and budget $ 3,985,000;

(c) **Notes** that;

- The expenditure timing in the LTP as 2018/19 ($2,300,000), 2019/20 ($1,685,000)
- The option attends to identified hazards and risks – both health & safety as well as business continuity and performance
• Provides future proofing for staff growth over the next 10 years and aligns with Ta Matou Mauri and the Council’s organisational culture.

• several lease and refurbishment options have been reviewed and evaluated and this is considered the preferred and most viable option.

• Adds value to the existing asset and improves the working environment for existing staff, as well as allowing for a more adaptable re-use of the building either for sale or for integration with a building extension, if needed.

5.18 Waimakariri District Plan Review – District Plan Review Budget – Trevor Ellis (Development Planning Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 171215136380.

(b) Approves loan funding of $4.131 Million to complete the statutory process of the District Plan Review over the five-year period to 2022/23 as set out in paragraph 3.6 below.

(c) Notes the estimated total cost of the District Plan Review is $8 Million.

(d) Notes a loan funding repayment period of 15 years (to 2032/33).

5.19 Additional Business and Centres Unit Resource – Simon Hart (Business and Centres Manager and Simon Markham (Manager Engagement and Strategy))

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Receives Report No. 180109001129

(b) Notes the information contained in the attached Resourcing Business Case.

(c) Notes the potential resourcing options illustrated in the Options and Issues section below.

(d) Approves an annual inclusion of $100,000 into the Business and Centres Unit budget for a permanent full time Business and Centres Advisor (Resourcing Option 3C as per section 3.3 below).

(e) Circulates a copy of this report to Community Boards for their information.
6. MATTERS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL AND COMMITTEES

Item 6.1 is referred from the Council meeting of 5 December 2017. A copy of report 171123127385 is attached.

6.1 Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2017 – Hearing Panel
Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2017 (Councillors R Brine – Chair, W Doody and P Williams)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 171123127385.

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

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

2. Insert the below targets in Section 2.2

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Item 6.2 is referred from the Utilities & Roading Committee meeting of 12 December 2017. A copy of report 171122126970 is attached.*

6.2 **Utilities and Roading Activity Management Plans 2018** – **Gerard Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading) and Simon Collin (Infrastructure Strategy Manager)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council

(a) **Adopts** the following 2018 Activity Management Plans for Roading, Water, Wastewater, Drainage, Stockwater, and Solid Waste:

i. **Introduction, IFR-02-01**, TRIM 170724076981

ii. **Roading AMP, IFR-02-02.04**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(b) Scheme / Document Reference</th>
<th>TRIM Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1 Executive Summary Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2 Introduction Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3 Levels Of Service Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4 Future Demand Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5 Risk Management Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6 Life Cycle Management Plan Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 7 Financial Summary Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 8 Asset Management Practices Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 9 Plan Improvement And Monitoring Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 10 Appendices Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A Glossary of Terms Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B 2018 Draft Strategic Business Case</td>
<td>171025115475</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C Level Of Services Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme / Document Reference</th>
<th>TRIM Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply AMP Overview Document 2018</td>
<td>170321027288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi (including Pines/ Kairaki) AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus/Woodend Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Urban Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Rural No. 2 Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Rural No. 1 Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville/Fernside Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerhill Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poyntz Road Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Eyreton Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrymere Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix D 2018 Roading Valuation Report Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme / Document Reference</th>
<th>TRIM Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018 Roading Valuation Report</td>
<td>170321027277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix E Capital Works Forward Works Programme Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme / Document Reference</th>
<th>TRIM Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply AMP Overview Document 2018</td>
<td>170321027288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi (including Pines/ Kairaki) AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus/Woodend Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Urban Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Rural No. 2 Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Rural No. 1 Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville/Fernside Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerhill Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poyntz Road Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Eyreton Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrymere Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### i. Water Supply AMP, IFR-02-03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme / Document Reference</th>
<th>TRIM Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply AMP Overview Document 2018</td>
<td>170822090191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>16116117739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi (including Pines/ Kairaki) AMP 2018</td>
<td>16116117709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus/Woodend Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>16116117732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Urban Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>16116117758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Rural No. 2 Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>16116117731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Rural No. 1 Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>16116117729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>16116117719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>16116117722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville/Fernside Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>16116117727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerhill Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>16116117718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>16116117711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poyntz Road Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>16116117736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Eyreton Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>16116117741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrymere Water Supply Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>16116117714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ii. Wastewater AMP, IFR-02-04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme / Document Reference</th>
<th>TRIM Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater AMP Overview Document 2018</td>
<td>16116117659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern District's Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>16116117662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>16116117667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>16116117680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>16116117668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegassus Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>16116117672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>16116117664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>16116117675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pines/Kairaki Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>16116117670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahwir Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>16116117666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Beach Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>16116117669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>16116117674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loburn Lea Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>16116117678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernside Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>16116117682</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### iii. Drainage AMP, IFR-02-05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme / Document Reference</th>
<th>TRIM Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drainage AMP Overview Document 2018</td>
<td>16116117610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal urban Drainage Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>16116117569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Urban Drainage Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>16116117571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
iv. Stockwater AMP, IFR-02-06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme / Document Reference</th>
<th>TRIM Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stock Water Race AMP 2018</td>
<td>16115117090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

v. Solid Waste AMP, IFR-02-07

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme / Document Reference</th>
<th>TRIM Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste AMP November 2018</td>
<td>171129129620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Notes that the levels of service provided for are reflected in the draft budgets for the Long Term Plan (LTP)

NOTE: The U&R Activity Management Plan documents have been circulated separately to members and are available to members of the public on request.

Items 6.3 to 6.5 are referred from the Community and Recreation Committee meeting of 21 November 2017. Copies are attached of these three reports.

6.3 **Community Green Space Strategic Planning – Chris Brown**

*Community Green Space Manager*

558 - 775

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 171103119339

(b) Receives the Sports Facilities Strategy (Trim: 171114123628)

(c) Receives the Public Toilet Strategy (Trim: 171114123588)

(d) Receives the Play Space Strategy (Trim: 171114123637)

(e) Approves a new level of service for the maintenance of street reserve and cemetery trees which provides a programmed maintenance visit for all trees based on the below table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Example Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Williams St, Kaiapoi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets</td>
<td>Main St Oxford, Good St, Rangiora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Reserves</td>
<td>Arlington Reserve, Corcoran Reserve, Pearson Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Roads</td>
<td>Keetley Place, Libby drive, Mill Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Reserves</td>
<td>View Hill Domain, Whites Road Reserve, West Oxford Reserve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Profile Reserves</td>
<td>Victoria Park, Kaiapoi Domain, Rangiora Service Centre, Trousellot Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young tree Maintenance (0-7 yrs)</td>
<td>WDC planted trees under 8 years old</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(f) **Notes** that approving the levels of service for tree maintenance will have no impact on current budget allocation.

(g) **Notes** that no additional land is required to be purchased over the LTP period.

(h) **Notes** that the artificial provision of $1.7million in 2018/19 is no longer required.

(i) **Approves** the provision of $1.7million over the ten year period for upgrading and development of existing sports facilities.

(j) **Notes** that there is a separate report on the provision of indoor court facilities.

(k) **Approves** an additional total of $500,000 of capital expenditure over ten year period to provide for a new toilet at Mandeville Sports Ground (Equestrian), Millton Memorial Reserve and West Oxford Reserve. Note that the previous LTP had a funding provision of $114,000 in 20/21.

(l) **Notes** that staff will investigate funding opportunities from the Tourism Infrastructure fund for West Oxford Reserve and Saltwater Creek.

(m) **Approves** an additional total of $90,000 capital replacement funding over the ten year period for replacement of existing toilets which will make a total funding $1,150,000 over the period of the LTP.

(n) **Approves** the inclusion of an additional $415,000 of capital expenditure over the ten year period for development of playgrounds at Hurunui Reserve, Millton Memorial Reserve, Kippenberger/Elm Green and a skate park for the Woodend/Pegasus Area.

(o) **Notes** that $190,000 is included for playground replacement which is consistent with previous years funding.
6.4 Community Facilities Provision – Craig Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No 171026115830

(b) Receives the Community Facilities Report (Trim 171017112201)

(c) Approves the level of service for provision of library space of 60m² per 1000 population

(d) Approves staff investigating off site storage space for library collection storage in either Rangiora or Kaiapoi and reporting back to Council.

(e) Approves the provision of $40,000 in Year 1 of the Draft LTP to allow for further investigation of the provision of a Library/Community Meeting Space in either Ravenswood or Pegasus with such a facility coming on line in Year 10 of the Draft LTP.

(f) Approves the level of service for provision of community meeting space for new communities to service a population of 2,500 it is proposed that there is a facility to cater for around 80 people plus storage space. This can be stand alone or incorporated as part of a facility such as a Library.

(g) Notes that the only part of the District that does not meet this standard is Pegasus and potentially Ravenswood depending on the speed of residential development.

(h) Notes that it is expected that the need for additional community facilities for meeting spaces in Rangiora will be met by developments currently being planned by the Anglican and Presbyterian Churches.

(i) Approves staff investigating the potential for using available Council owned land at Northbrook Road or Mixed Use Business Land in the Regeneration Area, for potential development of community owned buildings and notes that staff will prepare a report for Council’s consideration.

(j) Notes that there is no provision for further expansion or development of Aquatic Facilities in the District for the next ten years as the existing facilities have capacity to cope with projected growth.

(k) Approves the following financial provisions being included in the Draft LTP:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTP YEAR</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Investigation into location of Library Ravenswood/Pegasus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Further planning for library extension at Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$3 Million</td>
<td>Detailed design and construction commencement of Rangiora Library extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>Car-parking development for land approved for community groups buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$3.5 Million</td>
<td>Completion of Rangiora Library extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Landscaping/car-parking on land approved for community group’s buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3.9 Million</td>
<td>New Library at Ravenswood/Pegasus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(l) Circulates this report to the Boards.

6.5 Community Team Funding – Craig Sargison (Manager Community and Recreation)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 171107120563

(b) Approves the Community Team being staffed at a level of 5.65 FTE funded from rates which was the staffing level in 2016/17.

(c) Notes that external funding is anticipated of $80,000 which will fund project delivery

(d) Approves a rating contribution of $ 709,551 for the Community Team being included in the Draft Annual Plan

(e) Notes that staff will continue to work closely with Central Government Agencies and will keep Council informed of any further potential partnering opportunities.

6.6 Kaiapoi Wharf Marine Precinct and Riverbanks Programme LTP Budget - Duncan Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager - District Regeneration)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report No. 171109121919.
(b) Approves the budget for the Regeneration programme; noting that the proposed budget requests an additional $10,497,000 of funding in order to deliver the programme as outlined in this report, with a total programme value of approximately $18,381,000 expenditure.

(c) Notes that the overall Regeneration programme estimate and the timing of some key projects has changed since the last update in May/June 2017.

(d) Approves the budget for the Kaiapoi Wharf Marine Precinct & Riverbanks programme, which, after allowance for some reapportionment of existing budget components, includes an increase of approximately $450,000 over currently approved budgets, with some changes in the planned timing of expenditure.

(e) Notes that the overall Kaiapoi Wharf Marine Precinct & Riverbanks programme budget estimate and the timing of some key projects has changed since the last update in November 2017 (Trim: 171026116121[v2]).

7. BUDGETS

7.1 Roading

Note: This budget will be presented at 9am on Wednesday 31 January 2018.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

7.2 Solid Waste

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

7.3 Water

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

7.4 Wastewater

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.
7.5 **Drainage and Stockwater Races**

*RECOMMENDATION*

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

7.6 **Utilities and Roading Overheads**

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

7.7 **Project Delivery Unit**

*RECOMMENDATION*

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

7.8 **Earthquake Recovery**

*RECOMMENDATION*

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

7.9 **Libraries and Museums**

*RECOMMENDATION*

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

7.10 **Aquatic Facilities**

*RECOMMENDATION*

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

7.11 **Community Development**

*RECOMMENDATION*

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.
7.12 **Green Space and Community Facilities**

*RECOMMENDATION*

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

7.13 **Earthquake Recovery Community Facilities**

*RECOMMENDATION*

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

7.14 **District Regeneration**

*RECOMMENDATION*

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

7.15 **Planning and Regulation management Overhead**

*RECOMMENDATION*

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

7.16 **Plan Implementation Unit**

*RECOMMENDATION*

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

7.17 **Building Unit**

*RECOMMENDATION*

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

7.18 **Environmental Services**

*RECOMMENDATION*

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.
7.19 Civil Defence Emergency Management

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

7.20 Strategy and Engagement

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

7.21 Customer Service

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

7.22 Development Planning Unit

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

7.23 Economic Development

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

7.24 Finance

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

7.25 Information and Technology Support

**RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Council
(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

7.26 Museums

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

7.27 Property, Housing Elderly

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

7.28 Water Unit

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

7.29 Governance and Secretarial

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

7.30 District Management

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

7.31 Organisational Development and HR

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Approves the draft budget for the ten year plan 2018 -2028.

8. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Council is scheduled for Wednesday 7 February 2018.
1 SUMMARY

1.1 This report asks the Council to adopt the updated Risk Assessment and Financing Strategy Relating to Major Natural Disasters, and to increase the borrowing “head-room” provision in the 2018-28 LTP from $70 million to $84 million.

1.2 As part of Council’s planning it needs to consider major events that cannot be explicitly budgeted for, but could impact during the planning period, especially major natural disasters.

1.3 The Risk Assessment and Financing Strategy Relating to Major Natural Disasters gives systematic consideration to the likelihood and severity of major natural disasters and assesses how they could impact on the Council’s operations and its financial capacity and position.

Attachments

1 Risk Assessment and Financing Strategy relating to Major Natural Disasters (Trim No: 180112002171)

2 RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 180112002169

(b) Adopts the Risk Assessment and Financing Strategy relating to Major Natural Disasters (Trim No: 180112002171).

(c) Notes that there is a 30% probability of an Alpine Fault rupture occurring within the next 50 years, and it is assessed as being the most damaging event for Council’s assets.

(d) Notes that it is estimated to cost $210 million for the Council to recover from Alpine Fault rupture, which is nearly double the Council's recovery cost from 2010-11 Canterbury Earthquake series.
(e) **Notes** that, net of Government, NZTA financial assistance and insurance proceeds, the Council’s share of the recovery costs resulting from a major natural disaster could be in the order of $32 million, and if insurance was not available, for whatever reason, that amount could increase up to $104 million.

(f) **Notes** that any shortfall in Council’s share of the funding requirement can only be funded through maintaining adequate borrowing ‘head-room’.

(g) **Provides** in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan borrowing ‘head-room’ of $32 million, in the event of insurance being in place, and $84 million of borrowing ‘head-room’ in the unlikely situation of insurance not being available.

(h) **Notes** the Strategy’s priority listing for the restoration of Council’s services and assets.

(i) **Circulates** this report to all Community Boards.

3 **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1 Risk assessments have identified that a major earthquake, either an Alpine fault rupture or a major local earthquake, would generate the greatest damage to the Council’s assets. There is a 30% probability of 8.0 magnitude Alpine fault rupture occurring within the next 50 years. In the context of the Council’s Long Term Plan and infrastructure strategy it is a matter that is very relevant.

3.2 Other natural disasters that could also cause significant damage are floods or a tsunami, although the level of damage to Council assets will not be as high as for a major earthquake. However, there is a probability that flooding could recur with greater frequency.

3.3 The Strategy has assessed the financial effects of major natural disasters based on an expected ‘worse-case’ scenario, which is a major earthquake. However, any financial accommodation made in the Council’s Long Term Plan could be applied to manage the effects of any natural disaster(s) that may occur during the planning period.

3.4 The net book value of Council’s assets, including roads and parks and reserves, exceeds $1.65 billion (30 June 2017). The Council does not insure roads (valued at $880 million) and reserves. The insured value of Council assets is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Category</th>
<th>Insured Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building and Community facilities</td>
<td>$152 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Dwellings (mainly Elderly Persons Units)</td>
<td>$31 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above-ground Infrastructure (pump stations, well structures, ponds etc)</td>
<td>$154 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Ground Assets (mainly pipes)</td>
<td>$709 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Insured Value</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,051 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2010/2011 Canterbury earthquake series provided a very good insight into the damaging effects of earthquakes. The Council now has a very good understanding of how its assets will perform in a major earthquake event. The Council has, and will, spend about $139 million recovering from the 2010 and 2011 earthquakes. Of this nearly $20 million relates to strengthening and improving community facilities (eg Ruataniwha, Rangiora and Oxford Town Halls) and about $20 million is proposed for Regeneration works.

3.5 Much of the Council’s recovery spend has been invested into improving the resilience of its assets and strengthening buildings to higher standards. All Council facilities and buildings haven been
strengthened to greater than 67% of the New Building Standard, with many now at 100% of the Standard. This should place the Council in a better position when the next major earthquake occurs.

3.6 The Council will rely on several funding sources to recover from a major earthquake; namely continuing Crown and NZTA funding support, as well as having prudent insurance arrangements in place. The Council will also incur a share of the cost.

3.7 Following the 2010 earthquakes the Council lost its earthquake insurance cover; however, that has now been reinstated.

3.8 Any Council share of the recovery costs would need to be funded by borrowing as the Council does not anticipate having any significant cash or investment assets available to realise and contribute to a recovery. Accordingly, the Council needs provides borrowing ‘head-room’ in its Long Term Plan to cater for an event. The desired outcome is that after the borrowing ‘headroom’ has been allowed for the Council will still live within its Treasury and Borrowing Policy limits. This will need to be evaluated and confirmed as part of the Long Term Planning process.

3.9 The Council estimates that the maximum probable loss or damage to Council assets, along with the costs to recover from a major earthquake to be about $210 million. In 2015 the assessed damage was estimated at $172 million. The increase is attributed primarily to the increased costs of replacing underground assets, and this reflects a significant increase in the value of underground assets following recent asset revaluations.

3.10 It is assumed that the current level of Government support for emergency response, contribution to below-ground infrastructure repair (currently 60%) and NZTA roading subsidy remains in place. In total, this will fund about $106 million of the recovery costs, with $72 million recoverable from insurers and the Local Authority Protection Programme (LAPP, which funds the Council’s 40% share of below-ground infrastructure asset repair) leaving about $32 million to be funded by the Council itself.

3.11 The Strategy considers the unlikely, but possible, scenario where because of another major natural disaster in the country, or insurance region, insurance cover may not be in place when a major event occurs that seriously impacts the District. This was the situation the Council faced following the 2010 earthquakes. If there was a major earthquake elsewhere, before an event impacted this District and insurance cover was lost, the Council’s share of recovery costs would increase to about $104 million.

3.12 The Strategy recommends that not all the $104 million shortfall is accommodated within the Long Term Plan as it would probably constrain the Council’s and community’s priority spending initiatives to too great an extent. Rather this Strategy recommends that the Council considers providing borrowing ‘head-room’ of up to $84 million within its Long Term Plan.

3.13 With $84 million of borrowing ‘head-room’, and no insurance cover in place, it means the Council would need to undertake a prioritisation process. That would result in not all Council assets being replaced. Funding would be available to restore fully all water, sewer, drainage and roading assets, but there would need to be a prioritisation process around the repair and restoration of community facilities, Council buildings and reserves within the District. The Strategy has developed a priority list for the restoration of services and assets that would help inform the Council’s reinvestment decisions. It would mean that the Council would restore the vast majority of its assets and all its highest priority community facilities, such as town halls, libraries and aquatic facilities, but that the
repair of some lower priority assets would be subject to an assessment of the funds available, desired levels of service, and the District’s future needs.

3.14 The Strategy should be subject to regular review, at least three yearly.

3.15 The management team has reviewed the report and supports the recommendations.

4 COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1 It is proposed that the Strategy is referred to the Boards, and we would be particularly interested in their feedback on the priority listing for the restoration of assets.

5 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1 As noted above the Strategy estimates recovery costs could be in the order of $210 million.

5.2 While Government contributions and insurance proceeds would reduce the net cost to the Council to about $32 million, if adequate insurance is not secured for whatever reason that cost may increase to $104 million. The Strategy recommends the maximum head-room provided in the LTP and within the Council’s borrowing policy should be $84 million, meaning a prioritisation exercise for the restoration would need to occur.

5.3 The comparable head-room provisions contained in the 2015-25 LTP were $32 million with insurance in place and $69 million if no insurance was available.

5.4 A major natural disaster will, no doubt, place considerable financial stress on the businesses and residents of the community, and the Council would need to consider the ability of the community to withstand higher rates to fund additional borrowing. Community consultation about the proposed approach would be required. The Strategy notes that to fund an additional $84 million of debt the additional annual debt servicing cost per rateable property would be about $250-$300 per annum, for a period of 25 years.

Impact on Key Borrowing Policy Limits.

5.5 The draft budget and LTP to be considered by the Council on 30 January has been prepared adopting the proposed borrowing ‘head-room’ limits contained in this report. The following graphs show how Council’s compliance with its relevant key policies once the revised head-room provision has been made.
There are a number of risks that need to be acknowledged, including that the estimates of damage and loss could be significantly different to those forecast; both better and worse. The timing of events and the cumulative effect of events is unknown. There are risks around the long-term...
provision of funding from government, insurances and lenders that create some risk, albeit they are relatively low at this stage.

5.7 Because the estimates of damage are based on our experience of what occurred following the 2010-11 earthquakes, it almost certain that the pattern of damage will be different to that, and therefore the estimates contained in the Strategy will be wrong to some extent. However, in acknowledging the uncertainty in the estimates, it is felt more prudent to make a provision than the alternative which is to make no provision for an event is going to certainly happen at some point in the future.

6 CONTEXT

6.1 This is a matter that should be considered as part of the Long Term Plan process.

6.2 The Council has prudent borrowing limits in place and is living within them at this stage. The Council will need to consider any head-room provided in light of those policies.

6.3 The decisions should be made by the Council.

Jim Palmer
Chief Executive
Risk Assessment and Financing Strategy relating to Major Natural Disasters

January 2018
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Executive Summary

The most significant natural hazard risk facing the District and the Council is from a rupture of the Alpine Fault. GNS estimate that there is a 30% chance of a rupture occurring within the next 50 years.

The damage from such an event is likely to be extensive. The scenario anticipated by this Strategy is that the effects will be worse than were experienced during the 2010-11 Canterbury Earthquake sequence.

Purpose of this Strategy

This Strategy gives systematic consideration to the likelihood and severity of major natural disasters and assesses how they could impact on the Council’s operations and its financial capacity and position.

This Strategy updates and refines the first assessment completed in 2014. The financial assessment has been updated to reflect both increases in replacement costs, and changes in infrastructure and resilience that have occurred over the past 3-4 years.

The Waimakariri District Council’s Long Term Plan (LTP) 2018-2028 will reflect its priorities for the next 10 years, and will include its 30 year infrastructure strategy.

Risk Assessment

Risk assessments have identified that a major earthquake, either an Alpine fault rupture or a major local earthquake, would generate the greatest damage to the Council’s assets. There is a 30% probability of 8.0 magnitude Alpine fault rupture occurring within the next 50 years (this probability remains unchanged from 2014). In the context of the Council’s LTP and infrastructure strategy it is very relevant.

Other natural disasters that could also cause significant damage are floods or a tsunami, although the level of damage to Council assets will not be as high as for a major earthquake. However, there is a probability that flooding could recur with greater frequency.

This Strategy has assessed the financial effects of major natural disasters based on an expected ‘worse-case’ scenario, which is a major earthquake.

Financial Headroom in the LTP

The Council’s 2015-25 LTP made a provision whereby it reflected a situation where the Council did not have insurance cover for an earthquake. It was estimated the Council needed to maintain ‘headroom’ in its borrowing policy of approximately $70 million.

This updated Strategy suggests this amount should be increased to $84 million for the 2018-2028 LTP.
Damage Assessment

The net book value of Council’s assets, including roads and parks and reserves, exceeds $1.65 billion (30 June 2017). The Council does not insure roads (valued at $880 million) and reserves. The insured value of Council assets is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Type</th>
<th>Insured Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building and Community facilities</td>
<td>$152 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Dwellings (mainly Elderly Persons Units)</td>
<td>$31 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above-ground Infrastructure (pump stations, well structures, ponds etc)</td>
<td>$154 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Ground Assets (mainly pipes)</td>
<td>$709 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Insured Value</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,051 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2010/2011 Canterbury earthquake series provided a very good insight into the damaging effects of earthquakes. The Council now has a very good understanding of how its assets will perform in a major earthquake event. The Council has, and will, spend about $139 million recovering from the 2010 and 2011 earthquakes.

Since 2010 the Council’s recovery spend has been invested into improving the resilience of its assets and strengthening buildings to higher standards. All Council facilities and buildings have been strengthened to greater than 67% of the New Building Standard, with many now at 100% of the Standard. This should place the Council in a better position when the next major earthquake occurs.

This Strategy considers that the potential damage to Council assets, along with the costs to recover from an earthquake to be about $210 million, compared to the 2014 assessment of $172 million. The increase is due to the increased replacement costs estimates (following the 2017 revaluation) and an increase in the assets under Council ownership.

Most damage is anticipated to occur in areas where soils are liquefiable which badly affect buried infrastructure, especially deep gravity sewer mains. Experience from 2010 showed these assets to be the most vulnerable in an earthquake.

Sources of Recovery Funding

The Council will rely on several funding sources to recover from a major earthquake; namely continuing Crown and NZTA funding support, as well as having prudent insurance arrangements in place. The Council will also incur a share of the cost.

Any Council share of the recovery costs would need to be funded by borrowing as the Council does not anticipate having any significant cash or investment assets available to realise and contribute to a recovery. Maintaining headroom in the Council’s borrowing, for the foreseeable future, is the only funding strategy available to it.

Accordingly, the Council needs to consider providing borrowing ‘head-room’ in its LTP to cater for an event. The desired outcome is that after the borrowing ‘headroom’ has been allowed for the Council will still live within its Treasury and Borrowing Policy limits.

The Council estimates that the damage to Council assets, along with the costs to recover from a major earthquake, to be about $210 million.

It is assumed that the current level of Government support for emergency response, contribution to below-ground infrastructure repair (currently 60%) and NZTA roading subsidy remains in place.
In total, this will fund about $106 million of the recovery costs, with $74 million recoverable from insurers and the Local Authority Protection Programme (LAPP, which funds the Council’s 40% share of below-ground infrastructure asset repair) leaving about $32 million to be funded by the Council itself.

The Council has considered the unlikely, but possible, scenario where because of another major natural disaster in the country, or insurance region, insurance cover may not be in place when a major event occurs that seriously impacts the District. Following the 2010 earthquakes the Council lost its earthquake insurance cover for two years; although it has now been reinstated.

In the event the District was impacted by a major earthquake, and insurance cover was not in place, the Council’s share of recovery costs could increase to about $104 million.

This Strategy recommends that not all the $104 million shortfall is accommodated within the LTP as it would probably constrain the Council’s and community’s priority spending initiatives to too great an extent. Rather this Strategy recommends that the Council considers providing borrowing ‘head-room’ of up to $84 million within its LTP.

With $84 million of borrowing ‘head-room’, and no insurance cover in place, it means the Council would need to undertake a prioritisation process. That would result in not all Council assets being replaced.

Funding would be available to restore fully all water, sewer, drainage and roading assets, but there would need to be a prioritisation process around the repair and restoration of community facilities, Council buildings and reserves within the District. This Strategy has developed a priority list for the restoration of services and assets that would help inform the Council’s reinvestment decisions. It would mean that the Council would restore the vast majority of its assets and all its highest priority community facilities, such as town halls, libraries and aquatic facilities, but that the repair of some lower priority assets would be subject to an assessment of the funds available, desired levels of service, and the District’s future needs.

A major natural disaster will, no doubt, place considerable financial stress on the businesses and residents of the community, and the Council would need to consider the ability of the community to withstand higher rates to fund additional borrowing. Community consultation about the proposed approach would be required. This Strategy notes that to fund an additional $84 million of debt the additional annual debt servicing cost per rateable property would be about $250-$300 per annum, for a period of 25 years.
1. **Introduction**

The Council’s 2018-28 LTP reflects its priorities for the next 10 years, as well as its 30 year infrastructure strategy.

As part of Council’s planning it needs to consider events that cannot be explicitly budgeted for, but could occur during the planning period. The major events that could directly impact on the well-being of the community and the viability of the Council are major natural disasters.

This Strategy gives systematic consideration of the probability and severity of major natural disasters and to assess how they could impact on the Council’s operations and its financial capacity and position.

In forming a view this Strategy has sought to:

- Identify the types of natural disaster that could have significant financial consequences for the District, either singly or cumulatively.
- Model the ‘worse case’ scenario and identify what the potential financial effect could be.
- Consider the mechanisms to fund the recovery from that event(s).
- Provide information to allow the Council to determine what financial accommodation or ‘head-room’ it needs in its projected borrowing programme to take account of the event(s).
- Identify the Council’s priorities for repairing and rebuilding its assets following a major natural disaster.
- Determine what further information and assessment is required to improve its understanding and preparedness to address the consequences of a major natural disaster(s).

The Council has sought to determine the possible cost of recovering from a major natural disaster. By doing so, the intention is not to budget for that loss, rather it is to understand the potential financial consequences that may arise and then consider how best to plan for that in terms the LTP.

While the financial implications have been modelled on the ‘worse case’ event, which is major earthquake, the financial accommodation or borrowing ‘head-room’ created could be applied to any event that the Council needs to respond to, not just a major earthquake.

The Council has used the following key information to help inform its assessment:

- The Canterbury Group Civil Defence Plan 2014 that reflects detailed risk assessments identifying major natural disaster risks for the Canterbury Region, including the Waimakariri District.
- GNS information about the likelihood and consequences of a major Alpine fault rupture.
- Updated Flood and Tsunami modelling undertaken for the District by Ecan and GNS in 2017.
- An earthquake assessment for the District prepared by GNS on behalf of ECan, and liquefaction mapping undertaken for the Region.
- The LAPP assessment of the maximum probable loss for the District, undertaken by Risk Management Partners, on LAPP’s behalf.
- Asset schedules prepared to support the 2017 insurance placement, reflecting up-to-date asset valuations and their replacement costs.
- Importantly, the knowledge and experience of Council staff gained from the major earthquake series that impacted Canterbury in 2010 and 2011, especially in regards to damage patterns in the District and response and recovery strategies developed since that time.
2. **Natural Hazards and Risks Assessment**

The Canterbury Civil Defence Group Plan (2014) has developed a risk profile for Canterbury. The Plan notes that while the process for developing the risk profile was thorough, comparison of events of very different natures is not straightforward, and the results will always be somewhat subjective.

Risk assessment involves consideration of two main factors — the nature of the hazard itself (scale and likelihood) and the opportunity the hazard has to impact on people, and to what degree.

There a number of threats to the District, the major ones being Natural Hazards, Those which consistently rank highest and therefore form the basis of this Strategy are Earthquake, Tsunami and Flood risk. Other events could however cause damage.

With this Strategy focus on the events that have the potential to cause the most damage and disruption, the Strategy should provide for the ‘worst case’ scenarios.

2.1. **Major Risk Events**

The Canterbury Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Plan highlights the events that are likely to cause the most damage and disruption are earthquake, tsunami and flood.

**Earthquake Risk**

The Canterbury region sits across the boundary of the Pacific Plate and the Australian Plate. A series of major faults across North Canterbury mark the plate boundary, and consequently the earthquake hazard in North Canterbury is high. As the 2010 and 2011 earthquakes have demonstrated, and more recently by the 2016 Hurunui-Kaikoura earthquake series, all of Canterbury can be affected by large earthquakes.

The Alpine Fault runs down the length of the South Island near the Central Divide. Experts believe there is a 30% chance that there could be a magnitude 8.0 earthquake on this fault in the next 50 years. This would result in very strong shaking in the region lasting for 2-5 minutes, and could be of similar strength to the 2010 Darfield earthquake. Large and ongoing aftershocks will follow.

Earthquake fault mapping undertaken by GNS in the Waimakariri District, commissioned by ECan, shows that there are 15 suspected or known active faults or folds at the ground surface in the Waimakariri District and the report suggests that events that break the ground surface could be capable of generating earthquakes of magnitude high sixes through to mid-high sevens. These could potentially have similar effects to the 2010 Darfield earthquake.

**Tsunami Risk**

The tsunami likely to generate the greatest risk to the Canterbury coast is a distant-source tsunami from South America. Near-source tsunamis such as from the Hikurangi subduction fault off the east coast of the North Island may also generate a tsunami; however, the effect of the near-source event is likely to less on the Waimakariri coast line.

While experts believe that waves of up to ten metres are possible, this is very unlikely. Modelling shows that the coastal communities of Kairaki and The Pines Beach, along with Waikuku Beach, could be

---

1 GNS Website: https://www.gns.cri.nz/Home/Learning/Science-Topics/Earthquakes/Major-Faults-in-New-Zealand/Alpine-Fault


3 ECan Tsunami Presentation December 2017 – Trim No: 171215136484
inundated with 2-3 metres of water. Modelling suggests that the effects of a tsunami would not be felt far inland, although there may be some impacts on the lower reaches of the Kaiapoi River.

The amount of land that could be inundated by such a tsunami depends on the time of tide that the tsunami wave arrives. For areas affected, a tsunami is unlikely to be very destructive and although there would be about 16 hours of warning for a far-source tsunami.

**Flood Risk**

Flood modelling for the District shows storm events that affect the plains and foothills will produce the largest storm events, and damage, for the District.

The event most likely to cause major damage is a one-in-two hundred or one-in-five hundred year event that could see the Ashley River breached that would cause significant flooding across the District. The location of the breach would influence the effects. A breach at the confluence of the Ashley and Okuku Rivers would see flood flow pass to the west of Rangiora and into Kaiapoi. Modelling shows that flood waters in some parts of Kaiapoi could be up to 2 metres deep.

Rainfall events that generate a river breakout scenario are also the same weather patterns that would see extensive localised flooding. Accordingly, any river break-out would impact an already sodden and flooded District compounding the effects on communities.

With climate change occurring and with the probability of more frequent and heavier rainfall events, it is possible that the District could feel the effects of many smaller flood events that are still significant in the intervening periods.

**2.2. Conclusion**

The event that is most likely going to cause the greatest level of damage to the District and to the Council’s assets is a major earthquake. This conclusion is also supported by the risk assessment undertaken by Risk Management Partners on behalf of the Local Authority Protection Programme in March 2014 (Trim Ref: 140617063706).

There will be other ongoing events, such as floods, that have a smaller affect, but are frequent. While such events are likely to cause significant disruption they are unlikely to challenge the overall financial viability of the Council. Rather, they become matters that can be absorbed into the overall financial planning of the Council as any one event is unlikely to cause major financial hardship to the Council.

The Risk Assessment and Financial Strategy should estimate the financial effects of major natural disaster based on a worse-case scenario, which is a major earthquake. However, any financial provision or borrowing ‘head-room’ created would then be available to help manage the effects of any natural disaster(s) that may occur during the planning period.
3. Impact on Community and Council

Major natural disasters have significant impacts on communities, in terms of financial loss, but also in terms of the loss of community well-being and the stress that it places on residents in the months and years that follow an event(s).

While it is valid to acknowledge other forms of ‘loss’, for the purposes of this Strategy it is necessary to constrain our assessment to the financial consequences for the Council.

We do not have an estimate of what the Maximum Probable Loss would be for the Council (other than for below-ground assets) if a major earthquake occurred. However, we do have some recent history that provides a very good indication of the types and level of damage that the Council can expect to see and the basis on which to make a preliminary estimate.

While the cost to the Waimakariri community has not been calculated from the 2010 and 2011 earthquakes, the following table summarises the costs the Council expects to incur arising from the earthquakes and identifies the various funding sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Projected spend $M</th>
<th>Gov’t/NZTA $M</th>
<th>Insurance/LAPP $M</th>
<th>Council $M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Waters</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roading</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Recovery</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regeneration</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>139</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above estimate includes work that flowed from Council decisions to strengthen and upgrade a number of community facilities as part of the repair programme. In particular, the Council has invested $12 million into a new Kaiapoi Library, $10.7 million to earthquake strengthening and extending the Rangiora Town Hall and $3 million into strengthening the Oxford Town Hall. In addition to that the Kaiapoi Aquatic Centre has been rebuilt from the ground up. These decisions have increased the Council spend over what otherwise would be the case and that investment should future-proof those assets. The above expenditure also reflects the $20 million being committed to the Regeneration of Red Zone areas.

Had the Council not made those decisions the Council’s share of the net cost of the recovery would have been about $40 million less than that shown above.
4. Condition of Council’s Assets including Infrastructure

The net book value of Council’s assets, including roads and parks and reserves, exceeds $1.65 billion (30 June 2017). The Council does not insure roads (valued at $880 million) and reserves. The insured value of Council assets is as follows:

- Building and Community facilities: $152 million
- Residential Dwellings (mainly Elderly Persons Units): $31 million
- Above-ground Infrastructure (pump stations, well structures, ponds etc): $154 million
- Below Ground Assets (mainly pipes): $709 million
- Total Insured Value: $1,051 million

Of the Council’s major fixed and infrastructure assets, many have been recently built, rebuilt, or have or will be strengthened by the end of 2015 to above 67% of the New Building Standard (NBS), and are therefore likely to withstand a major earthquake and be operational within a very short time thereafter. In addition to this, every other community facility the Council owns has or will be strengthened to in excess of 67% of the NBS.

4.1. Assessment Community Facilities and Council Buildings

The Council has community facilities and Council buildings valued for insurance purposes at 30 June 2017, at about $152 million replacement cost. The major facilities are noted below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building/Structure</th>
<th>Estimated Replacement Value ($millions)</th>
<th>Performance relative to New Building Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Library (new)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Town Hall (strengthened and new)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>67%+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Town Hall (strengthened and new)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67%+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Aquatic Centre (rebuilt)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley Park Aquatic Centre (new)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Library (strengthened)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>67%+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Service Centre (strengthened)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>67%+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Service Centre (new)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67%+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2. Assessment of Above-Ground Infrastructure – recent new builds/upgrades

The insurance replacement sum for above-ground infrastructure totals $154 million (2017 insurance valuation). A lot of the infrastructure has been built in the last 10-15 years. Below is a list of more significant infrastructure that is likely to withstand an earthquake with a limited amount of damage. Other infrastructure tends to be spread around the District with pump stations scattered across towns, thereby reducing the concentration of risk. Where pump stations are built in more liquefaction prone areas foundations are more substantial than was previously the case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building/Structure</th>
<th>Estimated Replacement Value ($millions)</th>
<th>Performance relative to New Building Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Water headworks</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Outfall – Pumping Stations/Structures and ocean outfall pipeline</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Sewer headworks/STP</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Sewer headworks/STP</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Water headworks</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Water headworks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Sewage treatment plant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67%+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Water headworks</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67%+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Sewer headworks</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>67%+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Stormwater headworks/ponds</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67%+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Stormwater headworks/ponds</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>67%+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Council is also built the new Ashley Cones Bridge worth $12 million which is an important transport link and is built to the latest earthquake standards.

4.3. Likely Impact on Continuing Use of Council Buildings and Above-Ground Assets

It is likely that all of the assets listed in the tables above, all of which are important to the functioning of the Council and its community, would remain in service and/or become functional relatively quickly after an event and at a relatively low cost.

All major or critical Council buildings and above-ground assets have been built or strengthened to a standard of at least 67% of NBS. However, the following key bridges present some risk:

- Waimakariri Gorge Bridge (old single lane bridge that connects the western part of the District to the Selwyn District, subject to some seismic analysis when the deck was recently replaced – co-owned with Selwyn District Council)
- Old Waimakariri River Bridge (old two lane bridge adjacent to the Motorway Bridge, although it was partially strengthened following the 2010 earthquake – co-owned with Christchurch City Council)
- Williams Street Bridge, Kaiapoi – (the structure is old but performed well in the 2010 earthquakes albeit the approaches were damaged).

Of these three bridges, the Williams Street Bridge is the one that would cause the most long term disruption if it was seriously damaged, and unusable, following an earthquake. Given its performance in the 2010 event, it is likely to be an event greater than the 2010 event to cause serious damage to the structure (damage to the approaches was repaired to allow access within days of the 2010 event). The loss of the other two major bridges in the District would be very inconvenient, but would result in less overall disruption as the Motorway Bridge is adjacent to the Old Waimakariri Bridge and the Waimakariri Gorge Bridge has lower volumes of traffic over it; however it will be a long detour for those who use it regularly.
5. Estimate of Damage to Council Assets

5.1. Estimate of Damage to Buildings and Above-Ground Infrastructure

The Council has not undertaken a formal assessment of the Maximum Probable Loss related to its buildings and above-ground infrastructure as a result of major earthquake, but given the significant strengthening, rebuild and new structures (which are all of the Council’s critical structures) it is possible they may escape major damage in a future event. For the purposes of identifying an estimate of loss it may be prudent to anticipate $0.5 million of damage to every major/critical building and perhaps one total loss of a major/critical building of say $15 million, plus cumulatively another $5-10 million of damage to other Council buildings and above ground infrastructure assets, such as water headworks and well damage.

Based on these assumptions, there could be up to $30 million worth of building and above-ground infrastructure damage in a major event. This compares to an insurance claim of $18 million ($12 million for community facilities damaged and $6 million of above-ground infrastructure) as a result of the 2010 earthquake. It is noted that most of the damage to buildings in 2010 were to those not earthquake strengthened or sited on liquefiable soils.

Current earthquake insurance cover of $152 million is well in excess of this level of potential damage, meaning in the ordinary course of business, there is little residual risk for the Council in respect of above-ground buildings and structures. There may be an opportunity to review the future level of earthquake cover needed once a better assessment of the maximum probable loss is known.

If we lost insurance cover for whatever reason, then there would be an exposure to the Council while it waited for insurance cover to be reinstated. The most likely scenario where cover could be lost is if there was a major natural disaster event elsewhere in the country/insurance region that resulted in insurance market withdrawal of cover, or cover being so expensive it was prohibitive. Following the 2010 earthquake series the Council lost earthquake cover for 2-3 years. It is not inconceivable that cover could be lost for a period of up to ten years, or longer. If a major Wellington fault event occurred in the near-term that could be such a trigger.

It would be prudent to allow some headroom in the Council’s borrowing to provide for this remote contingency – say 50% of the ‘guestimated’ assessed loss of $30M, ie $15M. This would be a very conservative position, and if it transpired there would need to be some form of prioritisation of the rebuild, and some revision of the level of service the Council could afford to provide the community.

5.2. Estimate of Damage to Below-Ground Infrastructure

Damage to below-ground infrastructure is likely to be the greatest as result of a major earthquake and it should be that scenario that generates the Maximum Probable Loss estimate for the District.

LAPP’s Estimate

The Local Authority Protection Programme (LAPP) commissions Risk Management Partners Pty Limited to undertake a Risk Profile of each council to help them identify major natural hazard exposures to their below-ground infrastructure covered by the LAPP Fund and to estimate potential financial loss/exposure. (Trim Ref: 140617063706).

The last assessment completed by Risk Management Partners Pty Limited was in March 2014 and Council’s asset value covered by the LAPP Fund was $375.3 million (note: that LAPP cover in 2017 has increased to $709 million).
Risk Management Partners Pty Limited had assessed the Council’s expected losses from the major scenarios to be as follows:

- Earthquake with a 1-in-1000 year return period $27.64 million
- Flood with a 1-in-500 year return period $8.04 million
- Tsunami estimated as the same loss as a flood $8.04 million

The assessment does state that should there be a major regional event the losses could be significantly higher because:

- The loss estimates do not take into account additional costs such as emergency repairs and cost increases due to ‘demand surge’.
- Actual damage may be higher especially in liquefaction prone land
- Some undervaluation of assets and the costs required to replace them.

A More Conservative Assessment

In the 2010 and 2011 earthquakes the damage to below-ground infrastructure is estimated to cost $40 million to restore, of which 60% was funded from the Crown, which leaves 40% or $16 million to be funded by the Council’s insurer (LAPP) and the Council. LAPP contributed about $16 million to the loss.

From the 2010 earthquake series it is clear that below-ground infrastructure laid in liquefaction prone soils performed poorly. It is likely that a major earthquake will cause widespread liquefaction and damage to below-ground assets in those areas, with gravity sewer systems being worst affected, followed by stormwater and water systems. Waters systems made from more ductile materials have withstood the earthquakes well with relatively little damage even in liquefiable soils.

Following the 2010 earthquakes some of the most prone areas have been “Red Zoned” and rebuilding will not occur in those areas. As a result, while some infrastructure may traverse some Red Zoned areas, infrastructure will not be required to anywhere near the same extent as previously was the case in those areas.

It is reasonable to assume that the liquefiable soils in the east of the District will be the source of the greatest loss for below-ground assets in a future event. It is not inconceivable that a major Alpine fault rupture generates 2-5 minutes of intense shaking generating liquefaction and that could potentially result in a lot of the underground assets in Kaiapoi, Woodend and Pegasus being seriously compromised. This would also extend to the beach communities.

GNS4 has prepared a liquefaction map for the Region identifying potentially liquefiable land –see Attachment 3. Within the District it identifies land in the eastern part of the District, extending west almost as far as Rangiora, as potentially liquefiable. Below is an assessment of the cost of damage if the eastern part of the District was subject to significant liquefaction. The scenario and assumptions adopted regarding the level of damage reflect our experiences in 2010, but anticipating more damage than was experienced in 2010, as follows:

- 50% of sewers are damaged needing replacement
- 20% of water mains need replacement
- 25% of stormwater pipes need replacement

---

4Review of liquefaction hazard information in Eastern Canterbury including Christchurch city and parts of Selwyn Waimakariri Hurunui districts report : (Trim No 130214010865)
The values used are the replacement costs used for the 2017 Asset Revaluation.

### Asset Replacement Values and Damage Estimates for Below-Ground Infrastructure in Liquefiable Areas
(based on 2017 Asset Revaluation: Trim Ref: 170904095154)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset /Location</th>
<th>Kaiapoi</th>
<th>Woodend</th>
<th>Pegasus</th>
<th>Waikuku Beach</th>
<th>Woodend Beach</th>
<th>Pines/Kairaki</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sewer - value</td>
<td>$81 $M</td>
<td>$17 $M</td>
<td>$29 $M</td>
<td>$8 $M</td>
<td>$2 $M</td>
<td>$2 $M</td>
<td>$139 $M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50% damage)</td>
<td>(40) $M</td>
<td>(9) $M</td>
<td>(16) $M</td>
<td>(4.5) $M</td>
<td>(1) $M</td>
<td>(1) $M</td>
<td>(71.5) $M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water - value</td>
<td>$32 $M</td>
<td>$8 $M</td>
<td>$15 $M</td>
<td>$3 N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0 N/A</td>
<td>58 $M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20% damage)</td>
<td>(6) $M</td>
<td>(2) $M</td>
<td>(3) $M</td>
<td>(0.6) N/A</td>
<td>(0) N/A</td>
<td>(0) N/A</td>
<td>(11.6) $M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater - value</td>
<td>$32 $M</td>
<td>$8 $M</td>
<td>$6 $M</td>
<td>$0 $M</td>
<td>$0 $M</td>
<td>$0 $M</td>
<td>46 $M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25% damage)</td>
<td>(8) $M</td>
<td>(2) $M</td>
<td>(1.5) $M</td>
<td>(0) $M</td>
<td>(0) $M</td>
<td>(0) $M</td>
<td>(11.5) $M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>145 $M</strong></td>
<td><strong>33 $M</strong></td>
<td><strong>50 $M</strong></td>
<td><strong>11 $M</strong></td>
<td><strong>2 $M</strong></td>
<td><strong>2 $M</strong></td>
<td><strong>243 $M</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, for the purposes of modelling a worse-case scenario, it is reasonable to assume the loss could be in the order of $95 million for damage to below-ground assets in liquefiable parts of the District.

Pipes laid in alluvial gravels performed very well in the 2010 earthquakes with a relatively small amount of damage incurred (in the order of $2-3 million). Selwyn District Council and Christchurch City Council experienced the same impacts with relatively little damage where pipes lay in alluvial gravels.

Most of the damage to pipes in alluvial gravels was joint damage caused by violent shaking. If an Alpine fault generated shaking for 2-5 minutes it is unknown how much worse the damage would be. However,
it is reasonable to assume that it would not be that significant – possibly not more than $10 million of damage in a very bad event.

5.3. Funding of Below-Ground Infrastructure Damage

To fund $105 million of repair costs ($95 million in liquefiable areas and $10 million in non-liquefiable areas), the Crown's current commitment is to contribute 60% or $63 million. This compares with the current damage estimates for the 2010 and 2011 earthquakes of about $40 million with the Government share being $24 million.

LAPP’s estimate of Maximum Probable Loss of $27.6 million looks to be too low based on experiences in 2010 and 2011.

For the purposes of this Strategy it is assumed the Crown’s funding arrangements will remain in place. Note, following a review of the sector’s insurance arrangements, which is currently underway, this may alter. However, it is reasonable to assume the Crown would still have a role to play in funding future infrastructure recovery.

Based on the assessment above, Government would provide $63 million of funding and the Council’s share of cost would be $42 million, which would be covered by insurance. In the worst case, and insurance cover is not available, the Council would need to fund the $42 million.

In the event the Council has to fund the entire share, it should adopt a conservative approach to ensure there is sufficient head-room left in its borrowings to provide for this.

5.4. Damage to Roading Infrastructure

Most damage in 2010 again occurred where soils liquefied. Very little damage occurred in other areas. For the 2010 earthquakes the estimated cost to repair Council roads is approximately $19 million, of which New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) will fund $11 million leaving $8 million as the Council share. This excludes those Red Zone roads that have been largely decommissioned and therefore not repaired.

It is reasonable to assume that in future major events the damage pattern could be similar. For the purpose of this Strategy it is assumed that shaking of 2-5 minutes from an Alpine rupture will result in more liquefaction than occurred in 2010, and therefore more roads would be damaged. For the purposes of this Strategy it is assumed that double the 2010 damage could occur, or about $40 million.

NZTA indicates for emergency events over a certain threshold should be funded at 20% over the normal Financial Assistance Rate (FAR) and that in major events further specific funding arrangements could be made. Where repair occurs over several years, the Council’s current experience is that the agreed FAR is not as high as it would be case if repair occurred all in one year.

For modelling purposes it is assumed that 70% of the repair cost will be funded from NZTA, meaning the Council’s share is about $12 million. This would need to be loan funded.

5.5. Damage to Recreation Reserves

Reserves, improvements to reserves, and playgrounds were damaged in the 2010 earthquakes. Again damage was predominantly confined to liquefiable areas, and it is reasonable to assume this could be the case again in a major event. In Kaiapoi assets along the Kaiapoi River, near the town centre, will be particularly exposed to risk, as would reserves in Pegasus and the beach communities, and to a lesser extent Woodend.
It is reasonable to assume that the damage could be up to $10 million to replace assets and renovate damaged reserves and sports grounds. This type of damage is not subject to insurance and it would fall on the Council to fund it.

Some prioritisation of restoration funding may be required. If there is no insurance available for other insured assets, potentially only half of the restoration costs should be accounted for in any borrowing head-room - ie $5 million.

5.6. Emergency Repairs

Prior to any major repairs occurring there will be a period of emergency repair works that will be ongoing for 1-2 years after a major earthquake, and possibly longer with subsequent aftershocks.

In 2010 significant funds were spent getting all infrastructure services operational and maintaining them at a level that provided a basic/adequate level of temporary service. Temporarily fixing broken sewers and other reticulation systems and then keeping them functional is very expensive, and ultimately most of this work has no long term value when replacement occurs. But it is essential to carry out this work to enable members of our community to remain in their homes.

While it is hard to estimate the temporary repair costs from the 2010/2011 earthquakes, it ran to somewhere between $7-10 million. Most of the funding for this was provided by the Government through Civil Defence grants; some of which were funded at 100% and then ongoing repairs at 60%.

It is not unreasonable to imagine in a future major event that these costs could be in the order of $20 million, assuming $15 million funded by the Government and the Council bearing the rest.

5.7. Other Community Support

The Council’s experience in the 2010 earthquakes was that the community looked to the Council to provide support to the community in terms of social recovery, but also assisting with restoration of non-council owned community assets, hosting community meetings, supporting individuals and businesses, as well as providing rates relief.

While Government support was provided in 2010, it is not unreasonable for the Council to anticipate up to $5 million of its funding will also be needed to support the community.

6. Summary of Estimated Losses and Funding Sources

Council Funding Position with Full Crown and Insurance/LAPP Support

(Note: this assumes no betterment in the repair or change in level of service as a result of the event)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated Reinstatement Cost $M</th>
<th>Crown/NZTA funding $M</th>
<th>Insurance/LAPP funding $M</th>
<th>Council Share $M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above-ground Infrastructure and Buildings</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below-ground Infrastructure</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roading</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1. Funding Position Assuming No Insurance and LAPP support

In the event that, for whatever reason, insurance and LAPP support was not available, the Council would, based on the scenario presented above, need to fund $104 million for its share ($72m insurance/LAPP and $32 million Council share).

If that were the case the Council would likely prioritise which services and assets should be restored. As per the list contained in Section 9, the Council would most likely apply available funds to assets that have the highest priority (ie water, sewerage, drainage and roads). The reinstatement of community facilities and reserves has a lower priority.

Providing borrowing ‘head-room’ for the full $104 million may be a too conservative position, given the low probability of insurance not being in place. If the full amount of ‘head-room’ was provided for it would reduce the Council’s ability to undertake other projects within the community that may be of equal, or greater, value compared to the restoration of all existing services and assets.

It is suggested for Community Facilities, Council Buildings and Reserves that only 50% of the estimated loss for these assets be factored into any borrowing-headroom provided, or $20 million (ie respectively 50% of $30 million and $10 million, as noted in the earlier loss estimates).

Accordingly, it is suggested that $84 million borrowing ‘head-room’ is reserved, in the event that insurance is not available, and that would be sufficient to provide for the full restoration of infrastructure services and 50% of estimated repair costs for community facilities, buildings and reserves. This is represented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated Reinstatement Cost</th>
<th>Crown/NZTA funding</th>
<th>Insurance/ LAPP funding</th>
<th>Council Share</th>
<th>Possible Head-room required in the Long Term Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M</td>
<td>$M</td>
<td>$M</td>
<td>$M</td>
<td>$M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above-ground Infrastructure and Buildings</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below-ground Infrastructure</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roading</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Response/repairs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Financing Options

Mechanisms to fund major natural disasters rely on several sources. This Strategy must make some assumptions about the sources of funding that could be available to fund disaster recovery.

The following assumptions have been formed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Extent of Reliance</th>
<th>Comment/Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-event cash reserves</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Councils in high growth areas typically are in net-debt position and Waimakariri is no exception. The funding required to support growth means the Council will be in ‘net debt’ position, with its cash management strategy being to utilise any share cash to reduce external debt levels. Accordingly, the Council should not plan to rely on any accumulated cash reserves being available, at least, in the next 10 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown/NZTA Funding</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Unless there is a major change in Government sentiment, it is reasonable to assume that Crown and NZTA funding will be available in the event of a disaster. The strategy will need adjusting should any change be signalled in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>Moderate – High</td>
<td>The Council currently has insurance cover adequate to recover from a major event and, provided that support remains in place, this will enable the Council to fully restore current levels of service. There is a risk, such as that followed the 2010 earthquakes that insurance cover could be withdrawn. Should that occur the Council is at some risk. Some account of that risk should be considered in any long-term borrowing strategy by providing additional borrowing head-room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of Disposable Assets</td>
<td>Nil-Low</td>
<td>The Council has very few investment assets, including a small forestry holding. In total investment assets are currently valued at about $5 million, so it will not make a significant contribution to funding the recovery, should they be able to be realised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Debt</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>For any obligations outstanding that must be met by the Council, it will need to raise debt to fund its share. The Council is a shareholder in the Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA) and this has provided a very reliable source of debt funding for the Council. In the event of a disaster we anticipate that funding source to remain in place. For whatever reason that was not the case, then Council would need to seriously reprioritise recovery spending, seek alternative market support, and look for further Government/Crown intervention.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To fund the Council’s share of the cost of recovering from a major natural disaster, with or without insurance/LAPP support, it will almost certainly be via borrowing.
In making decisions around securing funding the Council would need to consider the certainty associated with securing that funding from the LGFA, the markets, or the Crown as a last resort. It would also need to take account of any expected terms of borrowing, especially the applicable interest rates, repayment terms and security.

Another key factor that would need serious consideration is the ability of a community to meet additional borrowing costs. A major natural disaster will, no doubt, place considerable financial stress on the businesses and residents of the community and the Council would need to consider the ability of the community to withstand a higher rate impost to fund the additional borrowing. Community consultation about the proposed approach would be required. It is noted that to fund an additional $84 million of debt that would translate into an annual debt servicing cost of about $250-$300 per rateable property, per annum for a period of 25 years (based on approximately 24,000 ratepayers). The actual rate impact would depend on a number of things including; the Council’s restoration priorities, the number of ratepayers, the level of borrowing required, how borrowing would impact Council’s treasury policy limits, and lender’s risk appetite which flows through into lending terms and conditions.
8. **Conclusions on Council’s Financing Strategy**

Essentially, the only viable option for the Council to fund its share of recovering from a major natural disaster is through maintaining ‘head-room’ in its borrowing policy.

From the analysis conducted, the Council’s net share of funding required to recover from a major earthquake event is about $32 million, if full insurance cover is available.

If, for whatever reason, insurance is not available the unfunded damage would be about $104 million. For insurance not to be available in any viable form would be the result of an unlikely, but not impossible, set of circumstances.

To protect the Council and community against that rare set of circumstances and fully provide for borrowing ‘head-room’ within the Long Term Plan of $104 million it may be a too conservative position to hold, and thereby unreasonably constrain the Council to too great an extent.

Providing $84 million borrowing ‘head-room’ would allow the Council to continue delivering its critical functions enabling the Council to fully restore all roads and critical infrastructure and then allow it to reinstate the vast majority of community facilities and reserves, but there may need to be some decisions made about the priority of any rebuild spend. The Council should engage the community about the funding options facing the community and its view on spending priorities. This is outlined further in Section 9 of this Strategy.

If $84 million capacity is provided within its future borrowing limits, the Council would need to consider how this impacted its overall Long Term Plan in terms of what it can afford and whether the full provision of $84 million can be accommodated within its borrowing plan.

Accordingly, the Council should retain ‘head-room’ within its Long Term Plan and should consider providing up to $84 million of borrowing ‘head-room’.
9. Priorities for Council Spending and Restoration of Council Assets

In the event the Council does not have sufficient funds to fully restore its assets and current levels of service, it will need to prioritise its investment of available funds. This may mean, in some circumstances, not all assets would be replaced as they may not align with future needs, or there are insufficient funds for their replacement.

The priority for the restoration, repair, or rebuild of Council assets would be in the following priority order:

**Top Level Priorities**

1. Water supplies to all communities
2. Sewer systems for Council reticulated systems
2. Major drainage trunk mains and pump stations
2. Strategic, Arterial and Collector Roads, including bridges on those routes
5. Rangiora airfield (for emergency response/recovery purposes)
6. Southbrook Refuse Transfer Station
7. Other local roads, including footpaths
8. Other drainage networks
9. Rangiora Service Centre
10. Rangiora and/or Kaiapoi Library (in the event one was severely damaged)
11. Dudley Park and/or Kaiapoi Aquatic Centre (in the event one was severely damaged)
12. Rangiora Town Hall
13. Oxford Town Hall
14. Oxford Service Centre and Library

**Lower Level Priorities (all, subject to funding availability and future need assessment)**

15. Public toilets
16. Major children’s playgrounds
17. Main sports grounds turf renovation
18. Other community facilities
19. Other reserves, sports grounds and playgrounds
20. Walkways and passive recreational areas
10. Future Actions and Risk Mitigation Strategies

This Strategy raises some issues that require further investigation and consideration to improve the Council’s understanding of its risks, feasible risk reduction strategies, and its possible financing options. The following actions are suggested to be undertaken over the next three years:

- Gaining a better understanding of the Maximum Probable Losses for Council Buildings and Above-Ground assets, as well as Below-Ground assets.

- Determining whether the level of Natural Disaster insurance cover is appropriate, especially that provided under the Material Damage policy.

- Continuing to review Long Term Plans to determine whether sufficient ‘head-room’ is available to cover the Council’s share of any loss.

- Determining whether any further detailed engineering assessment is required of any other critical infrastructure assets and, in particular, determining whether there should be any further strengthening work undertaken on three major bridges in the District that have not been subject to any major earthquake strengthening work.

- Continuing to apply resilient technologies when new and replacement infrastructure is installed.

- Continuing to engage the community about restoration priorities within the community in the event funding is not available to meet the full restoration of Council services.

- Engaging with the LGFA about it preparedness to provide funding support in the event of a major natural disaster, seeking clarity about the availability of funding and any terms and conditions that may be associated with that support. Engagement with other funders and/or the Crown (possibly on a sector-wide basis) may need to follow those discussions.
Attachment 1 - GNS Assessment of Liquefaction Prone Land

(From Review of liquefaction hazard information in Eastern Canterbury including Christchurch city and parts of Selwyn Waimakariri Hurunui districts report): (Trim No 130214010865)
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval of the Draft Revenue and Financing Policy (R&F Policy) that would be used as a basis of preparing the Draft Long Term Plan (LTP) 2018-2028.

1.2. This report also provides the Funding Impact Statement that will be included into the LTP.

1.3. From the Audit Committee workshop in July and September, the R&F Policy is referred for decision to the Council for approval.

1.4. There are no fundamental changes to the principles of the policy. The main amendments to the R&F Policy are:

1.4.1. Removal of the discounted rates for multiple pans. The discount is being applied through the addition of a rate remission policy;

1.4.2. Clarifying the rates being set based on being both a fixed charge and rate on capital value. E.g. Boards and Water rates;

1.4.3. Community outcomes have been changed to reflect Council decisions;

1.4.4. Some minor word edits e.g. “set as, instead of charged”, changing the word “ward” to “board” to reflect the changes made during the last election.

1.4.5. The Funding Impact Statement has been reformatted with additional clarifications made to the rate type, an additional rate type added for Barkers Road seal extension, previously approved by Council and removal of Rural Fire.

1.4.6. The requested change to kerbside recycling rates for motels has been made.

1.5. The changes being proposed to the draft R&F Policy are not significant or fundamental policy changes to the Policy.

Attachments:

(i) Draft Revenue & Financing Policy (Attachment 1)
(ii) Draft Funding Impact Statement (Attachment 2)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 180110001745
(b) Approves the Draft Revenue & Financing Policy as the basis for preparing the Draft 2018/28 Long Term Plan, and

(c) Approves the Draft Funding Impact Statement as the basis for preparing the Draft 2018/28 Long Term Plan, and

(d) Notes that the UAGC is recommended to be $120 in the Draft 2018/28 Long Term Plan and Impact Funding Statement, the same as in 2017/18 for the 2018/19 financial year.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

Background

3.1 The Council’s current Revenue and Financing Policy was reviewed through two workshops by the Audit Committee in July and September last year. There were no fundamental changes to the Policy. There are a number of other minor changes that have been included into the draft Revenue and Financing Policy as a result of other decisions made by Council throughout the past year. The changes being proposed to the R&F Policy and the remission policies are not significant and/or fundamental policy changes to the Policy.

3.2 This current policy for approval that will be incorporated into the 2018-28 Draft Long Term Plan are summarised as follows:

3.2.1 Removal of the discounted rates for multiple pans. The discount is being applied through the addition of a rate remission policy. The Funding Impact Statement and policies were reviewed by Simpson Grierson who are renowned for their advice and experience of the Local Government Rating Act. The recommendation by Simpson Grierson was treat all Sewer discounts as a remission, rather than a direct discount. The Policy has been amended and the treatment has been reflected within the R&F Policy & Funding Impact Statement;

3.2.2 Clarifying the rates being set based on being both a fixed charge and rate on property value. This is a minor amendment that clarifies that where there is a rate such as a Drainage or Board rate that is charged by both charging bases and has been clarified in the Policy.

3.2.3 Community outcomes have been changed to reflect Council decisions. The Council have previously reviewed the Community Outcomes and these have been incorporated into the R&F Policy;

3.2.4 Some minor word edits e.g. “set as, instead of charged”, changing the word “ward” to “board” to reflect the changes made during the last election. These have been to better reflect or correct past terminology and provide better consistency.

3.2.5 The Funding Impact Statement has been reformatted with additional clarifications made to the rate type.

3.2.6 An additional rate has been incorporated for the sealing extension of Barkers Road. This was approved by the Council in 2017 and will be charged from 1 July 2018.

3.2.7 Removal of Rural Fire. Rural Fire is no longer an activity that is a legislative function of the council and transferred to Fire & Emergency New Zealand from the July 2017. This has been removed from the R & F policy.

3.3 The Rating policies, including the Remission and Postponement Policy were reviewed by the Audit Committee and approved by Council in December 2017 and these changes have been reflected into the R&F Policy and Funding Impact Statement.
3.4 Drainage and Protection

One of the outcomes of the 3 Waters review undertaken by a working party in 2017, was to include $150,000, equivalent to $6/property for drainage works that occur outside of drainage rating areas/schemes. This work has been included and funded through the General rate.

3.5 Uniform Annual General Charge (UAGC)

No change is recommended to the UAGC. The calculation as provided within the Policy returns a value of $119.92. The current charge that was increased by $10 in the 2017/18 year is $120.

3.6 Rates Rebate (Retirement Village Residents) Amendment Bill – Rate Rebate (Retirement Village Residents) Amendment Act 2016

Previously through Submissions to the LTP and Annual Plan, Northbrook Villas (NBV) requesting rates relief/changes to the rating policy. The rates rebate scheme was introduced in 1973 to allow the ratepayers of residential properties who are on low incomes to receive a rebate on their rates. This scheme was legislated before the expansion of retirement villages and occupation agreements (ORAs). Residents of these ORAs pay rates but, in a lot of circumstances pay indirectly (i.e. to the retirement village owner or other entity) rather than directly to the local authority. Under the Rates Rebate Act 1973, these residents are not entitled to a rates rebate. The Bill addresses the anomaly and would allow rebates to ORAs to occur. The Council would be able to provide the Rates rebate and receive Government reimbursement. It is likely that this Bill, if enacted, would take effect from 1 July 2018.

3.7 Options

3.7.1 The Council has a number of options. It could

∑ Approve the recommended changes to the Policies; or
∑ Resolve to add, change or modify any of the content and/or recommendations proposed in the report and/or draft policies (to significantly change from the original Proposal may require a special consultative procedure); or
∑ Resolve to retain the status quo (current Policy), however this may mean the policy would become outdated and ineffective R & F policy for financing and rating and could increase the likelihood of a successful challenge to the Council’s rates.

3.8 The Management team/Chief Executive have reviewed this report.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. The Revenue and Financing Policy will be included in the draft 2018-28 LTP and will be referred to within the Consultation Document.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. The changes made to the Draft Policies as proposed will not have a significant effect on rates.

5.2. The Rates Resolution and Funding Impact Statement have been reviewed by Simpson Grierson.

6. CONTEXT

6.1 The matters contained in the report are not significant in terms of the Significance Policy of Council.
6.2 The Audit Committee have the delegated authority from Council to review and recommend the Policy to Council for approval.

6.3 “There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision-making by public organisations that affect our District. Public organisations make information about their plans and activities readily available”. The R & F Policy has been amended to include the Community Outcomes that were amended in 2017.


Jeff Millward
Manager, Finance & Business Support

Maree Harris
Customer Services Manager
Revenue and Financing Policy

1. Introduction
This Revenue and Financing Policy summarises the funding of activities undertaken by the Council with a view to achieve the fairest funding mix for the community as a whole.

The overall objective is:
To ensure users and beneficiaries of Council services pay what is fair and equitable.

The Council’s goal is that a consistent approach is used when considering the rating mechanisms that apply to funding each activity. Accordingly, the Council applied the following guiding principles:

- Services relating to a property, such as Sewer and Water, are set and assessed per rating unit, separately used or inhabited part (SU/UP) of a rating unit, per unit of water supplied or as a fixed charge per water closet or urinal
- Services that relate more to community or have an impact on the value of property, such as District Planning, are rated for on capital value
- Services that relate more to individuals, such as recreation activities, are set and assessed per rating unit or SU/UP taking into account the use to which the land is put
- Services that benefit land, such as land drainage, are set on land value or land area.

Rates provide the budgeted net funding requirement of the Council’s works programme published in the Long Term Plan after allowing for revenue from other sources such as fees, user charges and subsidies. Rates are set and assessed on each rating unit under the statutory provisions of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002.

2. Policy Context
Requirements of the Local Government Act 2002. Sections 102 and 103 of the Local Government Act 2002 require that a local authority have a revenue and financing policy demonstrating how operational expenditure and capital expenditure are funded or financed from

- general rates (including choice of valuation system, differential rating, uniform annual general charges)
- targeted rates
- lump sum contributions
- fees and charges
- interest and dividends from investments
- borrowing
- proceeds from asset sales
- development contributions
- financial contributions
- grants and subsidies
- other sources of revenue.

Section 101(3)(a) of the Local Government Act 2002 further requires that a local authority has, for each activity funded, shown it has given consideration to the

- community outcomes to which the activity contributes
- distribution of benefits between the community as a whole, any identifiable part of the community and individuals
- the period in or over which those benefits are expected to occur
- the extent to which the actions or inaction of particular individuals or a group contribute to the need to undertake the activity
- the costs and benefits, including the transparency and accountability, of funding the activity distinctly from other activities.

Section 101(3)(b) of the Local Government Act 2002 also requires that the Council consider the overall impact of any allocation of liability for revenue needs on the community. These matters are considered for each significant activity.
3. Policy Statement

**General Rate**

The Council considered each activity that was previously funded by the General Rate and using the guiding principles referred to above, determined the beneficiaries and fairest mechanisms to recover the cost of the activities.

The funding choices resulted from application of the following guiding principles:

- Services that relate more to community, or have an impact on the value of property, such as District Development Planning, are rated for on capital value.

- Services that relate more to individuals are set and assessed per rating unit.

The Council considers that a Uniform Annual General Charge per rating unit best reflects the benefits that are attributable to individuals. The Council has used Capital Value as the basis for setting a rate where the activity may impact directly or indirectly on the value of the property, or where the benefits relate to the wider community rather than individual people.

The following table illustrates the Council’s funding allocations for General rate activities. Activities that principally benefit individuals are funded by a Uniform Annual General Charge, where the benefit is to both individuals and properties or to the community there is an allocation between the Uniform Annual General Charge and Capital Value based rates. Services that benefit property are funded by a rate on capital value.

Refer to each significant activity later in this policy to ascertain the basis for the allocation for each activity.

### Basis of Uniform Annual General Charge

The allocation of costs based on the 2018/28 Long Term Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Share of costs to be funded by rates</th>
<th>% From Uniform Annual General Charge</th>
<th>% From General Rate</th>
<th>Costs to be funded from UAGC</th>
<th>Costs to be funded from General Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>2,145,234</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1,716,187</td>
<td>429,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Planning</td>
<td>1,572,045</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>314,409</td>
<td>1,257,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental services</td>
<td>1,067,351</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,011,983</td>
<td>55,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Compliance Enforcement</td>
<td>372,936</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>354,289</td>
<td>18,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Control</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90,250</td>
<td>4,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Defence</td>
<td>444,894</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>222,447</td>
<td>222,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Conveniences</td>
<td>691,909</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>571,813</td>
<td>30,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Policy and Strategy and Planning Development</td>
<td>1,578,470</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,578,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse Disposal</td>
<td>721,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>721,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Minimisation</td>
<td>19,300</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>115,383</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>115,383</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>477,702</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>477,702</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Prevention</td>
<td>132,121</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>132,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth development</td>
<td>78,987</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development and Promotion</td>
<td>692,270</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>692,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Business Areas</td>
<td>196,651</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>196,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook sewer</td>
<td>39,823</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook Drainage</td>
<td>82,786</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>82,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Investigation</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Drainage</td>
<td>17,882</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Response</td>
<td>487,536</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>487,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividend</td>
<td>(409,210)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(409,210)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tfr from Housing/Property/Invt</td>
<td>(1,460,000)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1,460,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tfr from Ashburton farms fund</td>
<td>(210,000)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(210,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8,658,769</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,785,253</td>
<td>6,073,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>417,788</td>
<td>911,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,203,041</td>
<td>6,384,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of properties subject to UAGC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assesses UAGC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$125,71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed UAGC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**District Wide Targeted Rates**

**Roading Rate**

The Council considers that the roading network is a District-wide activity. The roading network is managed as one asset and the maintenance and renewal benefits the wider community and properties in the District.

While the Council is eligible for subsidies from NZ Transport Agency that contribute to the maintenance and renewal of the roading network, the balance of the costs must be recovered by way of rates.

Individuals benefit as each has an equal opportunity to use the network and to an extent, many within the community make similar use of the network. Hence, the Council considers that 20% of the rates requirement should be recovered by way of a fixed amount per rating unit in the District, which reflects the equal opportunity to use the asset.

The Council considers that the balance of the rate requirement (80%) should be recovered by a rate in the dollar based on the capital value of a property. The Council considers that capital value better reflects the supporting infrastructure and the impact that access has on the value of a property. Also the higher the capital value the property has, the greater the likelihood of increased use of the roading network or damage caused to the network, particularly in respect of large rural, commercial or industrial properties.

When determining the appropriate mechanism to recover the cost, the Council considers that both individuals and properties benefit from the Roading activity. The Council discounted the option of creating separate rating areas within the District as it felt any separation would be artificial given the open access of the roading network, where any person can drive on any public road.

Under a system of capital value rating, the Council considers that the roading infrastructure in relation to a property (including roadways, bridges & culverts, footpaths, lighting etc) is reflected within the capital value of the property across the district.

Separate targeted areas will be used where a benefit exists for a defined group e.g. Thongcaster Road/ Browns Rock Road Seal Extension, where residents have entered into a cost sharing arrangement with the Council.

The Council considered, but decided against, creating a differential category for high use properties, as to some extent they already contribute through road user charges, which are collected and partially returned via the NZ Transport Agency subsidy.

**Community Services Rates**

Community services includes the following activities:

- Recreation reserves, including sports grounds
- Community buildings, including halls and community centres
- Community grants
- Swimming pools
- Libraries.

Community services rates are targeted according to the use to which the land is put - to separately used or inhabited parts of rating units that are used for residential purposes and rating units that are used for business purposes.

This does mean that rating units that have more than one dwelling will incur multiple charges. For example, a property that has three flats will incur three charges.

This approach has been applied because the Council considered that the services provided relate primarily to people.

In addition to rating units used for residential and business purposes, the Council agreed that a contribution towards the cost of neighbourhood reserves should be made by vacant land in the five main towns as the value of land benefits from the availability or proximity of neighbourhood reserves.

The Council did consider the option of charging based on location, with those closer to the services paying more. However, the Council considers that given the relatively compact nature of the District and the fact that every person has equal opportunity to use the facilities encapsulated by this charge, with the exception of neighbourhood reserves in the five main towns, the only differential should be based on the higher level of service for neighbourhood reserves. Past Council surveys have indicated users of community facilities are spread throughout the District. There are few neighbourhood reserves outside the main towns.
Council considered that an additional separate fixed amount per rating unit should be paid by properties in Pegasus to cover the higher level of service in that town in relation to street trees. Ratepayers within the town are required to cover 80% of the maintenance cost of street trees in the town.

The Council believes that rates for Community Services should be more transparent and therefore the following activities will be disclosed on the rate assessment as separate targeted rates:

- Community parks and reserves, buildings and grants rate
- Community swimming pools rate
- Community libraries and museums rate
- Pegasus Services rate.

4. How the Council decides to fund its activities

Councils are required to have a Revenue and Financing Policy to show who pays for the services it delivers. There is a list of principles relating to the funding of expenditure needs in the Local Government Act 2002, which the Council must take into consideration when it adopts its Revenue and Financing Policy.

When determining how to fund an activity, the Council considers, among other things, who benefits from the activity, by considering the individual and community benefits of an activity. This is explained below.

Benefits to Individuals

Some services, such as the separate services of water, sewer and refuse collection are provided to distinct groups of properties within service or contract areas. The costs of these services are shared only among the ratepayers who either have access to or use these services. These are called benefits to individuals.

Benefits to the Community as a Whole or any Identifiable Part of the Community

More difficult to determine are the beneficiaries of other Council services such as roads, parks and reserves, libraries, “governance” (which is the cost of running the Council and its Committees) and items such as policy and strategy, planning, cemeteries, public toilets and grants. These services benefit all ratepayers to some degree, but the extent of the benefit to each individual or group of ratepayers is often impractical or expensive to measure. These services are mostly benefits to the community as a whole, although for some there is a mixture with benefits to individuals. Cemeteries, for example provide some benefits to individuals and part of the revenue for this function is received from burial fees and plot purchase fees.

Benefits to the community as a whole are paid for from rates and the main sources of funding for these benefits are the general rate, roading rate and the community services rate.

Control of Negative Effects

Sometimes the Council incurs expenditure to protect the community from actual or potential problems, for example dog control and noise control services. Wherever possible, the Council will charge those persons who cause the negative effects.

5. Funding Depreciation

The Council’s depreciation policy is to fully fund depreciation over the life of the assets. The Depreciation funding policy was modified from 1 July 2015 to equate to the long term provision that is required to renew assets taking into consideration both inflationary and investment factors. Any funding provision is held in an interest earning special fund account and made available for asset renewals in the future. Modelling has shown that by adopting this revised approach sufficient funds will be available to fund the renewal of assets as they fall due.

The Council does not fund depreciation where

(i) excess capacity exits in the network, the depreciation relating to excess capacity in the network is not funded

(ii) an outline development area or large development occurs, depreciation is funded incrementally in proportion to the lots/sections titled relative to the entire area of the total lots/sections of the development.

The above supports the notion that funding of depreciation should be set at such an amount that
reflects the charge of an asset and that excess capacity or additional provision that is allowed for to cater directly or indirectly for growth should be excluded from the charge until such a time that the capacity of the network is used.

Although the policy not to fund excess depreciation can apply to all networks, this policy currently excludes the drainage networks. While capacity exists within areas of the network and meet current levels of service, there are also some deficiencies in the network that are being resolved over time and have been identified within the asset management plans. It is also acknowledged that drains cater for storm events and it is currently difficult to be certain about the spare capacity. Therefore, potential capacity for the drainage systems has not been identified and has been excluded until these issues have been resolved.

6. Significant Activities

The following sections outline the Council’s Revenue and Funding Policy for each activity of the Council’s operations

Community Leadership
• Governance
• District Development.

Infrastructure
• Roads and Footpaths
• Water Supply (including Stock Water)

• Sewerage and Treatment and Disposal of Sewage
• Solid Waste
• Stormwater Drainage.

Community Services
• Recreation (including reserves, swimming pools and community buildings)
• Libraries and Museums
• Community Protection
• Community Development.

Property Management
• Property Management
• Earthquake Recovery and Regeneration.

Community Leadership

Governance
The democratic process involves the election and operating costs of the Council and Community Boards, the operating costs of standing committees, community and advisory boards. The costs include the holding of regular meetings, as well as the preparation and consideration of reports for policy development, resource allocation and performance monitoring. It is a statutory function, necessary to ensure the people of the Waimakariri District are adequately represented, informed and consulted.

The Council is accountable to the community as a whole and elected on population basis (except for the Community Boards which are elected by the wards only). The operating costs of the Community boards are funded by properties within their Ward.

Comment
Community Board Targeted Rates are a combination of a fixed charge and rate on capital value.
## Operating Capital Costs (excluding GST – from 2018/28 Long Term Plan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Operating</th>
<th>Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,687,000</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Benefits

| Governance, including grants | 80% individual | 20% community | N/A |

## Funding

| General Rates – Capital Value | Yes | Nil |
| General Rates – Uniform Annual General Charge | Nil | Nil |
| Targeted Rates – Community Boards and Advisory Boards Rate | Yes | Nil |
| Fees and Charges | Yes | Nil |
| Interest and Dividends from Investments | Nil | Nil |
| Borrowing | Nil | Nil |
| Proceeds from Asset Sales | Nil | Nil |
| Development Contributions | Nil | Nil |
| Financial Contributions under the Resource Management Act 1991 | Nil | Nil |
| Grants and Subsidies | Nil | Nil |
| Other | Nil | Nil |

## Community outcomes

Effect is given to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi.
Our community’s needs for health and social services are met.
There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that effects our District.

## Impact on the community

Significant impact on the community, in terms of providing effective decision making and leadership for the community and through effective public information.

## Distribution of Benefits

The Governance process provides a benefit to the community as a whole. The democratic process and decisions affect individuals and properties within the community, hence 80% of the cost is recovered by way of a Uniform Annual General Charge on each property. This is because activities benefit primarily the people living within the District who have an equal opportunity to be heard by the Council. The Council recognises that there are community benefits from the activity and some decisions do affect property values or relate to the wider community, hence 20% is recovered by way of a rate in the dollar.

Community Boards and Advisory Boards activities benefit primarily the people living within the areas covered by these boards. Therefore, the costs are recovered from within each area by way of a targeted rate.
The costs and benefits of funding the activity distinctly from other activities | For transparency and accountability the costs associated with the democratic process have been separated.
---|---
The extent to which the actions or inaction of particular individuals or a group contribute to the need to undertake the activity | N/A.
Period in which the benefits are expected to occur | The benefits will occur in the year in which expenditure is made to ensure the people of the Waimakariri District are adequately represented, informed and consulted.

**District Development**
This significant activity focuses on activities related to the growth and development of the District. These include
- District Development
- Policy and Strategy
- Planning Administration
- District Promotion
- Economic Development.

**District Development Planning**
This is an integrated Council programme to ensure the timely, effective and efficient coordination and provision of infrastructure investment, land development and resource management, to plan and cater for growth in our community.

This function is considered to provide public benefit to the community as a whole, through the forward planning for and prudent investment in, key infrastructure services by the Council. The Council will fund this activity by way of General Rates, based on capital value.

**Policy and Strategy**
The Policy and Strategy function is focused on developing and documenting an integrated programme of Council activities to respond to and provide for growth and development of the District. Key components of this response include
- Preparing and maintaining the Long Term Plan and Annual Plan documents
- Engaging with and consulting the community
- Coordinating with other organisations delivering services to District residents
- Preparing and reviewing Council policies and long term strategies
- Developing, interpreting and providing District monitoring information.

The Council will fund this activity by way of the General Rate, based on capital value.
**District Plan**

**Plan Development**
The Council is required by the Resource Management Act 1991 to prepare and administer a District Plan to provide for the sustainable management of the District’s natural and physical resources. Once the plan is notified, its objectives, policies and methods for managing the environment are implemented. The Act requires a range of monitoring tasks to be performed to ensure the District Plan is effective and efficient as a tool in sustainable management of the District’s environment.

This function is considered to be primarily a community benefit through the management of the District’s resources in the natural and built environment. 80% of the cost is recovered on the basis of a General Rate on capital value, as it significantly impacts the value of properties. 20% is recovered through a Uniform Annual General Charge to reflect the benefits to individuals.

Cost of appeals to Council decisions cannot be recovered from the applicant and must be funded by the General Rate.

**District Promotion and Economic Development**
This activity promotes the District as a desirable place to visit and do business in and there is general district wide public benefit from undertaking these activities. Hence these services should be 20% funded by way of a targeted rate on all business and commercial properties in the District (excluding primary producers) with the 80% being funded from the General Rate.

### Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Operating</th>
<th>Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Rates (capital value)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Charges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Rates (capital value)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Charges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Rates (capital value)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Charges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Rates (capital value)</td>
<td>65-75%</td>
<td>25-35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Charges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion and Economic Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Rate</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Rates (capital value)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Community outcomes                                                                 | There is a safe environment for all.  
Businesses in the District are diverse, adaptable and growing.  
Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable, and sustainable.  
There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all  
There are areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats for indigenous fauna.  
The distinctive character of our takiwā-towns, villages and rural areas is maintained. |
| Impact on the community                                                             | Significant impact on the community, through ensuring that the District’s Development is sustainable. |
| Distribution of Benefits for District Development, Policy and Strategy and Plan Development and Administration | District Development Planning, Policy and Strategy and Plan Development and Administration are considered to provide predominantly community benefits that affect property values or benefit the community as a whole.  
The main benefits of Plan Administration (processing resource consents) are gained by the person or organisation seeking permission to undertake a particular activity. While there is usually a direct economic benefit received by the applicant, the public also benefits through the protection of the environment and appropriate development of land and property. User charges are in place to recover the costs from the applicants, while 80% of other costs are considered to be a benefit to the community are funded through the General Rate based on capital values and 20% is considered to reflect the benefit to individuals and is charged by a Uniform Annual General Charge on each property. |
| Distribution of Benefits for the Promotion and Economic Development Rate | Promotion and Economic Development activities promote the District as a desirable place to visit and do business in. There is a greater community benefit to the district as a whole and therefore 80% is charged by a general rate in the dollar and 20% as a private benefit. The individual benefit is primarily derived by the business and commercial properties throughout the District as the promotions and economic development activities have a District-wide focus. |
| The costs and benefits of funding the activity distinctly from other activities      | For transparency and accountability the costs associated with the Planning process have been separated. |
| The extent to which the actions or inaction of particular individuals or a group contribute to the need to undertake the activity | Persons or organisations applying for resource consents require the Council to undertake work and this is reflected in user charges for resource consent applications. |
| Period in which the benefits are expected to occur                               | Planning will provide ongoing benefit to the community through the sustainable development of the community’s vision.  
The benefits arising from promotions and economic development activities may occur beyond the period in which the expenditure occurs. |
**Infrastructure**  
**The Provision of Roads and Footpaths**  
Roading includes footpaths and bridges. The Council has responsibility for 972 kilometres of sealed roads, 573 kilometres of unsealed roads, 292 bridges and 329 kilometres of footpaths. A subsidy (essentially a user charge) is currently received from NZ Transport Agency for certain maintenance and safety works.

**Comment**  
District wide rates funding is based on two components
- Fixed amount per rating unit collects 20% of the roading rates requirement  
- The remaining roading rate is recovered by a rate in the dollar based on capital value.

Separate targeted rates are set where residents have entered into private agreements with the Council to fund seal extension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating</th>
<th>Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Costs (excluding GST – from 2018/19 Long Term Plan)</td>
<td>$18,991,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>50% individual 50% community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Rates - Capital Value</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Rates - Fixed amount per rating unit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Rates - Capital Value</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees and Charges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and Dividends from Investments</td>
<td>Yes ②</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from Asset Sales</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Contributions</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Contributions under the Resource Management Act 1991</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Subsidies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

① The Council Rates are set at a level to recover the depreciation related to the Council’s future asset replacement costs. The cash received is applied only to assets that are replaced.  
② Where scheme account balances have surplus funds interest earned on the account balance is used as a funding source.

**Community outcomes**  
Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable, affordable and sustainable.  
There is a safe environment for all.  
Businesses in the District are diverse, adaptable and growing.  
Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality.  
The distinctive character of our takiwā-towns, villages and rural areas is maintained.  
There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that affects our District.

**Impact on the community**  
An efficient road transport network has a significant impact on the community.

**Distribution of Benefits**  
The benefits apply in part to the whole community, as people are free to use any public road in the District. The recovery of subsidies from NZ Transport Agency reflects partly the individual benefit that is attributed to the roading network. However, in many instances parts of the roading activity are not eligible for subsidy. Therefore, the balance of costs must be recovered through rates.

For operating costs, it is considered that targeted rates are the most equitable form of funding this activity.
| Distribution of Benefits | In determining how targeted rates are collected, the Council views the roading network to be ‘one asset’, which benefits the entire community and therefore the base roading infrastructure should be funded on the same basis across the District. When considering the underlying roading infrastructure the Council recognises that there are benefits to both individuals and to properties, as a result of the roading activity. The Council’s assessment is that 20% of rates should be a fixed amount per rating unit and 80% should be apportioned to properties. Individuals have equal access to the network and therefore, have equal ability to use the network. The Council considers that a fixed amount to each property best reflects the equality of use and access that the network provides. |
| Distribution of Benefits | The Council also considers that properties benefit from the roading activity as the benefit of access to a property can have an impact on the value of a property. It considers that rating based on capital value does reflect that benefit. It also recognises that particularly larger valued properties (e.g. rural, commercial or industrial properties) may place a greater burden on the roading. |
| The costs and benefits of funding the activity distinctly from other activities | The benefit of funding roading distinctly is that it constitutes a large component of the District’s rates and it enables costs to be allocated in a fair manner. Accordingly, for accountability and transparency targeted rates have been set. |
| The extent to which the actions or inaction of particular individuals or a group contribute to the need to undertake the activity | Users of the roading network create the need for maintenance from the number of trips that are made and the type of vehicle used. The subsidies that the Council receives from NZ Transport Agency are funded through petrol taxes and road user charges that reflect the volume of use by each road user. However, the level of subsidies received does not equate to the Council’s view of the public/private benefit split. Hence the balance must be rate funded. Future residents will contribute to future operating costs and possibly some of the loan servicing costs, while current users must fund the cost of the additional capacity until those future users arrive. It is reasonable for those future users to make a contribution that relates to the cost of catering for that growth. Therefore, for capital costs relating to the Transport Regional Implementation Plan, it is considered that a mixture of targeted rates and Development Contributions is the most equitable form of funding this activity. |
| Period in which the benefits are expected to occur | The roading systems that are being implemented over the next 10 years will provide long-term benefit to the Community. For capital costs the Council will apply any accumulated funds arising from funding depreciation to the capital cost, as well as any development contributions received for growth-related projects. Further capital costs are to be funded from borrowing with rates set at a level to cover interest costs and loan repayments. It is considered that borrowing is the appropriate funding method that will most efficiently achieve intergenerational equity. |
| Funding | Operating Expenditure: |
| | Fixed amount per rating unit 12% |
| | Targeted Rate, based on capital Value 46% |
| | Subsidies 58% |
| | Fees and Charges 40% |
| | Interest from Investments 2% |
| | ii) Development contributions: if applicable |
| | iii) Loans |
| Capital Expenditure | (i) Accumulated funds: if applicable |
| | (ii) Development contributions: if applicable |
| | (iii) Loans |
**Water Supply**

The District Council manages 16 different water supply schemes. In addition there is a stockwater system comprising of some 800 kilometres of water race.

The Council provides a potable water supply to 85% of the District’s occupied properties, with the balance serviced by private supplies. Water is an essential need for individuals and stock.

Water supplies are considered to be a private benefit. The service is provided to identified properties. While restricted supplies (i.e. limited supply with on-site storage) have a charge related to supply, most properties receiving an unrestricted supply pay the same charge regardless of consumption. The annual charge varies according to the scheme.

The cost of the scheme relates to providing the supply and treating drinking water, funded by a standard charge.

The stockwater system is charged through a fixed amount per rating unit and a rate per hectare.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs (excluding GST – from 2018/19 Long Term Plan)</th>
<th>Operating</th>
<th>Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$7,480,000</td>
<td>$8,344,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benefits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>100% individual</th>
<th>100% individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Rates</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Nil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Rates</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees and Charges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and Dividends from Investments</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from Asset Sales</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Contributions</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Contributions under the Resource Management Act 1991</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Subsidies</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The Council Rates are set at a level to recover the depreciation related to the Council’s future asset replacement costs. The cash received is applied only to assets that are replaced.
2. Where scheme account balances have surplus funds interest earned on the account balance is used as a funding source.
3. Where possible a scheme is able to attract subsidies, these are applied. In this instance subsidies are available from the Ministry of Health for the upgrading of the Oxford water supply.

**Community outcomes**

- There is a safe environment for all.
- There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all.
- Businesses in the District are diverse, adaptable and growing.
- Core utilities services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner.

**Impact on the community**

- Water is a necessity of life and the supply of water has a significant impact on the community.

**Distribution of Benefits**

- The benefits apply indirectly to the whole community and directly to those who are connected to each scheme. While there are wider community and environmental benefits relating to the availability of a high quality supply of potable water, the Council considers that households who are connected, or will be connected, to the water schemes should be solely responsible for funding expenditure.

Therefore, for operating costs, it is considered that targeted rates are the most equitable form of funding this activity.
### The costs and benefits of funding the activity distinctly from other activities

The benefit of funding water distinctly is that only those currently connected, or planning to connect, to schemes will contribute to their funding. Therefore for accountability and transparency targeted rates have been set for each scheme.

### The extent to which the actions or inaction of particular individuals or a group contribute to the need to undertake the activity

People who are connected to the water schemes are creating the need for the Council to undertake work relating to the availability of a high quality supply of potable water. It is considered appropriate for these people to fund this work through targeted rates. Developers who are adding to the demands placed on schemes, which require the Council to undertake new Capital works related to growth will contribute to these costs. The Council applies Development Contributions to contribute to funding those costs – refer to the Development Contributions Policy.

### Period in which the benefits are expected to occur

The water supply systems that are being implemented over the next 10 years will provide long-term benefit to the Community. The duration of benefits is dependent on the ability to gain the necessary resource consents, but is anticipated to be a minimum of 35 years.

For capital renewal costs the Council will apply any accumulated funds arising from funding depreciation to the renewal capital cost. Any development contributions received for growth-related projects will be applied against growth capital works. Further capital costs are to be funded from borrowing with rates set at a level to cover interest costs and loan repayments. It is considered that borrowing is the appropriate funding method that will most efficiently achieve intergenerational equity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Operating Expenditure</th>
<th>Capital Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Rates</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees and Charges</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Accumulated funds:</td>
<td>if applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Development contributions:</td>
<td>if applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Subsidies:</td>
<td>if applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Loans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comment

Targeted rates for water schemes are set as a fixed charge to each rating unit or on separately used or inhabited parts of a rating unit or by a charge per unit of water on rating units that have a connection to a Council water scheme.

On some schemes there is a combination of fixed charge, and rate per unit of water. Rates assessed per unit of water are based on an annual allocation of water. 1 unit = 1000 litres/day. Supplies are limited by a restrictor on the property boundary that delivers the allocated amount of water. Rates are not assessed on actual use measured by water meter.

Water races targeted rates are charged by a mixture of a rate per hectare and a fixed amount per rating unit.
Sewerage and Treatment and Disposal of Sewage

The Council operates four different sewer schemes – Eastern Districts, Oxford, Fernside and Loburn Lea. The objective is to provide and maintain a safe, reliable and economic system of disposal of urban sewage wastes. The Canterbury Regional Council grants discharge consents in accordance with the Resource Management Act 1991.

The Council can be required to provide a sewerage system under the Health Act 1956. However it is not necessary for the Council to be involved. There are examples of private schemes operating in the District, with more proposed.

Properties not connected to schemes are required to provide their own on-property systems. These systems must meet the same discharge conditions as community schemes. Individuals are responsible for their own systems.

While there are some public benefits from the Council sewerage schemes in that they help maintain public health and they minimise the effect on the environment, the main beneficiaries and exacerbators are those people connected to the schemes, who can be readily identified.

Comment

Targeted rates are charged to identifiable properties, which have the service available to them. Generally the rate is either a fixed amount per rating unit or a fixed amount per water closet or urinal connected (pan charge), with larger users having multiple charges (i.e. schools, hotels, motels). Some properties with multiple pans are eligible for a remission – refer to the Rates Remission policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs (excluding GST – from 2018/19 Long Term Plan)</th>
<th>Operating</th>
<th>Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$10,194,000</td>
<td>$8,755,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>85% individual</th>
<th>15% community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>General Rates</th>
<th>Targeted Rates</th>
<th>Fees and Charges</th>
<th>Interest and Dividends from Investments</th>
<th>Borrowing</th>
<th>Proceeds from Asset Sales</th>
<th>Development Contributions</th>
<th>Financial Contributions under the Resource Management Act 1991</th>
<th>Grants and Subsidies</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The Council Rates are set at a level to recover the depreciation related to the Council’s future asset replacement costs. The cash received is applied only to assets that are replaced.

2 Where scheme account balances have surplus funds interest earned on the account balance is used as a funding source.

Community outcomes

There is a safe environment for all. Businesses in the District are diverse, adaptable and growing. Core utilities services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner. There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all

Impact on the community

Significant positive impact on the community. Treatment and disposal will protect the health of the community and the environment from adverse affects of untreated or uncontrolled effluent disposal.

Distribution of Benefits

The benefits apply indirectly to the whole community and directly to those people who are connected to one of the seven Council-operated schemes in the District. While there are wider community and environmental benefits relating to disposing of sewage to a high standard, the Council considers that people who are connected, or will be connected, to the sewerage schemes should be solely responsible for funding expenditure to ensure the environment is protected.

Therefore, for operating costs, it is considered that targeted rates are the most equitable form of funding this activity.
The costs and benefits of funding the activity distinctly from other activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The benefit of funding sewerage distinctly is that only those currently connected, or planning to connect, to schemes will contribute to their funding. Therefore for accountability and transparency targeted rates have been set for each scheme.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The extent to which the actions or inaction of particular individuals or a group contribute to the need to undertake the activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People who are connected to the sewer schemes are creating the need for the Council to undertake work to minimise the damage to the District’s waterways. It is considered appropriate for these people to fund this work through targeted rates. Developers who are adding to the demands placed on schemes, which require the Council to undertake new Capital works related to growth will contribute to these costs. The Council applies Development Contributions to contribute to funding those costs – refer to the Development Contributions Policy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Period in which the benefits are expected to occur

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The reticulation, treatment and disposal systems that are being implemented will provide long term benefit to the Community. The duration of benefits is dependent on the ability to gain resource consents for effluent disposal, but are anticipated to be a minimum of 55 years, with any engineering solution intended to provide future benefits equivalent to the design life of the systems components, which for certain assets is in excess of 70 years. For renewal capital costs the Council will apply any accumulated funds arising from funding depreciation to the renewal capital cost. Any development contributions received for growth-related projects are applied to growth capital costs. Further capital costs are to be funded from borrowing with rates set at a level to cover interest costs and loan repayments. It is considered that borrowing is the appropriate funding method that will most efficiently achieve intergenerational equity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Funding Operating Expenditure Capital Expenditure

| Targeted Rates 98% Fees and Charges 2% (i) Accumulated funds: if applicable (ii) Development contributions: if applicable (iii) Loans |
|---|---|---|---|---|

Annual Plan 2017-2018
Stormwater Drainage

The Council operates five urban drainage areas, six rural drainage areas and a rural – residential drainage scheme at Loburn Lea.

Systems are provided to protect property and the living environment and particularly in the rural areas, to enhance economic activity. The systems also provide for the drainage of water from roads.

Drainage systems are seen to be a private benefit in that they provide a service to identified properties. Providing a drainage service to roads is a public benefit. These costs are identified in the roading account and recovered along with other roading and maintenance costs.

Comment

The methods for charging rates for rural drainage do vary and include fixed charges, land value and land area. Some schemes use a combination of these methods. These have involved input from advisory groups set up from property owners in the defined areas.

Urban drainage is funded by a targeted rate on land value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs (excluding GST - from 2018/19 Long Term Plan)</th>
<th>Operating</th>
<th>Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$4,430,000</td>
<td>$9,372,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>90% individual</th>
<th>10% community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Rates</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Rates</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees and Charges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and Dividends from Investments</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from Asset Sales</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Contributions</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Contributions under the Resource Management Act 1991</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Subsidies</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The Council Rates are set at a level to recover the depreciation related to the Council's future asset replacement costs. The cash received is applied only to assets that are replaced.

2. Scheme account balances that are in surplus will receive interest that will be applied to fund operating costs.

Community outcomes

There is a safe environment for all.
There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all Businesses in the District are diverse, adaptable and growing.
Core utilities services are provided in a timely and sustainable manner.

Impact on the community.

An adequate drainage system has a significant impact on the community.

Distribution of Benefits

The benefits apply indirectly to the whole community and directly to those who are connected to each scheme. While there are wider community and environmental benefits relating to the availability of an effective drainage system, the Council considers that properties that are connected, or will be connected, to the drainage schemes should be responsible for funding expenditure to ensure the environment is protected and reduce the extent of flooding. The cost of draining roads is included in the Roading Activity.

Therefore, for operating costs, it is considered that targeted rates are the most equitable form of funding this activity.
In respect to Pegasus, responsibility for the 14 hectare lake is expected to be passed to the Council in the future. The Council considers that Pegasus residents are the main beneficiaries of the lake as it is integral to the town, its amenity is reflected in property values and forms part of the drainage solution for Pegasus. Seventy-five percent of the lake's maintenance costs are to be charged to Pegasus ratepayers, as a component of the drainage rate. The balance of the operating costs is funded as part of the District-wide basis Community Services rate.

The benefit of funding drainage distinctly is that only those currently connected, or planning to connect, to schemes, or property within a rural drainage area will contribute to their funding. Therefore for accountability and transparency targeted rates have been set for each scheme.

Owners of developed properties require that there are systems for the collection and disposal of stormwater. It is considered appropriate for these people to fund this work through targeted rates. Developers who are adding to the demands placed on schemes which require the Council to undertake new Capital works related to growth will contribute to these costs. The Council applies Development Contributions to contribute to funding those costs – refer to the Development Contributions Policy.

The drainage systems that are being implemented over the next 10 years will provide long-term benefit to the Community. The duration of benefits is dependent on the ability to gain the necessary resource consents, but is anticipated to be a minimum of 35 years. For renewal capital costs the Council will apply any accumulated funds arising from funding depreciation to the renewal capital cost. Any development contributions received relating to growth-related projects will be applied to growth capital costs. Further capital costs are to be funded from borrowing with rates set at a level to cover interest costs and loan repayments. It is considered that borrowing is the appropriate funding method that will most efficiently achieve intergenerational equity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of Benefits</th>
<th>The costs and benefits of funding the activity distinctly from other activities</th>
<th>The extent to which the actions or inaction of particular individuals or a group contribute to the need to undertake the activity</th>
<th>Period in which the benefits are expected to occur</th>
<th>Funding Operating Expenditure Capital Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In respect to Pegasus, responsibility for the 14 hectare lake is expected to be passed to the Council in the future. The Council considers that Pegasus residents are the main beneficiaries of the lake as it is integral to the town, its amenity is reflected in property values and forms part of the drainage solution for Pegasus. Seventy-five percent of the lake's maintenance costs are to be charged to Pegasus ratepayers, as a component of the drainage rate. The balance of the operating costs is funded as part of the District-wide basis Community Services rate.</td>
<td>The benefit of funding drainage distinctly is that only those currently connected, or planning to connect, to schemes, or property within a rural drainage area will contribute to their funding. Therefore for accountability and transparency targeted rates have been set for each scheme.</td>
<td>Owners of developed properties require that there are systems for the collection and disposal of stormwater. It is considered appropriate for these people to fund this work through targeted rates. Developers who are adding to the demands placed on schemes which require the Council to undertake new Capital works related to growth will contribute to these costs. The Council applies Development Contributions to contribute to funding those costs – refer to the Development Contributions Policy.</td>
<td>The drainage systems that are being implemented over the next 10 years will provide long-term benefit to the Community. The duration of benefits is dependent on the ability to gain the necessary resource consents, but is anticipated to be a minimum of 35 years. For renewal capital costs the Council will apply any accumulated funds arising from funding depreciation to the renewal capital cost. Any development contributions received relating to growth-related projects will be applied to growth capital costs. Further capital costs are to be funded from borrowing with rates set at a level to cover interest costs and loan repayments. It is considered that borrowing is the appropriate funding method that will most efficiently achieve intergenerational equity.</td>
<td>Targeted Rates 95% Fees and Charges 5% (i) Accumulated funds: if applicable (ii) Development contributions: if applicable (iii) Loans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Solid Waste
A weekly kerbside collection service is provided to approximately 14,000 properties at present and a kerbside recycling service was introduced in September 2000. Refuse collection is considered to be a benefit to individuals, providing a service to individual properties which they would otherwise have to do for themselves. Having a community service is efficient.

The Council has two transfer stations, one at Oxford and the other at Southbrook (Rangiora). Other existing disposal sites have been closed. Waste is disposed of at the Kate Valley landfill. Landfills are required to meet resource consent conditions.

Refuse disposal is considered to provide predominantly a private benefit to those who use the facility, but there are also benefits to the community as a whole that are derived from refuse being disposed of at transfer stations as illegal dumping of refuse is minimised. The activity also funds waste and hazardous waste minimisation and education initiatives, as well as the costs for managing closed landfill sites, which are seen as benefits to the community as a whole.

The council is consulting with the community regarding an optional 3 bin solid waste collection service. If the proposal is adopted the new service will commence in 2019/2020.

Comment
Kerbside collection rates are set as a fixed charge per separately used and inhabited part of a rating unit in the areas where the kerbside collection is available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs (excluding GST – from 2018/20 Long Term Plan)</th>
<th>Operating</th>
<th>Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$7,680,000</td>
<td>$1,622,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% private 15% public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste initiatives and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Rates - Capital Value and Uniform Annual General Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes  Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes  Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees and Charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes  Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and Dividends from Investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes  Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes  Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from Asset Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil  Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil  Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Contributions under the Resource Management Act 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil  Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Subsidies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil  Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil  Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The benefits apply indirectly to the whole community and directly to those who are in an area which has a waste collection service. The Council considers that properties that receive, or will receive, a waste collection service should be responsible for funding expenditure relating to collection and those that dispose of refuse at the transfer stations should pay a disposal fee.

General rates are used to fund part of the refuse activities that reflect general benefits such as minimisation initiatives, closed landfill costs and reflect the general benefit attributable to keeping the District clean.
The costs and benefits of funding the activity distinctly from other activities

Where benefits are identified to specific users it is appropriate that user charges and targeted rates are set to match the private benefit received.

Therefore for accountability and transparency targeted rates have been set for refuse collection. Appropriate fees for refuse disposal reflect the private benefit gained.

The extent to which the actions or inaction of particular individuals or a group contribute to the need to undertake the activity

The generator of waste creates the need for collection and disposal.

It is considered appropriate for these people to fund this work through targeted rates and user charges.

Period in which the benefits are expected to occur

The refuse disposal systems that have been developed will provide long-term benefit to the Community. The duration of benefits is dependent on the ability to gain the necessary resource consents, but is anticipated to be a minimum of 35 years.

For any future renewal capital costs the Council will apply any accumulated funds arising from funding depreciation to the renewal capital cost. Further capital costs are to be funded from borrowing with rates set at a level to cover interest costs and loan repayments. It is considered that borrowing is the appropriate funding method that will most efficiently achieve intergenerational equity.

| Funding Operating Expenditure | Targeted Rates (Collection) | 28% |
| Capital Expenditure           | General Rates (Disposal and Waste Initiatives) | 9% |
|                               | Fees and Charges (Disposal) | 63% |
|                               | (i) Accumulated funds:      | if applicable |
|                               | (ii) Loans                  |     |
Community Services – Recreation

Reserves

Within Waimakariri District, Reserves means land and includes facilities on those reserves, under the control and management of the Waimakariri District Council, to meet the needs of the District residents and visitors for open spaces and recreation.

The Council acquires and develops reserves to enable recreation activities, facilities and open spaces to contribute to the health and vitality of the District and enhance the District as a place to live and visit and to meet identified community outcomes for a healthy community.

Comment

The reserves activities are funded by way of the Community, Parks & Reserves, Buildings and Grants Rate. This is a fixed amount applied on a differential basis on rating units used for business purposes and separately used or inhabited parts of rating units used for residential purposes across the District and on vacant sections in Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Oxford, Pegasus and Woodend.

Differential rating is based on the use to which the land is put and where the land is situated.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs (excluding GST – from 2018/19 Long Term Plan)</th>
<th>Operating</th>
<th>Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>$7,565,000</td>
<td>$6,913,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airfield</td>
<td>$322,000</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping Grounds</td>
<td>$173,000</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benefits

100% community

Funding

- General Rates: Nil
- Targeted Rates - fixed charge: Yes
- Fees and Charges: Yes
- Interest and Dividends from Investments: Nil
- Borrowing: Nil
- Proceeds from Asset Sales: Nil
- Development Contributions: Nil
- Financial Contributions under the Resource Management Act 1991: Nil
- Grants and Subsidies: Nil
- Other: Nil

(1) The Council Rates are set at a level to recover the depreciation related to the Council’s future asset replacement costs. The cash received is applied only to assets that are replaced.

Community outcomes

Our community's needs for health and social services are met. There are areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats for indigenous fauna. Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality. The distinctive character of our takiwā-towns, villages and rural areas is maintained. People are friendly and caring, creating a strong sense of community in our District.

Impact on the community

Significant impact on the social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing of the community, in terms of promoting recreation opportunities and activities, social spaces, environmental enhancement and cultural enrichment while adding distinctive open spaces and infrastructure.

Distribution of Benefits

The benefits apply to the whole community by providing the opportunity to develop a lifestyle that enhances an individual’s physical and mental wellbeing. The Council considers that all people in the District have equal opportunity to use the District and community reserves therefore the charge should be the same irrespective of proximity to facilities, through a targeted rate (by way of a Community, Parks and Reserves, Buildings and Grants Charge).
### Distribution of Benefits

People in Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Oxford, Pegasus and Woodend benefit from neighbourhood reserves, predominantly in those urban areas and they should therefore fund the costs of those reserves.

### The costs and benefits of funding the activity distinctly from other activities

The benefit of funding recreation reserves from the community services rate is that it enables transparency and accountability to be demonstrated for reserves in the District. Funds taken for development contributions are used for the purposes for which they were intended.

### The extent to which the actions or inaction of particular individuals or a group contribute to the need to undertake the activity

The Council undertakes the activity to allow Waimakariri District residents to enjoy access to a wide range of reserves and the projected population growth of the District will increase the demand for reserves. Development contributions will be required from developers to enable the Council to match the demand for new reserves resulting from growth in the District.

### Period in which the benefits are expected to occur

The reserves, which are being developed over the next ten years, provide ongoing benefit to the community. For renewal capital costs the Council will apply any accumulated funds arising from funding depreciation to the renewal capital cost. Any development contributions received relating to growth-related projects is applied to growth capital costs. Further capital costs are to be funded from borrowing with rates set at a level to cover interest costs and loan repayments. It is considered that borrowing is the appropriate funding method that will most efficiently achieve intergenerational equity.

### Funding Operating Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Rates (for Neighbourhood Reserves)</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Rates (Community, Parks &amp; Reserves, Buildings &amp; Grants Charges)</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Charges</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Accumulated funds:</td>
<td>if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Development contributions:</td>
<td>if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Loans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Capital Expenditure

- Accumulated funds: if applicable
- Development contributions: if applicable
- Loans
Pegasus Services Rate

The Council provides a higher level of service for the number of street trees in Pegasus. Pegasus will have about 5,000 street trees, which is a similar number of trees under the Council’s management as for the total of the rest of the District. The Council policy is to recover 80% of the maintenance costs of Pegasus street trees from Pegasus ratepayers, which reflects the higher level of service provided.

Comment

Rates are set as a fixed amount on rating units in Pegasus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Operating</th>
<th>Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Costs (excluding GST – from 2018/19 Long Term Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Level of Service to Pegasus</td>
<td>$101,000</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% community</td>
<td>100% community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Rates</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Rates</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees and Charges</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and Dividends from Investments</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from Asset Sales</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Contributions</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Contributions under the Resource Management Act 1991</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Subsidies</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community outcomes
Our community’s needs for health and social services are met. There are areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats for indigenous fauna. Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality. The distinctive character of our takiwā-towns, villages and rural areas is maintained. People are friendly and caring, creating a strong sense of community in our District.

Impact on the community.
Significant impact on the social, economic, cultural and environmental wellbeing of the community, in terms of promoting recreation opportunities and activities, social spaces, environmental enhancement and cultural enrichment while adding distinctive open spaces and infrastructure.

Distribution of Benefits
The benefits apply to the whole community by providing the opportunity to develop a lifestyle that enhances individual’s physical and mental wellbeing. The Council considers that all people in Pegasus have a higher level of service provided in respect to street trees. In respect of the street trees 80% of the operational cost will be charged to the Pegasus properties.
The Council manages three swimming pools at Kaiapoi, Rangiora and Oxford. These are operated to meet the New Zealand Standard for Swimming Pool Supervision. The benefits of public pools are a mixture of public and private.

**Comment**

Targeted rates are set as a fixed amount per separately used and inhabited part of a rating unit used for residential purposes and on each rating unit used for business purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The costs and benefits of funding the activity distinctly from other activities</th>
<th>The Pegasus services rate recognises that Pegasus properties will benefit to a greater extent than do other ratepayers. Accordingly, it is appropriate to part fund these activities by way of targeted rates.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the actions or inaction of particular individuals or a group contribute to the need to undertake the activity</td>
<td>The Council undertakes the activity to allow Waimakariri District residents to enjoy access to a wide range of reserves and the projected population growth of the District will increase the demand for reserves. Development Contributions will be required from developers to enable the Council to match the demand for new reserves resulting from growth in the District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period in which the benefits are expected to occur</td>
<td>The reserves, which are being developed will provide ongoing benefit to the Community. For renewal capital costs the Council will apply any accumulated funds arising from funding depreciation to the capital cost. Any Development Contributions received relating to growth-related projects will be applied growth capital costs. Further capital costs are to be funded from borrowing with rates set at a level to cover interest costs and loan repayments. It is considered that borrowing is the appropriate funding method that will most efficiently achieve intergenerational equity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Swimming Pools

The Council manages three swimming pools at Kaiapoi, Rangiora and Oxford. These are operated to meet the New Zealand Standard for Swimming Pool Supervision. The benefits of public pools are a mixture of public and private.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Targeted Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenditure</td>
<td>(i) Accumulated funds: if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditure</td>
<td>(ii) Development contributions: if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Loans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Costs (excluding GST - from 2018/19 Long Term Plan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Operating</th>
<th>Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pools</td>
<td>$4,985,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>40% individual 60% community</th>
<th>40% individual 60% community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>General Rates</th>
<th>Targeted Rates - Fixed amount</th>
<th>Fees and Charges</th>
<th>Interest and Dividends from Investments</th>
<th>Borrowing</th>
<th>Proceeds from Asset Sales</th>
<th>Development Contributions</th>
<th>Financial Contributions under the Resource Management Act 1991</th>
<th>Grants and Subsidies</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The Council Rates are set at a level to recover the depreciation related to the Council’s future asset replacement costs. The cash received is applied only to assets that are replaced.
### Community Outcomes
Our community’s needs for health and social services are met. Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality. People are friendly and caring, creating a strong sense of community in our District.

### Impact on the Community
The provision of swimming pools contributes to the social wellbeing of the community by providing individuals with the opportunity to develop a lifestyle that enhances their physical and mental wellbeing. It also contributes to the economic wellbeing of the community by encouraging visitors with the diversity of recreation experience available within the District.

### Distribution of Benefits
The provision of swimming pool benefits both the individuals that utilise the facilities and the wider community. The community-wide benefits apply to the whole community as they are available to all residents and provide individuals with the opportunity to develop a lifestyle that enhances their physical and mental wellbeing.

### The costs and benefits of funding the activity distinctly from other activities
The benefit of funding swimming pools distinctly is that appropriate levels of user charges can be identified to match the private benefit received. There is a community acceptance and market reality that public swimming pools cannot be fully self-funding. There is the opportunity to minimise the shortfall through value added services such as learn to swim and fitness classes. Therefore swimming pools are funded by a mixture of targeted rates (charged through a Fixed Community Swimming Pools Rate) and user charges.

### The extent to which the actions or inaction of particular individuals or a group contribute to the need to undertake the activity
The Council undertakes the activity to help to ensure that the community has access to a broad range of recreational, arts cultural and social opportunities. It is considered appropriate for this activity to be funded through the Community Swimming Pools Rate.

### Period in which the benefits are expected to occur
The existing facilities will be of long-term benefit to the community. For renewal capital costs the Council will apply any accumulated funds arising from funding depreciation to the renewal capital cost. Any development contributions received for growth-related projects will be applied to growth capital costs. Further capital costs are to be funded from borrowing with rates set at a level to cover interest costs and loan repayments. It is considered that borrowing is the appropriate funding method that will most efficiently achieve intergenerational equity.

### Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Expenditure</th>
<th>Capital Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Rates (Community Swimming Pools Rate)</td>
<td>60-70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User charges</td>
<td>30-40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Accumulated funds:</td>
<td>if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Development contributions:</td>
<td>if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Loans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Community Buildings**

The Council manages 12 community buildings, three community centres and two town halls. These have a mixture of benefits to individuals and the community as a whole. A large proportion is an individual benefit received by the groups and individuals who choose to use the facility. There is a benefit for communities by providing a focal point for events and gatherings. These facilities are generally well established, with a community expectation that they shall be maintained.

Within the community, there are a number of privately owned facilities, which also meet a demand. They tend to be provided for the owner’s purposes (e.g. church halls) but are available for wider use. The Council supports some privately owned facilities.

Privately owned facilities create a “market” for hire charges. If the Council moves above these charges, there is a chance that Council facilities may not be utilised as much. Conversely, if charges are below the market level, there may be a greater demand on Council resources.

A number of the facilities are used for children’s activities, for example cinema, toy libraries, preschools, Plunket and playcentres. The Council community survey indicated a preparedness to subsidise activities which benefit children.

Community buildings are funded by way of the Community, Parks & Reserves, Building and Grants Rate. This is a fixed amount applied on a differential basis on rating units used for business purposes and separately used or inhabited parts of rating units used for residential purposes across the District and on vacant sections in Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Oxford, Pegasus and Woodend.

---

**Operating** | **Capital**
---|---
**Costs (excluding GST – from 2018/19 Long Term Plan)** | $2,342,000 | $111,000
**Benefits** | 20% individual | 20% individual
80% community | 80% community
**Funding**
General Rates | Nil | Nil
Targeted Rates - Fixed amount | Yes | Yes ①
Fees and Charges | Yes | Nil
Interest and Dividends from Investments | Nil | Nil
Borrowing | Nil | Yes
Proceeds from Asset Sales | Nil | Nil
Development Contributions | Nil | Nil
Financial Contributions under the Resource Management Act 1991 | Nil | Nil
Grants and Subsidies | Nil | Nil
Other | Nil | Nil

① The Council Rates are set at a level to recover the depreciation related to the Council’s future asset replacement costs. The cash received is applied only to assets that are replaced.

---

**Community outcomes**
Our community’s needs for health and social services are met.
Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality.
The distinctive character of our takiwā-towns, villages and rural areas is maintained.
People are friendly and caring, creating a strong sense of community in our District.

**Impact on the community**
Significant impact on the community, in terms of promoting cultural enrichment and opportunities for residents to be involved in community life.

**Distribution of Benefits**
The benefits apply to the whole community by providing the opportunity to develop a lifestyle that enhances wellbeing. However, the Council recognises that there are individual benefits as well to users of community buildings, but given the location and type of use the facilities, full cost recovery is not possible.
Targeted rates (by way of Community, Parks & Reserves, Buildings, & Grants Rates) are an appropriate method of funding operating costs for community buildings.

**The costs and benefits of funding the activity distinctly from other activities**
The benefit of funding community buildings distinctly is that it enables appropriate user charges to be calculated for applicable buildings. The Council accepts that the user charges cannot achieve 20% of the costs of operating community buildings and therefore sets charges based on what is charged for other (non Council) community buildings such as church halls. The balance of the activity is funded by way of Community, Parks and Reserves, Buildings and Grants Rates.
Central Business Areas
The Council provides a higher level of service (street cleaning, car parks, street lighting, footpaths and garden/reserve maintenance) to the central business areas of Kaiapoi and Rangiora. These are required because of their activities and the desire to make the areas attractive for visitors to do business.

The Council considers that the costs of providing these additional services provide primarily individual benefits to the community, acknowledging that the businesses also benefit.

Comment
These services are 20% funded by way of a targeted rate on Capital Value of rating units used for business purposes within the Central Business District (CBD Area Maintenance and Street Works Rate) and 80% charged as a general rate in the dollar.
### Community outcomes
Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality.
The distinctive character of our takiwā - towns, villages and rural areas is maintained.

### Impact on the community
Significant impact on the community.

### Distribution of Benefits for the Area Maintenance and Street Works Rate
Central business areas receive a benefit to individuals from promotion and events as well as maintaining the area at a higher level of service. Residents and visitors to the District also benefit, although the benefit to the community as a whole receives greater benefit from the use of the facilities and higher level of services that is provided within the central business districts.

### The costs and benefits of funding the activity distinctly from other activities
The distribution of benefits from these activities differs from those of other activities. In particular, the community benefits to a greater extent and accordingly, it is appropriate to fund these activities by way of general rates.

### The extent to which the actions or inaction of particular individuals or a group contribute to the need to undertake the activity
The Council provides a higher level of service to the central business areas of Kaiapoi and Rangiora. These are required because of their activities and the desire to make the areas attractive for visitors to do business.

### Period in which the benefits are expected to occur
While area maintenance and street works services are likely to provide benefits primarily in the period in which they occur, there is also potential for a longer term benefit in that attractive central business districts may encourage others to move into the District.

### Funding CBD Maintenance & Street Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Expenditure</th>
<th>Capital Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Targeted Rates</strong></td>
<td><strong>General Rates</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Costs (excluding GST – from 2018/28 Long Term Plan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Expenditure</th>
<th>Capital Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20% private</td>
<td>20% private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% public</td>
<td>80% public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Rates</th>
<th>Uniform Annual General Charge</th>
<th>Fees and Charges</th>
<th>Interest and Dividends from Investments</th>
<th>Borrowing</th>
<th>Proceeds from Asset Sales</th>
<th>Development Contributions</th>
<th>Financial Contributions under the Resource Management Act 1991</th>
<th>Grants and Subsidies</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## REVENUE AND FINANCING POLICY

### Community Grants
The Council gives grants to various organisations in the District. These organisations are involved in recreation, the arts, community development and District museums. These organisations all make contributions to the social, cultural or environmental benefit of the District.

### Comment
Community grants are funded by way of the Community, Parks & Reserves, Building and Grants Rate. This is a fixed amount applied on a differential basis on rating units used for business purposes and separately used or inhabited parts of rating units used for residential purposes across the District and on vacant sections in Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Oxford, Pegasus and Woodend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community outcomes</th>
<th>Our community’s needs for health and social services are met.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The distinctive character of our takitā towns, villages and rural areas is maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People are friendly and caring, creating a strong sense of community in our District.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Impact on the community | Significant impact on the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the community, in terms of promoting cultural enrichment and opportunities for residents to be involved in community life. |

| Distribution of Benefits | The benefits apply to the whole community by providing the opportunity to develop a lifestyle that enhances community wellbeing. The Council recognises that there are individual benefits as well. The organisations will obtain funding from other sources as well as the Council. |
|                         | Targeted rates (by way of Community, Parks and Reserves, Buildings and Grants Rates) are an appropriate method of funding operating costs for this activity. |

| The costs and benefits of funding the activity distinctly from other activities | The benefit of funding community grants is that the organisations are providing services that of benefit to the whole District. Therefore the activity is funded by way of Community, Parks and Reserves, Buildings and Grants Rates. |

| The extent to which the actions or inaction of particular individuals or a group contribute to the need to undertake the activity | The Council undertakes the activity to allow Waimakariri District residents to enjoy access to a wide range of cultural and social activities. |

| Period in which the benefits are expected to occur | The community grants provide ongoing benefit to the community. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Operating Expenditure</th>
<th>Targeted Rates (Community, Parks &amp; Reserves, Buildings &amp; Grants Charge) 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditure</td>
<td>(i) Targeted Rates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Conveniences
The Council provides conveniences at 43 sites throughout the District. This is to meet the expectations of visitors and residents that essential facilities are available in major reserves and central business areas.

| Community outcomes | There is a safe environment for all. |
| Impact on the community | Our community’s needs for health and social services are met. |
| Distribution of Benefits | Provision of adequate Public Conveniences impacts on the community. |
| The costs and benefits of funding the activity distinctly from other activities | The Council considers that the benefits of providing public conveniences are to the public at large, which recognises the wider community benefits of the activity and in particular, visitors to the District. Funding is by way of General Rates charged 95% as a Uniform Annual General Charge and 5% as a rate in the dollar and any capital expenditure will be undertaken through loans or accumulated funds. |
| The extent to which the actions or inaction of particular individuals or a group contribute to the need to undertake the activity | The benefit of funding Public Conveniences distinctly is that appropriate levels of user charges can be identified to match the individual benefit received. The Council considers that the most appropriate way of funding the activity is by way of General Rates which recognises the wider community benefits of the activity. |
| While there are benefits to individuals who use the facilities, any fall-off in use through the introduction of a charging system may not achieve the desired community benefits. It is considered appropriate for this activity to be funded through general rates and uniform annual general charges. |
REVENUE AND FINANCING POLICY

Period in which the benefits are expected to occur

The Public Conveniences that are being built over the next 10 years will provide long-term benefit to the Community. The duration of benefits are anticipated to be a minimum of 40 years.

For capital costs the Council will apply any accumulated funds arising from funding depreciation to the capital cost. Further capital costs are to be funded from borrowing with rates set at a level to cover interest costs and loan repayments. It is considered that borrowing is the appropriate funding method that will most efficiently achieve intergenerational equity.

Funding Operating Expenditure

General Rates 5%
Uniform Annual General Charge 95%
(i) Accumulated funds if applicable
(ii) Loans

Funding Capital Expenditure

Libraries and Museums

The service is provided from libraries in Kaiapoi, Rangiora and Oxford. This activity is discretionary - there are no legal requirements for the Council to provide this service.

There is however an expectation within the community that this is necessary. The library service provides benefits to both individuals and the community.

The Council also pays a levy to the Canterbury Museum for ongoing operations and the Museum's redevelopment programme.

The Canterbury Museum development levies will be funded with the use of borrowing.

Comment

The Community Libraries and Museums Rate and Canterbury Museum levies are both set as a fixed charge per separately used and inhabited part of a rating unit used for residential purposes and each rating unit used for business purposes.

Libraries

10% community
90% individuals

Canterbury Museum Levy

100% community N/A

Funding

General Rates - Capital Value Nil Nil
Targeted Rates Yes Yes
Fees and Charges Nil Nil
Interest and Dividends from Investments Yes Nil
Borrowing Yes Yes
Proceeds from Asset Sales Nil Nil
Development Contributions Nil Nil
Financial Contributions under the Resource Management Act 1991 Nil Nil
Grants and Subsidies Nil Nil
Other Nil Nil

The Council Rates are set at a level to recover the depreciation related to the Council’s future asset replacement costs. The cash received is applied only to assets that are replaced.

The costs of the Canterbury Museum development levy, a Canterbury Museum development project, which is expected to commence in the later part of the LTP is not included in this amount. The funding basis of this development levy is likely to be loan, with rates funding to cover the repayment costs.
| Community outcomes | Businesses in the District are diverse, adaptable and growing.  
The community's cultures, arts and heritage are conserved and celebrated.  
People have wide ranging opportunities for learning and being informed.  
People are friendly and caring, creating a strong sense of community in our District. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on the community.</td>
<td>The provision of libraries contributes to the wellbeing of the community by providing individuals with the opportunity to enhance their mental wellbeing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Distribution of Benefits | The benefits potentially apply to the whole community as libraries provide individuals with the opportunity to develop a lifestyle that enhances their mental wellbeing. Membership figures from the library indicate that library users are evenly spread throughout the District in close proportion to population.  
The Canterbury Museum provides benefits to all people in Canterbury. There is no admission charge and costs are primarily recovered from contributing councils. The benefit applies to all people within the District. The Council has set a Canterbury Museum levy rate, which is a fixed amount targeted to all properties in the District with a residential or commercial use. |
| The costs and benefits of funding the activity distinctly from other activities | There is a benefit to individuals that use the library services. However, the Council considers that there are wide community benefits from ensuring only minimal charges are imposed thereby encouraging community use that may not occur if significant user charges were imposed.  
Accordingly, the Council considers that the majority of the cost should be targeted rate funded (by way of Community Libraries and Museums Rate which is charged to all properties with a residential or commercial use) with the balance being collected from user charges.  
Therefore libraries are funded by a mixture of targeted rates and user charges.  
The Canterbury Museum is accessible to all people in the District and a fixed amount per rating unit or separately used and inhabited part of a rating unit is seen as the fairest mechanism to allocate the cost. |
| The extent to which the actions or inaction of particular individuals or a group contribute to the need to undertake the activity | The Council undertakes the activity to help to ensure that the community has access to a broad range of recreational, arts cultural and social opportunities.  
It is considered appropriate for this activity to be funded through the Community Libraries & Museums Rate and a targeted rate. |
| Period in which the benefits are expected to occur | The existing facilities will be of long-term benefit to the community.  
For renewal capital costs the Council will apply any accumulated funds arising from funding depreciation to the renewal capital cost. Further capital costs are to be funded from borrowing with rates set at a level to cover interest costs and loan repayments. It is considered that borrowing is the appropriate funding method that will most efficiently achieve intergenerational equity.  
For extensions required to libraries to cater for growth a development contribution is sought from each new lot created within the District. |
| Funding Library Operating Expenditure Capital Expenditure | Targeted Rates (Community Libraries & Museums Rate) 94-95%  
User charges 5-6%  
Accumulated funds: if applicable  
Development contributions: Targeted Rates - Museum Levies 100%
**Community outcomes**

Our community’s needs for health and social services are met. People have wide ranging opportunities for learning and being informed. People are friendly and caring, creating a strong sense of community in our District.

**Impact on the community**

Significant impact on the community.

**Distribution of Benefits**

Community Development is considered to benefit the community as a whole. This is funded by way of a Uniform Annual General Charge.

**The costs and benefits of funding the activity distinctly from other activities**

For transparency and accountability of the costs associated with Community Development have been separated. Central government agencies fund safer communities and Youth Development initiatives. The Council’s contribution relates to the provision of accommodation.

**The extent to which the actions or inaction of particular individuals or a group contribute to the need to undertake the activity**

N/A
Period in which the benefits are expected to occur  
Community Development will provide ongoing benefit to the District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Operating Expenditure</th>
<th>Safer Communities and Youth Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating</th>
<th>Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,248,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Operating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Development</th>
<th>General Rates</th>
<th>98%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Rates</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Rates</td>
<td>15-18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Subsidies</td>
<td>82-85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community Housing**

The Council manages and maintains 112 elderly person housing units, seven community houses and three other rentals.

In recent times, these units have been substantially upgraded. Subsidies are sometimes available for particular capital works.

Community outcomes  
Our community’s needs for health and social services are met. People are friendly and caring, creating a strong sense of community in our District.

Impact on the community  
Significant impact on the social well-being of the community.

Distribution of Benefits  
While past Councils have recognised this need, the benefits are to the individual occupier, with no need for subsidy from the general ratepayer.

The costs and benefits of funding the activity distinctly from other activities  
Appropriate rentals are set to recover the costs associated with providing community housing. The Council recovers costs and makes no return on its capital investment. To achieve this all of these costs need to be separately identified. This allows transparency and accountability for this activity.
The extent to which the actions or inaction of particular individuals or a group contribute to the need to undertake the activity

Elderly people who have a need for assistance with accommodation creates the need to undertake this activity.

Period in which the benefits are expected to occur

The community housing units are maintained to a high standard to provide an ongoing service where capital expenditure is required it will be funded from accumulated funds and borrowing.

Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Expenditure</th>
<th>Capital Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>User charges</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Accumulated funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Loans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Subsidies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building Control**

The objective is the control of building work within the District, including the processing of building consents, provision of Project Information Memoranda, (PIMs) site inspections and the issue of code compliance certificates and building warrants of fitness and holding property records. The cost of this service is funded by user fees.

The residual activities undertaken by the Council are the provision of PIMs and issuing and recording consents. These are also funded by the users of the service.

The follow-up on public enquiries and complaints is funded by General Rates.

**Civil Defence and Emergency Management**

The Council is required to have a current Civil Defence Emergency Management Plan to allow for an effective response to natural disasters. Costs are associated with organising and training volunteers and preparation of a coordinating centre in the event of an emergency.

This is a statutory requirement and the benefits of being prepared are spread across the whole community. Funding is therefore provided from a General Rate on capital value on the basis that the Civil Defence Emergency Management activity is primarily concerned with the safety of the community and therefore a General Rate as a rate in the dollar on capital value best reflects the community benefits.

**Environmental Health**

This function provides for a monitoring and regulatory service to assist in the health, safety and wellbeing of the community. These include requirements under the Health Act 1956. For some functions, legislation restrains or limits the amount of user charges. Funding from user charges is maximised within these limits.

There is considered to be individual benefits for operators being able to show their customers that their premises meet required standards. The community, as a whole, benefits through control of infectious diseases and monitoring of environmental standards. The community beneficiaries are the collective population and visitors to the District.

The activity also undertakes other functions as a statutory requirement where there is limited or no power to recover the full costs.

These include:
- Dangerous Goods Licences
- Amusement Device Inspections
- Building Warrants of Fitness
• Swimming Pool Fences
• Car Parking enforcement.

For these services, while the user is identified and licence fees are charged, non-recoverable costs are met by a General Rates rate in the dollar, on the capital value, which best reflects the benefits provided to the community.

**Cemeteries**
The Council is required by the Burial and Cremation Act 1964 to establish and maintain a suitable cemetery where sufficient provision is not otherwise made for the burial of the bodies of persons dying within its District.

The service has been identified as providing three core functions
• burial of bodies
• amenity area for relatives, friends and the public
• public record of genealogy information.

There is a community expectation that these facilities be maintained to a good standard.

The Council currently administers five public cemeteries. This service is considered to have a mixture of community and individual benefits.

**Community benefits**
• Maintaining a green space
• Health
• Cultural significance.

There is a market limit on what can be charged. Statistics indicate that approximately 75% of people in Canterbury choose cremation. There is limited ability to charge for future maintenance costs. For individual benefits the Council considers that the best way of recovering the costs is through a Uniform Annual General Charge that better reflects the benefits received by individuals.
Animal Control
This activity includes dog control and stock control. Dog control is undertaken under the Dog Control Act 1996, the Impounding Act 1955 and Council Bylaws. The services include registration of ownership (dogs), educating the public and responding to complaints. Revenue through registration and impounding recovers all costs.

Stock control involves dealing primarily with wandering stock in the rural areas.

While some costs can be recovered through sale of stock or recovery from the stock owners, the balance will be recovered through a targeted rate from properties in the Residential 4A, 4B and rural zones.

### Community outcomes
- There is a safe environment for all.
- Businesses in the District are diverse, adaptable and growing.
- There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all.

### Impact on the community
Significant impact on the community, through maintaining readiness to respond to adverse events, assisting with the health, safety and wellbeing of the community and the control of building work in the District.

### Distribution of Benefits
Building Control activity provides the majority of benefits to those applying for building consents, although there is some public benefit through the activity to maintain public safety, which is recovered through the General Rates rate on capital value.

Civil Defence activities are considered to provide public benefit, received by the community as a whole, therefore the costs are recovered from General Rates rate on capital value that reflects the benefit to community.

The community are the main beneficiaries of Environmental Services, through control of infectious diseases and monitoring of environmental standards, although because charges are set under statute the full cost of the activity cannot be recovered, therefore recovery is required through rates. The Council considers that the most appropriate means of recovery is by way of a General Rate on capital value. Functions performed under the Sale of Liquor Act benefit individuals.

### Operating Capital Costs (excluding GST – from 2017/18 Annual Plan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Operating</th>
<th>Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Control</td>
<td>5,473,000</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Defence</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Health</td>
<td>1,365,000</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>88,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td>536,000</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Control</td>
<td>90% individual, 10% community \ 90% individual, 10% community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Defence</td>
<td>50% individual, 50% community \ 50% individual, 50% community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Services</td>
<td>60% individual, 40% community \ 60% individual, 40% community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>25% individual, 75% community \ 25% individual, 75% community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td>10% individual, 90% community \ 10% individual, 90% community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Operating</th>
<th>Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Rates</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Rates - Stock Control</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees and Charges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and Dividends from Investments</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from Asset Sales</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Contributions</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Contributions under the Resource Management Act 1991</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Subsidies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guidance: The Council Rates are set at a level to recover the depreciation related to the Council’s future asset replacement costs. The cash received is applied only to assets that are replaced.
Distribution of Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Funding Operating</th>
<th>Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Rates</td>
<td>6-9%</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Charges</td>
<td>91-94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidies</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Defence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Rates</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Charges</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidies</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Rates</td>
<td>91-92%</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Charges</td>
<td>8-9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidies</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Control</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Rates</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Charges</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The maintenance of Cemeteries is considered to be a community benefit and burial and records to be an individual benefit. The community benefit component is recovered by way of a Uniform Annual General Charge.

The benefits of Dog Control are considered to be largely to the community, through protection of the public. Private individuals benefit through administration of the registration system and returning lost or strayed animals. While there are community benefits, the Council considers that the exacerbator should fund this activity and therefore the community benefit is to be funded by registration fees.

There are community and individual benefits from Animal Control – community benefits accrue by way of public safety, while individual benefits accrue through returning wandering stock. Where stock is returned the owner is charged or stock is sold to recover the costs. However, this only funds about 10% of the cost. The Council considers that the balance should be recovered by a targeted rate on all rating units in the Residential 4A, 4B and Rural Zones.

The costs and benefits of funding the activity distinctly from other activities

For transparency and accountability the costs associated with health and wellbeing have been separated.

The protection of the community from aggressive or straying animals allows owners to enjoy their pets. Exacerbators should fund control incidents.

The users of the Building Consent services are identifiable, receiving an individual service. The processing and administration of building consents is recovered by way of user charges.

The provision of Project Information Memoranda (PIMs) and issuing and recording consents are also funded by the users of the service.

Persons or organisations requiring licensing and monitoring under the Sale of Liquor Act should fund the cost of this regulatory work.

User charges are in place to fund all of these activities.

Period in which the benefits are expected to occur

These activities will provide ongoing benefit to the Community by assisting the development of a safe community.
## Property Management

The Council manages Forestry plantations on Reserves, Domains and for the protection of the coastal zone.

### Costs (excluding GST – from 2018/19 Long Term Plan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Operating</th>
<th>Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>$588,000</td>
<td>$239,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>$202,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Operating</th>
<th>Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>100% individual</td>
<td>100% individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>100% community</td>
<td>100% community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Operating</th>
<th>Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Rates</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Rates</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees and Charges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and Dividends from Investments</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from Asset Sales</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Contributions</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Contributions under the Resource Management Act 1991</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Subsidies</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community outcomes

There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all.

### Impact on the community

Positive impacts on the community and insofar as property holdings relate to the future needs of Council activities and the current needs of occupiers, in a minor way property relates to all four wellbeings.

### Distribution of Benefits

The benefits are to the individual occupier or user, with no need for subsidy from the general ratepayer.

### The costs and benefits of funding the activity distinctly from other activities

Appropriate rentals are set to recover the costs associated with providing commercial property. To achieve cost recovery, costs need to be separately identified. This allows transparency and accountability for this activity.

### The extent to which the actions or inaction of particular individuals or a group contribute to the need to undertake the activity

The protection of the coastal zone and key recreational areas from erosion and adverse weather. Provision for activity expansion, for example areas to meet future recreational needs.

### Period in which the benefits are expected to occur

Property and Forestry assets are maintained to appropriate standards to provide an ongoing service. Where capital expenditure is required it will be funded from accumulated funds and borrowing.

### Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Operating Expenditure</th>
<th>Capital Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>User charges</td>
<td>(i) Accumulated funds:</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Loans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Funding Impact Statement

Funding impact statement
The funding impact statement is required under the Local Government Act 2002 Schedule and conforms to the Local Government (Financial Reporting) Regulations 2011. General accepted accounting practice does not apply to the preparation of the funding impact statement as stated in s111(2) of the Local Government Act.

Reconciliation between the surplus in the prospective statement of revenue and expense and surplus (deficit) of operating funding in the funding impact statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SURPLUS / (DEFICIT) OF OPERATING FUNDING</td>
<td>8,542</td>
<td>5,957</td>
<td>7,324</td>
<td>8,715</td>
<td>10,481</td>
<td>13,464</td>
<td>15,653</td>
<td>17,221</td>
<td>18,664</td>
<td>21,086</td>
<td>23,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add items in capital funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidies for capital</td>
<td>18,662</td>
<td>10,744</td>
<td>8,229</td>
<td>2,757</td>
<td>3,220</td>
<td>3,181</td>
<td>4,844</td>
<td>5,101</td>
<td>4,890</td>
<td>4,920</td>
<td>3,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance proceeds - capital</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development contributions</td>
<td>14,051</td>
<td>14,503</td>
<td>14,340</td>
<td>13,857</td>
<td>13,842</td>
<td>12,994</td>
<td>11,325</td>
<td>8,912</td>
<td>8,287</td>
<td>6,658</td>
<td>5,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add non-cash items in P&amp;L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vested assets</td>
<td>27,530</td>
<td>17,497</td>
<td>16,547</td>
<td>13,628</td>
<td>13,632</td>
<td>12,783</td>
<td>11,946</td>
<td>11,965</td>
<td>10,271</td>
<td>10,287</td>
<td>10,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gains on sale</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less depreciation</td>
<td>(15,423)</td>
<td>(18,862)</td>
<td>(20,018)</td>
<td>(20,878)</td>
<td>(21,587)</td>
<td>(22,238)</td>
<td>(22,997)</td>
<td>(23,914)</td>
<td>(24,726)</td>
<td>(25,412)</td>
<td>(26,227)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET SURPLUS (DEFICIT) BEFORE TAXATION</td>
<td>54,041</td>
<td>29,983</td>
<td>26,485</td>
<td>18,152</td>
<td>19,665</td>
<td>20,263</td>
<td>20,855</td>
<td>19,376</td>
<td>17,485</td>
<td>17,646</td>
<td>16,573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Funding Impact Statement for the Ten Years starting 2015/16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$’000</td>
<td>$’000</td>
<td>$’000</td>
<td>$’000</td>
<td>$’000</td>
<td>$’000</td>
<td>$’000</td>
<td>$’000</td>
<td>$’000</td>
<td>$’000</td>
<td>$’000</td>
<td>$’000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Rates, uniform annual general charges, rates penalties</strong></td>
<td>27,885</td>
<td>30,651</td>
<td>33,107</td>
<td>34,749</td>
<td>36,815</td>
<td>38,825</td>
<td>41,063</td>
<td>44,166</td>
<td>46,969</td>
<td>50,109</td>
<td>52,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Targeted Rates</strong></td>
<td>18,061</td>
<td>18,215</td>
<td>21,171</td>
<td>25,222</td>
<td>27,656</td>
<td>28,689</td>
<td>29,628</td>
<td>31,148</td>
<td>32,336</td>
<td>33,593</td>
<td>35,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subsidies and grants for operating purposes</strong></td>
<td>2,346</td>
<td>2,753</td>
<td>2,731</td>
<td>2,889</td>
<td>3,089</td>
<td>3,129</td>
<td>3,317</td>
<td>3,570</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>3,648</td>
<td>3,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fees and charges</strong></td>
<td>15,414</td>
<td>16,104</td>
<td>15,091</td>
<td>15,532</td>
<td>15,788</td>
<td>15,969</td>
<td>16,375</td>
<td>16,826</td>
<td>17,306</td>
<td>17,805</td>
<td>18,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest and dividends from investments</strong></td>
<td>836</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>1,066</td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td>1,277</td>
<td>1,414</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>1,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local authorities fuel tax, fines, infringement fees, and other receipts</strong></td>
<td>3,573</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OPERATING FUNDING</strong></td>
<td>68,115</td>
<td>69,610</td>
<td>75,978</td>
<td>79,961</td>
<td>83,765</td>
<td>87,358</td>
<td>91,398</td>
<td>96,122</td>
<td>101,112</td>
<td>106,305</td>
<td>110,277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Applications of operating funding

| Payments to staff and suppliers | 53,317                     | 56,917                   | 60,129    | 61,861    | 63,678    | 64,327    | 65,809    | 67,978    | 71,224    | 74,169    | 75,558    |
| Finance costs                   | 6,256                      | 6,736                    | 8,525     | 9,385     | 9,606     | 9,936     | 10,923    | 11,224    | 11,050    | 11,438    |            |
| Other operating funding applications | -                         | -                       | -        | -         | -         | -         | -         | -         | -         | -         | -         |
| **TOTAL APPLICATIONS OF OPERATING FUNDING** | 59,573                     | 63,653                   | 68,654    | 71,246    | 73,284    | 78,901    | 82,448    | 85,219    | 86,996    |            |            |

**SURPLUS / (DEFICIT) OF OPERATING FUNDING**

| 8,542                      | 5,957                      | 7,324                   | 8,715     | 10,481    | 13,464    | 15,653    | 17,221    | 18,664    | 21,086    | 23,281    |            |

### Sources of capital funding

| Subsidies and grants for capital expenditure | 18,662                     | 10,744                   | 8,229     | 2,757     | 3,220     | 3,181     | 4,844     | 5,101     | 4,890     | 4,920     | 3,718     |
| Development and financial Contributions     | 14,052                     | 14,503                   | 14,340    | 13,857    | 13,842    | 12,994    | 11,325    | 8,912     | 2,827     | 6,658     | 1,866     |
| Increase (decrease) in debt                  | 59,083                     | 31,071                   | 22,547    | 3,321     | 3,278     | (4,468)   | 15,494    | 13,986    | (5,005)   | (211)     | 11,799    |
| Gross Proceeds from sale of assets           | 745                        | 745                      | 178       | 182       | 187       | 192       | 197       | 203       | 216       | 223       |            |
| Lump sum contributions                       | -                          | -                        | -        | -         | -         | -         | -         | -         | -         | -         | -         |
| Other dedicated capital funding              | 535                        | -                        | -        | -         | -         | -         | -         | -         | -         | -         | -         |
| **TOTAL SOURCES OF CAPITAL FUNDING**         | 93,077                     | 57,063                   | 45,094    | 20,117    | 20,527    | 11,899    | 31,860    | 28,202    | 8,381     | 11,583    | 17,626    |

### Applications of capital funding

**Capital expenditure**

- to meet additional demand
- to improve the level of service
- to replace existing assets
- Increase (decrease) in reserves
- Increase (decrease) in investments

| 47,625                      | 17,413                     | 20,880                   | 12,545    | 11,978    | 9,857     | 12,108    | 13,894    | 8,901     | 12,115    | 20,574    |            |
| 31,238                     | 15,301                     | 8,574                    | 5,439     | 8,958     | 6,420     | 22,798    | 18,765    | 5,936     | 6,948     | 8,995     |            |
| 44,566                     | 32,003                     | 21,860                   | 11,732    | 10,403    | 13,387    | 11,841    | 12,372    | 12,216    | 12,645    | 11,860    |            |
| (21,800)                   | (2,194)                    | 946                      | (937)     | (384)     | (4,301)   | 518       | 392       | (8)       | 961       | (711)     |            |
| Increase (decrease) in investments | -                          | 497                      | 358       | 53        | 52        | -         | 248       | -         | -         | 189       |            |
| **TOTAL APPLICATIONS OF CAPITAL FUNDING**    | 101,619                    | 63,020                   | 52,418    | 28,832    | 31,008    | 25,363    | 47,513    | 45,423    | 27,045    | 32,669    | 40,907    |

**SURPLUS / (DEFICIT) OF CAPITAL FUNDING**

| (8,542)                     | (5,957)                    | (7,324)                  | (8,715)   | (10,481)  | (13,464)  | (15,653)  | (17,221)  | (18,664)  | (21,086)  | (23,281)  |            |

**FUNDING BALANCE**

| -                            | -                          | -                        | -         | -         | -         | -         | -         | -         | -         | -         | -         |
Particulars of the Rating System

General Rates

The Council sets its General Rate using a Uniform Annual General Charge, assessed on each rating unit, with the balance collected on the capital value of all rating units in the District. The calculation of the Uniform Annual General Charge is based on the General Rate activities that provide benefit to individuals. The balance is collected by a rate in the dollar of capital value based on the functions that provide community-wide benefit or benefit primarily to property. For a full explanation of the basis of the calculation, refer to the Revenue and Financing Policy.

There are no differentials on the General Rate.

The Council sets targeted rates under Section’s 16-19 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 and the purposes for them are summarised in The Detailed Rating Schedule. The Detailed Rating Schedule sets out the targeted rating mechanism selected, the basis for the calculation and the amount of rates to be collected.

The Council utilises differential rates for its Community Parks and Reserves, Buildings and Grants, Rates, the Water Race Rate, the Kaiapoi Urban Drainage Rate and some water rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATE AND DIFFERENTIAL CATEGORIES</th>
<th>OBJECTIVE OF DIFFERENTIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks and Reserves, Buildings and Grants differential according to where the land is situated and the use to which the land is put - to separately used or inhabited parts of rating units that are used for residential purposes and rating units that are used for business purposes. The following differential categories apply:</td>
<td>This differential was set to reflect the higher level of service that exists for reserves, particularly the provision of neighbourhood reserves in the five main towns. The differential reflects the cost of maintaining neighbourhood reserves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1</td>
<td>There are three levels of charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Residential which includes all those rating units located in the towns of Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, Oxford or Pegasus that are used for residential purposes.</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2</td>
<td>This is set and assessed on all rating units in the Town Vacant category and contributes partly to the Level 3 charge. This meets the cost of providing neighbourhood reserves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Commercial which includes all those rating units located in the towns of Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, Oxford or Pegasus that are used for business purposes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### RATE AND DIFFERENTIAL CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 3</th>
<th>Objective of Differential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town Vacant which includes all those rating units located in the towns of Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, Oxford or Pegasus on which there are no improvements as defined in the Rating Valuations Act 1998 or the improvements do not fit into Categories 1 and 2 above.</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Residential which includes all those rating units located outside the towns of Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, Oxford or Pegasus that are used for residential purposes.</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Commercial which includes all those rating units located outside the towns of Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, Oxford or Pegasus that are used for business purposes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Definitions

Town boundaries for Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, Oxford and Pegasus are illustrated on Rating Policy Maps 1-4. The Rural Commercial and Rural Residential categories comprise the area of the District not included Rating Policy Maps 1-4.
### RATE AND DIFFERENTIAL CATEGORIES

| Category 1 | Rating units with an unrestricted connection to an “on-demand” supply. This differential is set as a fixed amount per separately used or inhabited part of rating units or per rating unit, depending on the scheme. |
| Category 2 | Rating units with a restricted connection to an “on-demand” supply. There is a differential for some “on-demand” water supplies based on the provision and availability of a restricted supply service. |

### OBJECTIVE OF DIFFERENTIAL

| The differential recognises that rating units provided with a restricted connection to an “on-demand” water scheme do not have access to the same amount of water as rating units with an unrestricted connection to the same scheme. |
| Rating units that are provided with an unrestricted connection to an “on-demand” water scheme pay 100% of the fixed rate for that scheme. (either on a per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit or per rating unit basis.) |
| Rating units provided with a restricted connection to an “on-demand” water scheme pay 40% of the fixed rate for each unit of water supplied (note – 1 unit of water equates to 1,000 litres per day). |

A differential rate is in place for the Tuahiwi water loan rates that are set as a fixed amount on rating units in the Tuahiwi residential area serviced by the Woodend-Tuahiwi water supply. The differential is based on the provision or availability of the service.

The Tuahiwi residential water area is defined on Rating Policy Map 45.

### Category 1

Rating units located inside the Tuahiwi residential water area that are connected to the Woodend-Tuahiwi water supply.

### Category 2

Rating units located inside the Tuahiwi residential water area that are not connected to the Woodend-Tuahiwi water supply.

Loan rates are not set on rating units where a lump sum contribution to meet the capital cost of the water reticulation has been paid.

The cost of installing the reticulation to the Tuahiwi residential area is met by all rating units within that area.

A higher rate is set on rating units that are connected to the water supply to meet the cost of property connections.
The targeted rates for Water Races include a rate on land area and an amount per rating unit that is collected using a differential based on land area on rating units that have access to the water race network, (provision or availability of a service). There are two categories of fixed charge.

**Category 1**
Properties with a land area over .4046ha.

**Category 2**
Properties with a land area equal to or less than .4046ha.

The introduction of a fixed charge for water race rates caused some hardship to smaller properties. The differential of $5.00 was introduced to ease the burden on residential sections that had access to the races but do not place a high demand on the service.

Rating units with a land area equal to or less than .4046ha pay a fixed charge of $85.00.

Rating units with a land area in excess of .4046ha pay a fixed charge of $90.00.

The Kaiapoi Urban Drainage rate levied on rateable land value has a differential scheme based on where the land is situated. There are two differential categories.

**Category 1**
Area inside the Kaiapoi Urban Drainage Targeted Rating Area that is not situated in the Rural zone of the Waimakariri District Council Operative District Plan.

**Category 2**
Area inside the Kaiapoi Urban Drainage Targeted Rating Area situated in the Rural zone of the Waimakariri District Council Operative District Plan.

The boundary of the Kaiapoi Urban Drainage Targeted Rating Area is shown on Rating Policy map 15.

Rural zoned properties receive a lower level of service due to not being developed to urban standards eg no formed kerb and channel. Generally the larger property size would result in a higher rate being paid on a land value base.

The council calculated that a differential rate of 50% would be appropriate and reflect the level of service received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RATE AND DIFFERENTIAL CATEGORIES</strong></th>
<th><strong>OBJECTIVE OF DIFFERENTIAL</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The targeted rates for Water Races include a rate on land area and an amount per rating unit that is collected using a differential based on land area on rating units that have access to the water race network, (provision or availability of a service). There are two categories of fixed charge. <strong>Category 1</strong> Properties with a land area over .4046ha. <strong>Category 2</strong> Properties with a land area equal to or less than .4046ha.</td>
<td>The introduction of a fixed charge for water race rates caused some hardship to smaller properties. The differential of $5.00 was introduced to ease the burden on residential sections that had access to the races but do not place a high demand on the service. Rating units with a land area equal to or less than .4046ha pay a fixed charge of $85.00. Rating units with a land area in excess of .4046ha pay a fixed charge of $90.00.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Kaiapoi Urban Drainage rate levied on rateable land value has a differential scheme based on where the land is situated. There are two differential categories. <strong>Category 1</strong> Area inside the Kaiapoi Urban Drainage Targeted Rating Area that is not situated in the Rural zone of the Waimakariri District Council Operative District Plan. <strong>Category 2</strong> Area inside the Kaiapoi Urban Drainage Targeted Rating Area situated in the Rural zone of the Waimakariri District Council Operative District Plan. The boundary of the Kaiapoi Urban Drainage Targeted Rating Area is shown on Rating Policy map 15.</td>
<td>Rural zoned properties receive a lower level of service due to not being developed to urban standards eg no formed kerb and channel. Generally the larger property size would result in a higher rate being paid on a land value base. The council calculated that a differential rate of 50% would be appropriate and reflect the level of service received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Definitions

1 Business Purposes
Business purposes means rating units where there are any or all of the following:
- Business operations are carried out on the property
- Purpose built buildings or modified premises for the purpose of carrying out business
- Resource consents, Building consents or licences relating to business activity
- Advertising business services on the property, or through the media identifying the property as a place of business
- The property has a traffic flow greater than would be expected from a private residence.
This definition does not include rating units used primarily for farming or other forms of primary production or on rating units for utility network purposes, but only to the extent that the unit is used solely for primary production or utility network purposes.

2 Differential Rates
Rates are set and assessed on a differential basis when the rates in respect of any one or more specified types or groups of property vary from the rates in respect of other types or groups of property. Schedule 2 of the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 contains the matters that may be used as the basis for differential rating.

3 Rates assessed per unit of water
Where targeted rates are shown as being assessed per unit of water, this is based on an annual allocation of water. 1 unit = 1000 litres/day. Rating units receiving a restricted supply are assessed at the start of the rating year to receive a certain number of units during the year. Supplies are limited by a restrictor on the property boundary that delivers the allocated amount of water. Wamakariri water rates are not assessed on actual use measured by a water meter.

4 Residential Purposes
Residential purposes includes any separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit that is used as a dwelling.
5 Separately Used or Inhabited Parts of a Rating Unit (SUIP)

Includes any portion inhabited or used by [the owner/a person other than the owner], and who has the right to use or inhabit that portion by virtue of a tenancy, lease, licence, or other agreement.

This definition includes separately used parts, whether or not actually occupied at any particular time, which are used by the owner for rental (or other form of occupation) on an occasional or long term basis by someone other than the owner.

For the purpose of this definition, vacant land and vacant premises offered or intended for use or habitation by a person other than the owner and usually used as such are defined as “used”.

For the avoidance of doubt, a rating unit that has a single use or occupation is treated as having one separately used or inhabited part.

Examples of separately used or inhabited parts include: Each flat within a block of flats, or each shop within a block of shops. The same applies to a rating unit with more than one dwelling, unless the second dwelling is a granny flat occupied by a member of the ratepayers household or the second dwelling is not let or available to be let.

For the purposes of the Kerbside Refuse and Recycling Collection Rates, the definition of a SUIP does not include individual units in a motel complex. Multiple motel units comprise one SUIP. Any areas for managers accommodation, office or restaurant facilities are separate SUIPs.

Targeted Rating Areas

Where targeted rates are assessed by situation, Rating Policy maps illustrate the location where the targeted rate applies. Rating Policy maps are available at Council Service Centres or at waimakariri.gov.nz

Lump Sum Contributions

The Council will only accept lump sum contributions in respect of the Oxford Sewer Loan Rates and Southbrook Services Extension Stage 1 Loan Rate.
## Detailed Rating Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Schedule 2</th>
<th>Factors of Liability Schedule 3</th>
<th>Factor Quantity</th>
<th>2016/17 Rate/Charge (GST at 15%)</th>
<th>2017/18 Rate/Charge (GST at 15%)</th>
<th>Revenue expected 2017/18 $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL RATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Annual General Charge</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Rating unit</td>
<td>24,930</td>
<td>102.00</td>
<td>120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General rate in the dollar</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Capital value</td>
<td>15,443,778,400</td>
<td>0.000431</td>
<td>0.000385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EARTHQUAKE RECOVERY RATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Charge</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Rating unit</td>
<td>24,930</td>
<td>39.03</td>
<td>43.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds earthquake recovery and repairs to council property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROADING RATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Charge</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Rating unit</td>
<td>24,930</td>
<td>95.77</td>
<td>96.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roading rate in the dollar</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Capital value</td>
<td>15,443,778,400</td>
<td>0.000700</td>
<td>0.000626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision and maintenance of the roading network. Traffic management and road safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNITY SERVICES RATES -</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Reserves, Buildings and Grants Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town - Residential</td>
<td>Situation/use</td>
<td>Sep used/inhab</td>
<td>13,944</td>
<td>465.50</td>
<td>468.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Commercial</td>
<td>Rating unit</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>465.50</td>
<td>468.70</td>
<td>247,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Vacant</td>
<td>Situation/use</td>
<td>Rating unit</td>
<td>1,487</td>
<td>58.70</td>
<td>58.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural - Residential</td>
<td>Situation/use</td>
<td>Sep used/inhab</td>
<td>8,010</td>
<td>406.80</td>
<td>410.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Commercial</td>
<td>Rating unit</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>406.80</td>
<td>410.00</td>
<td>31,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds distinct parks and reserves, community buildings and community grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Library And Museums Rate</td>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Sep used/inhab</td>
<td>22,558</td>
<td>172.25</td>
<td>181.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing library facilities and resources and local museums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Swimming Pools Rate</td>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Sep used/inhab</td>
<td>22,558</td>
<td>164.24</td>
<td>152.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds the net cost of operating the district aquatic facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Detailed Rating Schedule (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Schedule 2</th>
<th>Factors of Liability Schedule 3</th>
<th>Factor Quantity</th>
<th>2016/17 Rate/Charge (GST at 15%)</th>
<th>2017/18 Rate/Charge (GST at 15%)</th>
<th>Revenue expected 2017/18 $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CANTERBURY MUSEUM RATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Museum Operational Levy Rate</td>
<td>- Commercial</td>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Rating unit</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>27.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Residential</td>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Sep used/inhab</td>
<td>21,956</td>
<td>27.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Museum Redevelopment Levy</td>
<td>- Commercial</td>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Rating unit</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>- Residential</td>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Sep used/inhab</td>
<td>21,956</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Waimakariri Share of the Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum annual operating and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>redevelopment levies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DISTRICT WIDE RATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thongcaster Road &amp; Browns Rock Road</td>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Rating unit</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>354.39</td>
<td>354.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seal Extension Loan Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barkers Road Seal Extension Rate</td>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Rating unit</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>232.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds the private share of seal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extension work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Services Rate</td>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Rating unit</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>63.88</td>
<td>63.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution towards the cost of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>street trees at Pegasus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANIMAL CONTROL (STOCK) RATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock Control - Residential 4A, 4B &amp;</td>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Capital value</td>
<td>7,543,022,750</td>
<td>0.000007</td>
<td>0.000007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Zones in the Waimakariri District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council District Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost of stock control (other than</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dogs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNITY BOARD RATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi board</td>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Capital value</td>
<td>2,897,007,900</td>
<td>0.000007</td>
<td>0.000009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi board</td>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Rating unit</td>
<td>6,182</td>
<td>23.59</td>
<td>17.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora-Ashley board</td>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Capital value</td>
<td>5,806,368,000</td>
<td>0.000006</td>
<td>0.000007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora-Ashley board</td>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Rating unit</td>
<td>10,045</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>17.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend-Sefton board</td>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Capital value</td>
<td>1,781,079,800</td>
<td>0.000011</td>
<td>0.000013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend-Sefton board</td>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Rating unit</td>
<td>3,763</td>
<td>20.96</td>
<td>25.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford-Ohoka board</td>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Capital value</td>
<td>4,465,592,700</td>
<td>0.000003</td>
<td>0.000006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford-Ohoka board</td>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Rating unit</td>
<td>4,745</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>23.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds the operating cost of Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Detailed Rating Schedule (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Schedule 2</th>
<th>Factors of Liability Schedule 3</th>
<th>Factor Quantity</th>
<th>2016/17 Rate/Charge (GST at 15%)</th>
<th>2017/18 Rate/Charge (GST at 15%)</th>
<th>Revenue expected 2017/18 $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROMOTION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT RATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Properties</td>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Capital value</td>
<td>659,236,500</td>
<td>0.00029</td>
<td>0.00028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of district and events promotion and economic development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICTS AREA MAINTENANCE AND STREET WORKS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Area Maintenance</td>
<td>Situation/use</td>
<td>Capital value</td>
<td>219,840,000</td>
<td>0.0001573</td>
<td>0.0001352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Area Maintenance</td>
<td>Situation/use</td>
<td>Capital value</td>
<td>103,585,000</td>
<td>0.0002775</td>
<td>0.0002321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of CBD maintenance costs including street cleaning, landscaping, lighting and security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICTS AREA MAINTENANCE AND STREET WORKS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53,764</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| KERBSIDE REFUSE AND RECYCLING COLLECTION RATES | | | | | | |
| Service Rate in areas where combined refuse and recycling provided | Availability of service/situation | Sep used/inhab | 15,754 | 84.00 | 86.00 | 1,354,844 |
| Ohoka recycling service | Availability of service/situation | Sep used/inhab | 815 | 74.00 | 76.00 | 61,940 |
| Net cost of the Kerbside refuse and recycling collection | | | | | 1,416,784 |

| WATER RATES | | | | | | |
| Cust | Provn/Avail | Sep used/inhab | 142 | 596.70 | 719.50 | 102,141 |
| Cust Water - restricted unit rate | Provn/Avail | Unit of water | - | 238.68 | 287.72 | - |
| Summerhill – per unit | Provn/Avail | Unit of water | 504 | 90.40 | 104.60 | 52,718 |
| Summerhill – per property | Provn/Avail | Rating unit | 169 | 811.80 | 935.40 | 158,083 |
## Detailed Rating Schedule (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Schedule 2</th>
<th>Factors of Liability Schedule 3</th>
<th>Factor Quantity</th>
<th>2016/17 Rate/Charge (GST at 15%)</th>
<th>2017/18 Rate/Charge (GST at 15%)</th>
<th>Revenue expected 2017/18 $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WATER RATES (CONT'D)</td>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Unit of water</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>392.90</td>
<td>96.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernside Loan Rate</td>
<td>Proven/Avail</td>
<td>Sep used/inhab</td>
<td>7,862</td>
<td>356.50</td>
<td>325.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>Proven/Avail</td>
<td>Unit of water</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>142.60</td>
<td>130.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora - restricted unit rate</td>
<td>Proven/Avail</td>
<td>Sep used/inhab</td>
<td>5,189</td>
<td>178.70</td>
<td>176.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>Proven/Avail</td>
<td>Unit of water</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>71.48</td>
<td>70.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi - restricted unit rate</td>
<td>Proven/Avail</td>
<td>Sep used/inhab</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>265.70</td>
<td>311.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach</td>
<td>Proven/Avail</td>
<td>Unit of water</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>106.28</td>
<td>124.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach - restricted unit rate</td>
<td>Proven/Avail</td>
<td>Sep used/inhab</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>459.20</td>
<td>463.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend - Tuahiwi</td>
<td>Proven/Avail</td>
<td>Unit of water</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>183.68</td>
<td>185.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend - Tuahiwi - restricted unit rate</td>
<td>Proven/Avail</td>
<td>Rating unit</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>778.30</td>
<td>778.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi Rural Water Loan rate</td>
<td>Proven/Avail</td>
<td>Unit of water</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>168.32</td>
<td>182.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi Water Connection Loan rate</td>
<td>Proven/Avail</td>
<td>Rating unit</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>489.22</td>
<td>489.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi Water Pipeline Loan rate</td>
<td>Proven/Avail</td>
<td>Rating unit</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>46.70</td>
<td>68.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Ereyton</td>
<td>Proven/Avail</td>
<td>Unit of water</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>504.30</td>
<td>734.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Township</td>
<td>Proven/Avail</td>
<td>Unit of water</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>420.80</td>
<td>455.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Township - restricted unit rate</td>
<td>Proven/Avail</td>
<td>Unit of water</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>168.32</td>
<td>182.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Rural Water No 1</td>
<td>Proven/Avail</td>
<td>Unit of water</td>
<td>1,505</td>
<td>330.40</td>
<td>396.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Rural Water No 2</td>
<td>Proven/Avail</td>
<td>Unit of water</td>
<td>1,505</td>
<td>337.00</td>
<td>419.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Proven/Avail</td>
<td>Unit of water</td>
<td>1,864</td>
<td>189.50</td>
<td>194.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka</td>
<td>Proven/Avail</td>
<td>Unit of water</td>
<td>1,578</td>
<td>12.78</td>
<td>20.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka</td>
<td>Proven/Avail</td>
<td>Rating unit</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>657.83</td>
<td>1061.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus</td>
<td>Proven/Avail</td>
<td>Sep use/inhab</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>337.00</td>
<td>419.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus - Restricted</td>
<td>Proven/Avail</td>
<td>Unit of water</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>134.80</td>
<td>167.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poyntzs Road</td>
<td>Proven/Avail</td>
<td>Unit of water</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poyntzs Road</td>
<td>Proven/Avail</td>
<td>Rating unit</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>457.00</td>
<td>513.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrymere</td>
<td>Proven/Avail</td>
<td>Unit of water</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>28.19</td>
<td>31.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrymere</td>
<td>Proven/Avail</td>
<td>Rating unit</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1,065.23</td>
<td>1,209.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>7,275,029</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detailed Rating Schedule (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Schedule 2</th>
<th>Factors of Liability Schedule 3</th>
<th>Factor Quantity</th>
<th>2016/17 Rate/Charge (GST at 15%)</th>
<th>2017/18 Rate/Charge (GST at 15%)</th>
<th>Revenue expected 2017/18 $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WAIMAKARIRI WATER RACE RATES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Race - per hectare</td>
<td>Provn/Avail Area of land</td>
<td>41,925</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>257,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Race - fixed charge over .4046 ha land area</td>
<td>Provn/Avail Rating unit</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>141,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Race - fixed charge equal or less than .4046 ha</td>
<td>Provn/Avail Rating unit</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>93.00</td>
<td>8,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Race Special Rate for piped supply</td>
<td>Provn/Avail Rating unit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision and maintenance of stock water race network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL WATER RACE RATES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>407,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL WATER RATES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,682,994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEWER RATES

| | Situation Provn/Avail | WC or urinals | 15,315 | 438.90 | 466.70 | 7,147,511 |
| Eastern Districts | Situation Rating unit | 115 | 449.72 | 396.13 | 45,555 |
| Ohoka Utilities Connection Loan Rate | Situation Rating unit | 38 | 1,719.70 | 1,806.60 | 68,651 |
| Loburn Lea | Situation Rating unit | 873 | 811.40 | 844.80 | 737,510 |
| Oxford - Uniform operating | Situation Rating unit | 173 | 216.05 | 216.05 | 37,377 |
| - Loan Rate Uniform Charge | | | | | |
| - Loan Rate Valuation | Situation Land Value | 20,109,000 | 0.0006043 | 0.0006197 | 12,462 |
| Fenside | Situation Rating unit | 21 | 1,893.10 | 2,044.80 | 42,941 |

Southbrook Services Extension Stage 1 Loan Rates

| | Situation Rating Unit | 21 | 785.70 | 746.10 | 15,668 |
| - Fixed Charge per rating unit | Situation Area of Land | 21 | 5,149.25 | 4,889.20 | 104,849 |

Provision and maintenance of wastewater collection, treatment and disposal facilities

| TOTAL SEWER | | | | | 8,807,640 |

URBAN STORMWATER DRAINAGE RATES

| | Situation Land value | 783,884,400 | 0.001991 | 0.002069 | 1,621,857 |
| Kaiapoi Urban excluding Island Rd extension differential | Situation Land value | 16,749,000 | 0.000996 | 0.001035 | 960 |
| Kaiapoi - Island Rd Extension differential | Situation Rating unit | 8 | 120.00 | 120.00 | 17,327 |
| Kaiapoi - Alexander Lane | Situation Land value | 1,269,668,790 | 0.0010786 | 0.0010677 | 1,355,625 |
| Rangiora | Situation Land value | 287,412,600 | 0.0010231 | 0.0010745 | 308,825 |
| Oxford | Situation Land value | 111,016,000 | 0.0009766 | 0.0009280 | 103,023 |
| Pegasus | Situation Land value | 260,623,600 | 0.0011261 | 0.0013359 | 348,167 |

Provision and maintenance of urban stormwater drainage networks and disposal facilities

| TOTAL URBAN DRAINAGE | | | | | 3,755,784 |

---
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## Detailed Rating Schedule (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Schedule 2</th>
<th>Factors of Liability Schedule 3</th>
<th>Factor Quantity</th>
<th>2016/17 Rate/Charge (GST at 15%)</th>
<th>2017/18 Rate/Charge (GST at 15%)</th>
<th>Revenue expected 2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RURAL LAND DRAINAGE RATES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka – per rating unit</td>
<td>Situation Rating unit</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>53,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka - land value</td>
<td>Situation Land value</td>
<td>402,266,000</td>
<td>0.0004584</td>
<td>0.0005232</td>
<td>210,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loburn Lea</td>
<td>Situation Land value</td>
<td>9,465,000</td>
<td>0.0022897</td>
<td>0.0021865</td>
<td>20,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford - per rating unit</td>
<td>Situation Rating unit</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>8,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford - land value</td>
<td>Situation Land value</td>
<td>184,731,300</td>
<td>0.0001692</td>
<td>0.0001721</td>
<td>31,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkville - per rating unit</td>
<td>Situation Rating unit</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>109.00</td>
<td>126.00</td>
<td>24,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkville - per hectare</td>
<td>Situation Area of Land</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>23.66</td>
<td>32.78</td>
<td>24,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri Coastal Rural (formerly Rangiora No 1) per rating unit</td>
<td>Situation Rating unit</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>27,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri Coastal Rural (formerly Rangiora No 1) per hectare</td>
<td>Situation Area of Land</td>
<td>4,177</td>
<td>20.15</td>
<td>26.42</td>
<td>110,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri Central (formerly Rangiora No 2) - per rating unit</td>
<td>Situation Rating unit</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>30,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri Central (formerly Rangiora No 2) - land value</td>
<td>Situation Land value</td>
<td>399,226,600</td>
<td>0.0002160</td>
<td>0.0002283</td>
<td>91,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust per hectare</td>
<td>Situation Area of Land</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>3,770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provision and maintenance of rural drainage schemes providing land drainage and protection from flooding

**TOTAL RURAL DRAINAGE**

638,566

**TOTAL RATES**

63,826,522

8,325,199

**RATES PER PROSPECTIVE STATEMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE REVENUE AND EXPENSE**

55,501,324

**LUMP SUM OPTIONS AND OTHER RATE**

Early repayment on Oxford Sewer Loan

- Fixed Lump Sum Contribution
  - Situation Rating Unit
  - 384.93
  - 277.62

- Variable Lump Sum Contribution
  - Situation Land Value
  - 0.004559
  - 0.003234

Southbrook Services Extension Stage 1 Lump Sum Contribution

- Fixed Charge per rating unit
  - Situation Rating Unit
  - 4,730.02
  - 4,730.02

- Rate per hectare
  - Situation Area of Land
  - 30,997.76
  - 30,997.76

Lump sum contributions to pay a share of capital works project costs
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to present the Draft Treasury Policy for adoption, which incorporates changes from the annual review undertaken.

1.2. The Treasury Policy has been reviewed in accordance with the policy guidelines that requires the policy to be reviewed within three yearly Long Term Plan cycle.

1.3. While there are a number of minor word changes to the policy, there are three key changes recommended to the Treasury Policy (and shown within the Draft Treasury Policy as track changes). These are:

   1.3.1. Altering our borrowing policy limits to be aligned the same as those of the Local Government Funding Agency (section 3.3 of the Treasury Policy); and
   1.3.2. Lowering the percentage from 40% to 33% of total borrowing that is subject to refinancing in any financial year (section 3.4 of the Treasury Policy); and
   1.3.3. Allowing fixed term loans or fixed rate hedging in excess of 10 years, providing it is carried out in conjunction with an underlying debt instrument (section 3.5 of the Treasury Policy)

Attachments:
   i. Draft Treasury Policy (Trim 180118003863)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180118003861.

(b) Approves the Treasury Policy (Trim 180118003863)

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. The Treasury Policy has been reviewed in conjunction with Miles Connor of BANCORP Treasury Services Limited, who is the Council’s Treasury Advisor. Normally these
changes would be firstly provided to the Audit & Risk Committee, however given the timing of the consultation of the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan, it is appropriate and timely to provide the Policy in this instance to the Council.

3.2. The Treasury Policy was first adopted in August 1999 and has since required a number of changes to keep it valid and continue to be an effective framework for borrowing, investment and interest rate risk management.

3.3. The changes recommended are to ensure the Treasury Policy remains current and able to respond to Council’s treasury requirements. Other than a number of word changes and updating current understandings, there are three key changes being recommended to be made to the Policy. These are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section in Policy</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Altering our borrowing policy limits to be aligned the same as those of the Local Government Funding Agency</td>
<td>To provide consistency to the LGFA and generally accepted limits in the Local Government sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Lowering the percentage from 40% to 33% of total borrowing that is subject to refinancing in any financial year</td>
<td>Provides a lower risk tolerance and greater discipline to ensure interest rate risk is spread over longer time periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Allowing fixed term loans or fixed rate hedging in excess of 10 years, providing it is carried out in conjunction with an underlying debt instrument</td>
<td>The LGFA are now issuing longer term debt. This changes allows Council to take up the option should it wish to “lock in” debt and rates over a longer period than 10 years currently.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4. Options

3.4.1. The Council could adopt the recommended changes to the Treasury Policy; or
3.4.2. Decide to reject the changes and request staff to investigate further additions or deletions to the Policy.

3.5. The Management Team/CEO has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. The changes have been provided or reviewed by BACORP Treasury Service Limited

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. There are no significant costs associated with approving the recommendations included in this report.
5.2. The Treasury Policy provides the framework, procedures, controls that mitigate the risks associated with Treasury management.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy

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

Policy Limits

The following tables represent the policy limits to forecast shown that will be shown in the draft 2018-2028 financial forecasts. The LGFA policy limits are being met. The additional debt limit that council provides for in the event of a significant adverse event is also met for all of the self-imposed limits except for one. The limit not proposed to be met is the limit on Total Debt to Total Revenue ratio. This breach is corrected from year five (2022-23) and only breached where insurance is not available. Given that the LGFA covenants and other limits self-imposed limits are well within the limits, it is not seen as a significant matter.

Interest cost on debt to rate revenue

![Interest cost on debt to rate revenue graph]

Total Debt to Total Revenue ratio

![Total Debt to Total Revenue ratio graph]

Interest on debt to Gross Operating Revenue

![Interest on debt to Gross Operating Revenue graph]
6.2. Legislation

The Local Government Act 2002 (LGA), section 102 (2), requires a Local Authority to adopt a Liability Policy and Investment policy, which are contained within the Council’s Treasury Policy.

As stated in section 102 (5) of the LGA, any changes to these policies are not subject to section 82, where a LA must consult any changes.

6.3. Community Outcomes

The Policy contributes and provides mechanisms that assist indirectly to the achievement of the Community Outcomes.

Jeff Millward
Manager Finance & Business Support
Treasury Policy
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INTRODUCTION

Waimakariri District Council (Council) undertakes borrowing and investment activity (in total referred to in this document as treasury activity). Council’s treasury activities are carried out within the requirements of the Local Government Act 2002, its related amendments and other relevant local authority legislation. This treasury policy document provides the policy framework for all of Council’s treasury activities and defines key responsibilities and operating parameters within which borrowing and investment activity is to be carried out. The scope of this policy covers treasury activity at the Council level, and not at the total Group level. This treasury policy document is reviewed on an annual basis.

1.1 Borrowing

Council’s borrowing activity is largely driven by its capital works programme, mainly related to its infrastructure assets. Council’s borrowing policy is discussed in Section 3 of this document.

1.2 Investments

Council manages a portfolio of investments comprising, loan advances, equity investments, forestry, property and financial investments. Council’s investment policy is discussed in Section 4 of this document.

1.3 Policy Setting and Management

Council approves policy parameters in relation to its borrowing and investment activities.

Council’s Chief Executive has overall responsibility for the operations of Council. The Manager Finance and Business Support has financial management responsibility over Council’s borrowing and investments.

Council’s borrowing, investment and cash management activities are managed centrally through its finance function.

The finance function is broadly charged with the following responsibilities:

∑ Provide appropriate finance, in terms of both maturity and interest rates and manages Council’s borrowing programme to ensure funds are readily available at margins and costs favourable to Council.
∑ Develop and maintain professional relationships with the financial markets in general and Council’s main relationship bank in particular.
∑ Manage Council’s investments within its strategic objectives and ensure that surplus cash is invested in liquid and creditworthy instruments.
∑ Manage the impact of market risks such as interest rate risk and liquidity on Council’s borrowing and investments.
∑ Minimise adverse interest rate related increases on ratepayer charges and maintain overall interest costs and revenues within budgeted parameters.
∑ Provide timely and accurate reporting of treasury activity and performance.

1.4 Philosophy

Council acknowledges that there are various financial risks such as interest rate risk, liquidity risk and credit risk arising from its borrowing and investment activities. Council is a risk adverse entity and does not wish to incur additional risk from its treasury activities.

Council’s treasury function is a risk management function focused on protecting Council’s budgeted interest costs and interest income and stabilising Council’s cashflows. Council does not undertake any treasury activity that is unrelated to its underlying cashflows or is purely speculative in nature.
2. STRUCTURE

2.1 Treasury Organisational Structure

The organisation chart for treasury activity is as follows:

```
Council

Audit & Risk Committee

Treasury Management Committee

Chief Executive Officer

Manager Finance and Business Support

Finance Manager

Creditors Clerk  Finance Clerk
```
2.2 Treasury Responsibilities

The key responsibilities of the above positions are as follows:

**Council**
- Council approves the Treasury Policy and all programmes to be funded by borrowing.
- Approve overall borrowing limits on an annual basis through the annual plan process

**Audit & Risk Committee**
- Recommends to Council Treasury Policy (incorporating borrowing and investment management policy) document.
- Approves amendments to Council, various control limits, bank facilities, approved instruments and treasury policy.
- Approves use of risk management instruments.
- Reviews the borrowing, investment, cash and treasury risk management process through quarterly reporting.
- Formally reviews the Treasury Policy document on an every three years.

**Treasury Management Committee**
- Responsibility for monitoring and reviewing the ongoing treasury risk management performance of the council, ensuring compliance with treasury policy parameters and approving all risk strategies for execution by the delegated authority.
- Recommending to the Audit & Risk Committee of any strategies outside the parameters outlined in the Treasury Policy.
- The Treasury Management Committee comprises of:
  - Chief Executive
  - Manager Finance and Business Support
  - Finance Manager
  - An Independent Treasury Advisor
- A quorum of two members is required for the Treasury Management Committee, with one of them being either the Chief Executive or the Manager of Finance and Business Support

**Chief Executive**
- Overall responsibility for all activities relating to implementation of approved treasury policy.
- Approve risk management hedging strategies beyond Manager Finance and Business Support’s discretionary authority.

**Manager Finance and Business Support**
- Review of Treasury Policy, borrowing, investment, cash and treasury risk management activities, through monthly reporting.
- Recommend amendments to the Treasury Management Committee Treasury policy and procedures for Audit & Risk Committee approval.
- Responsible for keeping Chief Executive informed of significant treasury activity and market trends.
- Report treasury activities to Audit & Risk Committee.
- Review and approve recommended risk management hedging strategies.
- Determine most appropriate source of borrowing.
- Manage Council’s relationship with its bankers, the capital markets and the Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA).
- Liaise with brokers/bankers for issue of debt; co-ordinate tenders if handled in-house.
- Negotiate borrowing facilities with bankers, appoint brokers/bankers.
- Approve bids and pricing for stock issue, bank borrowing.
- Review and approve monthly deal summary.
- Back up dealer for treasury activity in Finance Manager’s absence.
- Responsibility to approve any deal ticket discrepancies.
- Approve general ledger journals.
Finance Manager

- Recommend to Manager Finance and Business Support and the Treasury Management Committee appropriate borrowing, investment and treasury risk management strategies.
- Jointly manage Council's relationship with its bankers and brokers.
- Execute daily investment, borrowing, cash management and treasury risk management activities.
- Complete deal tickets.
- Update treasury spreadsheet from deal tickets on the day deal is done.
- Review credit standing of issuers on a three monthly basis.
- Produce reports and work papers on investment, borrowing, cash and treasury risk management activity.
- Review and approve monthly bank reconciliations.
- Review and approve monthly reconciliation of treasury spreadsheet to general ledger.

Creditors Clerk

- Arrange payment and receipt of approved treasury transactions.

Finance Clerk

- Receive deal confirmations and complete check to deal ticket and treasury spreadsheet.
- Complete bank reconciliation.
- Check and reconcile direct debits/credits.
- Reconcile treasury spreadsheet to general ledger.
- Complete general journal entries.
3. LIABILITY MANAGEMENT POLICY

3.1 General Policy
Council exercises its flexible and diversified borrowing powers within the Local Government Act 2002. Council approves the borrowing programme by resolution during the Annual Plan and Long Term Plan process. A resolution of Council is not required for hire purchase, credit or deferred purchase of goods if:

- the period of indebtedness is less than 91 days; or
- the goods or services are obtained in the ordinary course of operations on normal terms for amounts not exceeding in aggregate, an amount determined by resolution of Council.

Council raises borrowing for the following primary purposes:

- General debt to fund Council’s balance sheet and from time to time liquidity requirements.
- To fund assets with intergenerational qualities.

Council borrows through a variety of market mechanisms which primarily comprise the issue of stock (bonds) and direct bank borrowing.

Before evaluating any new or renewal external borrowings (in relation to source, term, size and pricing) the Manager Finance and Support Services takes into account the following:

- The size and the economic life of the project.
- The impact of the new debt on the borrowing limits.
- Relevant margins and total cost under each borrowing source.
- Council’s overall debt maturity profile, to ensure concentration of debt is avoided at reissue/rollover time.
- Prevailing interest rates relative to term for both stock issuance and bank borrowing and management’s view of future interest rate movements.
- Available term from bank and stock issuance.
- Legal documentation and financial covenants.

3.2 New Zealand Local Government Funding Agency Limited (“LGFA”)
Despite anything earlier in this Liability Management Policy, the Council may borrow from the New Zealand Local Government Funding Agency Limited (“LGFA”) and, in connection with that borrowing, may enter into the following related transactions to the extent it considers necessary or desirable:

- Contribute a portion of its borrowing back to the LGFA as an equity contribution to the LGFA;
- Provide guarantees of the indebtedness of other local authorities to the LGFA and of the indebtedness of the LGFA itself;
- Commit to contributing additional equity (or subordinated debt) to the LGFA if required;
- Subscribe for shares and uncalled capital in the LGFA; and
- Secure its borrowing from the LGFA and the performance of other obligations to the LGFA or its creditors with a charge over the Council’s rates and rates revenue.

3.3 Borrowing Limits
In managing borrowing, Council adheres to the following limits:

- Gross interest shall not exceed a maximum of 25% of rates revenue
- Net debt as a percentage of operating revenue shall not exceed 175% or if WDC obtains a Standard and Poor’s long term credit rating of ‘A+’ or better, 250%.
- Gross interest paid on term debt will not exceed 20% of gross operating revenue.¹
- Net cash inflow from operating activities exceeds gross annual interest expense by two times.²
- Net debt as a percentage of total assets will not exceed 15%.
- Liquidity ratio of greater than 110%.³

¹ Operating revenue includes rates, interest, subsidies, fees and charges, petroleum tax, dividends.
² Net cash inflow from operating activities before total interest expense and taxation divided by total interest expense.
³ Liquidity Ratio: Reflects the agreement with the Local Government Funding Agency. Defined as external debt plus committed loan facilities plus liquid investments divided by external debt.
3.4 **Liquidity and Funding Credit Risk Management**

- Council’s ability to readily attract cost effective borrowing is largely driven by its ability to maintain a strong balance sheet as well as its ability to rate, manage its image in the market and its relationship with its banker.
- To ensure funds are available on repayment of debt, specific reserve funds for the repayment of debt are maintained in liquid assets and available bank facilities.
- To minimise the risk of large concentrations of debt maturing or being reissued in periods where credit margins are high for reasons within or beyond Council’s control, Council ensures debt is spread over a band of maturities and ensures that:
  - Where practicable, no more than 3340% of total borrowing is subject to refinancing in any financial year. Total borrowing includes any forecast borrowing.
- In accordance with LGFA provisions WDC shall maintain access to liquidity sources of at least 110% of anticipated peak borrowing requirements over the ensuing 12 month period.
  - The Council is able to borrow through a variety of market sources and mechanisms including:
    - Commercial Paper
    - Local Authority Bonds
    - Medium Term Notes
    - Floating Rate Notes
    - From the Local Government Funding Agency (“LGFA”)
    - From New Zealand Registered Banks
    - Funding from internal sources.

The finance function is responsible for administering Council’s internal loan portfolio. Loans are set up within the portfolio based on planned loan funded capital or asset expenditure as approved by Council resolution as part of the Annual Plan and Long Term Plan process.

The primary objective in funding debt internally is to use specific reserves effectively by establishing an internal loan portfolio that provides funding to internal activity centres. This creates operational efficiencies as savings are created by eliminating the ‘bankers margin’ that would be owing through Council simultaneously investing and borrowing with the bank. The Long Term Fund and other general funds are used for internal borrowing purposes:

The Long Term Fund consists of proceeds from the sale of the Lyttelton Port investment, proceeds from the Pines Kaiapoi Freeholding, proceeds from the sale of Ashburton Farms and Southbrook properties and the balance of the proceeds from the sale of Kaiapoi Electricity.

The following operational parameters apply to the management of Council’s internal loan portfolio:

- A notional internal loan is set up for all new capital or asset expenditure and allocated in the internal loan portfolio to the activity centre incurring the expenditure.
- The term of the loan is limited to a maximum of 25 years and re-priced annually but the term of the loan is no greater than the original purpose of the reserve.
- Instalment amounts are agreed on establishment of the loan and determined on a table mortgage basis.
- Principal amounts are repaid in instalments monthly.
- Interest is charged monthly by finance to each activity centre at an agreed interest rate that is fixed for a twelve month period and reviewed annually.
- The interest rate charged is on loan balances is equivalent to the average external cost of raising debt.
- Interest charged on credit balances is equivalent to the average interest rate received on external investments.
- Interest received from proceeds of the Long Term Fund are allocated into the general account and offset against the general rate requirement.
- Interest received on other internal funds, is allocated back to that source fund generating the internal funding.

Finance uses the internal loan portfolio as an input into determining Council’s external debt requirements. Where possible, the Council’s cash reserves are used to reduce external debt effectively reducing Council’s net interest cost.

All internal borrowing activities are consistent with the principals and parameters outlined throughout Section 3.
### 3.7 Interest Rate Risk Management

Treasury Management Committee approves the interest rate risk management strategy. The Committee will seek appropriate advice, monitors interest rate markets on a quarterly basis regular and evaluates the outlook for short term rates in comparison to the rates payable on Council’s fixed rate borrowing.

Council’s borrowing gives rise to a direct exposure to interest rate movements. Generally, given the long term nature of Council’s assets, intergenerational factors and Council’s preference to avoid an adverse impact on rates, there is a general tendency to have a high percentage of long term fixed rate or hedged borrowing.

To provide flexibility in the Council’s hedging arrangements interest rates should be fixed as follows:

- Minimum 50% to a Maximum 100% for years 0 – up to 3 years
- Minimum 30% to a Maximum 80% for years 3 – up to 6 years
- Minimum 0% to a Maximum 50% for years 6 – up to 10 years.

This operating parameter achieves a floating rate mix together with the appropriate discretionary authority and highlights Council’s maximum allowable floating rate exposure.

Council is exposed to interest rate re-pricing risk on the maturing of existing fixed rate borrowing that is refinanced, as well as issue yield risk on planned new debt. Council manages these exposures using the following operational parameter:

Management implements interest rate risk management strategy through the use of the following financial market instruments:

- Forward rate agreements
- Interest rate swaps
- Swaptions
- Interest rate collar type option strategies in a ratio not exceeding 1:1.
- Selling interest rate options for the primary purpose of generating premium income is not permitted because of its speculative nature.
- Fixed rate Term Loans
- Interest rate risk management products to convert fixed rate borrowing into floating rate borrowing or, floating rate borrowing into fixed or hedged borrowing.
- SEC risk on existing fixed rate debt and issue yield on forecast borrowing.

### 3.8 Security

Council generally does not offer assets other than a charge over rates or rate revenue as security for general borrowing programmes.

### 3.9 Repayment

Council repays borrowings from existing specific sinking fund, specific reserves, available bank facilities or from general funds.

### 3.10 Contingent Liabilities

Council from time to time provides financial guarantees to organisations for recreational and community purposes generally located on Council land. All guarantees are approved by the Council and have a charge secured over the buildings or the constitution of the organisation will vest the improvements in Council on winding up.

Financial statements are received annually. Should the guarantee be called upon, Council will take immediate steps to recover the money.
4. INVESTMENT POLICY

4.1 Investment Mix

Council maintains investments in the following financial assets:

- loan advances (covered in Section 4.3)
- equity investments (covered in Section 4.4)
- property investments (covered in Section 4.5)
- forestry investments (covered in Section 4.6)
- financial investments (covered in Section 4.7)

4.2 General Policy

Council’s philosophy in the management of investments is to optimise returns in the long term while balancing risk and return considerations. Council recognises that as a responsible public authority any investments that it does hold should be low risk, giving preference to conservative investment policies and avoiding speculative investments. It also recognises that lower risk generally means lower returns. Any new investments are approved by the appropriate delegated authority.

Council does not hold financial investments other than those involving general and specific reserves and cash management balances. In its financial investment activity, Council’s primary objective when investing is the protection of the investment capital value and to minimise the risk of loss. Accordingly, only creditworthy counterparties are acceptable. Council’s policy on managing credit risk is contained in Section 4.7.

Within the credit constraints contained in Section 4.7, Council also seeks to:

- Optimise investment returns.
- Ensure investments are liquid and sufficiently flexible.
- Diversify the mix of financial investments.
- Manage potential capital losses due to interest rate movements if investments need to be liquidated before maturity.

4.3 Loan Advances

Nature of Investment/Rationale for Holding

External loan advances include loans to recreational and community organisations which further the Council’s community objectives. Where possible all external loan advances are secured by a charge over an organisation’s land and/or buildings.

Internal loan advances are made from general funds for separate rating accounts or other capital expenditure projects and subject to applying the following criteria tests:

- Loans are to recreational and community organisation endeavouring to further Council’s community objectives.
- The activity provides benefits to the District.
- The security provided by the organisation will be sustained over the loan term.
- The organisation must be able to demonstrate that it can service the loan repayment terms.
- The organisation is financially stable and its future prospects, including structure and controls are sound.

All loan advances are approved by Council resolution.

Disposition of Revenue

All loan advances are charged at market interest rates and interest received is credited to general funds or where the original source of funds. The market rate is determined by the Manager Finance and Business Support with reference to the average market rates for borrowing and investing at the time of the borrowing. Any alternative rates are approved by the Audit & Risk Committee.

Risk Management

The total of all external loan advances as outlined in this section are not to exceed 10% of total cash balances and investments as at 30 June in any year.

Management Reporting and Procedures
The Audit & Risk Committee monitors performance of these investments on a regular basis to ensure that interest and principal repayments are being made in accordance with the loan agreement.

**Specific Policy**

**4.4 Equity Investments**

Council has equity investments in Civic Assurance Limited (previously known as NZ Local Government Insurance Corporation), Transwaste Canterbury Limited, Canterbury Economic Development Company Limited.

It also has two trusts which it appoints 50% of the trustees and therefore constitute Council Controlled Organisations. These are Te Kōhaka O Tūhaitara Trust, Enterprise North Canterbury. Other Council Organisations include Waimakariri District Libraries Trust, and the Waimakariri Arts Collection Trust.

*Civic Assurance Limited (previously known as NZ Local Government Insurance Corporation Limited)*

Nature of Investment/Rationale for Holding

The shares in Civic Assurance and were acquired by virtue of Council being a local authority. The Council holds 38,086 shares. The purpose of the company in which most local authorities are shareholders is to ensure that adequate insurance arrangements are available to local authorities at the lowest possible cost. The shares are not readily transferable.

Disposition of Revenue

Revenue earned from the shares is minimal. Any sale requires Council approval. Any disposition will be realised in a managed form and proceeds are taken to general funds.

**Risk Management**

The investment will be managed by reviewing annually the performance, and the consideration of an approval of the Statement of Corporate Intent.

**Management Reporting and Procedures**

Annual Reports are received and reviewed by Council. Election of Directors takes place at the AGM held at the Local Government New Zealand annual conference. The Council votes by proxy.

Specific Policy

Council will continue to hold its shares in Civic Assurance whilst it continues to do business with this company.

*Transwaste (Canterbury) Limited*

Nature of Investment/Rationale for Holding

TCL is a company owned jointly by six local authorities and Canterbury Waste Services Limited, to develop and operate a regional landfill site. The Council hold 78 shares or 3.9% of the shares to be issued by TCL. The shares are not readily transferable.

Disposition of Revenue

Revenue earned from the shares is currently not quantified. Any sale requires Council approval. Any disposition will be realised in a managed form and proceeds are taken to general funds.

**Risk Management**

The investment will be managed by reviewing annually the performance, and the consideration of an approval of the Statement of Intent.

**Management Reporting and Procedures**

Annual Reports are received and reviewed by Council. Election of Directors takes place at the AGM. 
Specific Policy
Council will continue to hold its shares in TCL whilst the Council/District requires a regional landfill site.

Canterbury Economic Development Company Limited (CEDCL)

Nature of Investment/Rationale for Holding
CEDCL is a Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) owned jointly by ten local authorities which promotes transformational economic development projects that will benefit Canterbury and to utilise the Canterbury Regional Development Strategy to coordinate strategic economic development initiatives. Each Council owns 10% of the shares in CEDCL. The shares are not be readily transferable.

Disposition of Revenue
Revenue earned from the shares is currently not quantified. Any sale requires Council approval. Any disposition will be realised in a managed form and proceeds are taken to general funds.

Risk Management
The investment will be managed by reviewing annually the performance, and the consideration of an approval of the Statement of Intent.

Management Reporting and Procedures
Annual Reports are received and reviewed by Council. Election of Directors takes place at the AGM.

Specific Policy
Council will continue to hold its shares in CEDCL to coordinate strategic economic development initiatives.

Te Kōhaka O Tūhātara Trust

Nature of Investment/Rationale for Holding
The Council appoints 50% of the trustees of the Trust, with the balance appointed by Te Runanga O Ngai Tahu. The Council vested land in the Trust for it to administer. The Trust’s objective is to hold and administer reserves in the coastal area of the District, in accordance with a Management Plan.

Disposition of Revenue
There are no anticipated revenue streams to the Council from the Trust.

Risk Management
The Trust is required to submit a Statement of Intent to the Council annually for its consideration.

Management Reporting and Procedures
Annual Reports are received and reviewed by Council. Appointment of Trustees takes place in accordance with the Trust Deed. The Council appoints three Trustees to the Trust.

Specific Policy
The Council will continue to appoint trustees to the Trust and support to the Trust in meeting its objectives.

Enterprise North Canterbury

Nature of Investment/Rationale for Holding
The Council appoints 50% of the trustees of the Trust, with the balance appointed by The Hurunui District Council. The Trust’s objectives include cultivating economic initiatives and foster growth in North Canterbury, and fostering and assisting in the management of best practices and effective use of resources in North Canterbury.

Disposition of Revenue
There are no anticipated revenue streams to the Council from the Trust.

Risk Management
The Trust is required to submit a Statement of Intent to the Council annually for its consideration.
Management Reporting and Procedures

Annual Reports are received and reviewed by Council. Appointment of Trustees takes place in accordance with the Trust Deed.

Specific Policy

The Council will continue to appoint trustees to the Trust and support to the Trust in meeting its objectives.

Waimakariri Libraries Trust

Nature of Investment/Rationale for Holding

The Council appointed 50% of the initial trustees of the Trust. Subsequent trustees are made by the trustees. The Trust’s objectives are to assist the District Librarian in the purchase of additional books and materials for library users.

Disposition of Revenue

Any revenue streams from the Trust are applied to purchasing books and material for the libraries.

Risk Management

The Trust is required to submit a Statement of Intent to the Council annually for its consideration.

Management Reporting and Procedures

Annual Reports are received and reviewed by Council. Appointment of Trustees takes place in accordance with the Trust Deed.

Specific Policy

The Council will continue to appoint trustees to the Trust and support to the Trust in meeting its objectives.

Waimakariri Arts Collection Trust

Nature of Investment/Rationale for Holding

The Waimakariri Arts Collection Trust was formed to establish and maintain a collection of artwork of merit that has an association with North Canterbury. The Council’s ownership is 33%. The Council appoints one third of the Trustees of the Trust. Subsequent trustees are made by the trustees.

Disposition of Revenue

Any revenue streams from the Trust are applied to art collections and materials for the Trust.

Risk Management

The Trust is required to submit a Statement of Intent to the Council annually for its consideration.

Management Reporting and Procedures

Annual Reports are received and reviewed by Council. Appointment of Trustees takes place in accordance with the Trust Deed.

Specific Policy

The Council will continue to appoint trustees to the Trust and support to the Trust in meeting its objectives.

4.5 Property Investments - Nature of Investment/Rationale for Holding

Council’s primary objective is to own only property (including land and buildings) that is necessary to achieve its strategic objectives as stated within the Long Term Plan. This definition excludes infrastructural service e.g. reserves and drainage. Council will generally acquire new property if it achieves Council’s strategy objectives. Council’s Property assets include a number of properties termed as “Commercial”, including the Oxford Medical Centre, rental accommodation often attached to reserve land, and commercial land in Kaiapoi. The Council also retains Housing for the Elderly accommodation and leases camping grounds at Pines/Kairaki, Oxford (Ashley/Rakahuri), Woodend and Waikuku. There are still a number of sections rented at Pines Beach and these are Freeholded at the resident’s request. The Council also administers the Waimakariri Harbour account and collects rentals/lease from this land.
Disposition of Revenue
Council seeks to achieve an acceptable commercial rate of return. All income, including rentals and ground
rent from property investments is included in general funds or in relation to Reserves to be applied to
Reserves under the Reserves Act 1977.
Sale of this property requires Council approval. Proceeds from the disposition of property investments are
used firstly in the retirement of related debt and then for capital development purposes.
Risk Management
The Council’s investment in properties other than reserves and those required for own occupation and
infrastructural services will not exceed 50% of total fixed assets.
Management Reporting and Procedures
The Audit & Risk Committee reviews the performance of its property investments and ensures that the
benefits of continued ownership are consistent with its stated objectives.
Specific Policy
Council’s policy is to dispose of any property that does not achieve a commercial return having
regard to any restrictions on title or other requirements or needs to achieve Council objectives.

4.6 Forestry
Nature of Investment/Rationale for Holding
The Council holds 800 hectares of Forestry, sited on reserve and domain lands - 600 hectares are
production forests and 200 hectares are protection forests. Approximately 300 Hectares of the 600
Hectares production forest is included on land transferred to the Te Kohaka O Tuhaitara Trust and the
ownership of the forestry is currently under debate. The Forest and the improvements remained in Council
ownership. The balance (300 hectares) is “plains” forest; a combination of single reserves, plantation
reserves and recreational reserves (e.g. Oxford racecourse). Forestry assets are held as long-term
investments on the basis of current establishment and tending costs, factored by age, at 5% compounding
interest. Council’s accounting policy is to revalue its production forests annually. Protection forests will be
valued at a nominal value recognising that they have no commercial value
Disposition of Revenue
Any disposition requires Council approval. Upon harvest, disposition proceeds will firstly repay related
borrowings then fund any establishment costs, with the remainder allocated at Council’s discretion.
Risk Management
Forestry is operated incidental to the Council’s core functions. Insurance cover is provided for fire and up
to 50% for wind damage, and third party liability.
Management Reporting and Procedures
Council manages the forests and financial performance is monitored annually by the Audit & Risk
Committee.
Specific Policy
Council’s policy is to harvest the production forestry plantation at maturity.

4.7 Financial Investments
Council has the following financial investments, namely:
∑ the Long Term Fund (see Section 4.7.1)
∑ other financial investments (see Section 4.7.2)
∑ Financial Institutions
Long Term Fund
Proceeds held in the Long Term Fund, are invested in long-term investments, managed funds or internally
lent to activity centres. Council seeks to maintain the principal value of these funds. Interest from the fund
is allocated to the general account. Council allocates funds to those investments that emphasise capital security, maximise revenue and provide regular cash payouts.

Council has set aside a fund for disaster recovery and maintains the fund in investments with a maturity of less than one year. These funds are not permitted to be used for internal borrowing.

**Other Financial Investments**

Council maintains financial investments for the following primary reasons:

- Invest proceeds from the sale of assets.
- Invest amounts allocated to general and specific reserves e.g. disaster reserve.
- Invest funds allocated for approved future expenditure.
- Invest surplus cash and working capital funds.

Interest income earned on financial investments relating to separate accounts is allocated to those accounts. Interest income on other balances is taken to general funds and allocated to all accounts other than interest on sinking funds which is taken to the sinking fund account. The Audit & Risk Committee reviews financial investment performance through standard monthly reporting.

**Investment Objectives**

Council’s primary objective when investing is the protection of its investment. Accordingly, only creditworthy counterparties are acceptable. Creditworthy counterparties are selected on the basis of their current Standard and Poors (S&P) rating which must be strong or better as outlined in Section 7. Credit ratings are monitored on a three monthly basis by the Finance Manager from updated S&P advices.

The Manager Finance and Business Support approves an investment strategy, as recommended by the Finance Manager, who after seeking appropriate advice, incorporates plans for approved expenditure and strategic initiatives and evaluates the outlook for interest rates and the shape of the yield curve.

The following principles capture the above objectives and form the key assumptions of the operating parameters:

- Credit risk is minimised by placing maximum limits for each broad class of non-Government issuer, and by limiting investments to local authorities, registered banks, strongly rated SOE’s, and corporates within prescribed issuer and portfolio limits.
- Liquidity risk is minimised by ensuring that all investments must be capable of being liquidated in a readily available secondary market. Furthermore, Council maintains $1 million in specific reserves, with a maturity of less than one year.

Council invests in approved instruments which include:

- Government investments
- Registered bank investments
- Local authority investments
- SOE and corporate investments

Definitions for approved financial investment instruments are included in Appendix 2.

**4.8 Interest Rate Risk Management**

Council’s investments give rise to a direct exposure to a change in interest rates, impacting the return and capital value of its investments.

The Manager Finance and Support Services approves interest rate risk management strategy as recommended by the Finance Manager, who seeks appropriate advice and monitors the interest rate markets on a semi-annual basis, evaluating the interest rate outlook and determining the interest rate profile to adopt for investments.

The Finance Manager implements the interest rate risk management strategy by using risk management instruments to protect investment returns and to change interest rate and maturity profiles. The use of interest rate risk management instruments requires Audit & Risk Committee approval. A current list of approved interest rate risk management instruments with appropriate definitions is included in Appendix 4. Additions to and deletions from this list are recommended by the Manager Finance and Support Services and approved by the Audit & Risk Committee.

---

3 Authorised instruments include: treasury bills and government stock
4 Authorised instruments include: money market call deposits, money market term deposits, negotiable certificates of deposit, registered certificates of deposit, bank bills
5 Authorised instruments include: local authority stock, bonds and promissory notes, local authority debentures
6 Authorised instruments include: commercial paper, promissory notes and corporate bonds
4.9 New Zealand Local Government Funding Agency Limited (“LGFA”)

Despite anything earlier in this Investment Policy, the Council may invest in shares and other financial instruments of the New Zealand Local Government Funding Agency Limited (LGFA), and may borrow to fund that investment. The Council’s objective in making any such investment will be to:

∑ Obtain a return on the investment; and
∑ Ensure that the LGFA has sufficient capital to become and remain viable, meaning that it can continue as a source of debt funding for the Council.

Because of this dual objective, the Council may invest in LGFA shares in circumstances in which the return on that investment is potentially lower than the return it could achieve with alternative investments.

If required in connection with the investment, the Council may also subscribe for uncalled capital in the LGFA.
5. FOREIGN EXCHANGE POLICY

Council has foreign exchange exposure through the occasional purchase of foreign exchange denominated goods and services, and offshore investments.

Generally, all significant goods and service commitments for foreign exchange are hedged using foreign exchange contracts, once expenditure is approved. Smaller payments are converted at the spot exchange rate on the date of payment. Both spot and forward foreign exchange contracts are used by Council.

Council does not borrow or enter into incidental arrangements within or outside New Zealand in currency other than NZ currency.
6. CASH MANAGEMENT

From time to time, Council has daily cashflow surpluses and borrowing requirements due to the mismatch of daily receipts and payments. Council receives rates revenue three monthly in the months of August, November, February and May. All cash inflows and expenses pass through the main bank account controlled by the finance function.

Daily transaction logs and bank statement reconciliation is compiled from the ANZ Direct system by the Finance Clerk. Generally any cash to be invested for longer than three months is covered by Section 4 of this policy.

Cash management activities must be undertaken within the following parameters:

∑ Cash management instruments are limited to:
   - Call deposits with registered banks.
   - Registered certificates of deposit and promissory notes with a maturity of up to three months.
   - Term deposits with registered banks (of up to 3 months). Not recommended if early break penalties are enforced.

∑ Cash may only be invested with approved counterparties as detailed in Section 7.

∑ If practical, a targeted minimum of $500,000 is invested at call.

Interest rate risk management on cash management balances is not permitted.
7. **COUNTERPARTY EXPOSURE LIMITS**

Council ensures that all investment, interest rate risk management as well as any foreign exchange activity is undertaken with institutions that are of a high quality credit to ensure amounts owing to Council are paid fully and on the due date.

More specifically, Council minimises its credit exposure by:
- Transacting with entities that have a strong credit rating.
- Limiting total exposure to prescribed amounts and portfolio limits.
- Timely and rigorous compliance monitoring.

The following table summarises credit requirements and limits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Minimum S&amp;P Short Term Credit Rating</th>
<th>Minimum S&amp;P Long Term Credit Rating 8</th>
<th>Total Exposure Limit for each Counterparty</th>
<th>Portfolio Limit (% of Total Portfolio)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Unlimited</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- On balance sheet exposures</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>$10 million</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Off balance sheet exposures</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>$10 million</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Rated Corporates, Local Authorities and SOEs (on balance sheet exposures only)</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>$2 million</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If any counterparty’s credit rating falls below the minimum specified in the above table then immediate steps are taken to reduce the credit exposure to that counterparty to zero.

Exposures to each counterparty are computed as follows:
- On-balance sheet
  - Total amounts invested with that counterparty.
- Off-balance sheet
  - Credit exposure on interest rate contracts computed by multiplying the face value of outstanding transactions by an interest rate movement factor of 5%.
  - Credit exposure on foreign exchange contracts computed by multiplying the face value of outstanding transactions by an exchange rate movement factor of 10% for contracts up to one year maturity, and 20% for contracts greater than a year.

---

7 Short term refers to securities with a remaining maturity of 12 months or less.
8 Long term refers to securities with a remaining maturity of more than 12 months.
8. PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

Measuring the effectiveness of Council’s treasury activities is achieved through a mixture of subjective and objective measures. The predominant subjective measure is the overall quality of treasury management information. The Audit & Risk Committee has prime responsibility for determining this overall quality. Objective measures are as follows:

1. Borrowing:
   - Adherence to policy and in particular the borrowing limits outlined in Section 3.2.
   - Unplanned overdraft costs.
   - Comparison of actual quarterly and year to date interest costs vs budget borrowing costs.

2. Equity Investments:
   - Adherence to policy.
   - Comparison of financial ratios to budgeted ratios as per the Long Term Plan.

3. Property Investments:
   - Adherence to policy.

For commercial property investments:
   - Comparison of actual gross and net income to budgeted gross and net income.
   - Comparison of actual rental yield to budgeted rental yield.

4. Forestry Investments:
   - Adherence to policy.
   - Comparison of actual year to date returns to budgeted returns.

5. Financial Investments:
   - Adherence to policy.
   - Comparison of actual quarterly and year to date interest income vs budget interest income.
   - Comparison of actual quarterly and year to date accrued returns vs investing the entire treasury portfolio at the weekly average three month bank bill rate for short term investments. For investments of longer maturity compare year to date accrued returns to the weekly average three year Government stock rate or to a recognised fixed interest benchmark index. At budget round, the appropriate weighting of the benchmark portfolio is approved by the Audit & Risk Committee. For the purposes of this section, longer maturity refers to the Long Term Fund referred to in 4.7.1.
9. REPORTING & MEETINGS

9.1 Reports
The following reports are produced:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Name</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Prepared by</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank Reconciliation</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Finance Clerk</td>
<td>Finance Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Spreadsheet</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Finance Clerk</td>
<td>Manager Finance and Business Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Report (Appendix 5, Sections 3-4)</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Finance Manager</td>
<td>Manager Finance and Business Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limits Report (included within Treasury Report)</td>
<td>Quarterly, reported daily on an exceptions basis</td>
<td>Finance Manager</td>
<td>Manager Finance and Business Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Report (Appendix 5, Sections 1-2)</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Finance Manager</td>
<td>Manager Finance and Business Support Audit &amp; Risk Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Reconciliation</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Finance Clerk</td>
<td>Finance Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Summary Operating Statement</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Finance Manager</td>
<td>Manager Finance and Business Support Audit Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Papers</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Treasury Management Committee</td>
<td>CEO Audit &amp; Risk Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Borrowing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Investment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interest Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Cashflow Report</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Finance Manager</td>
<td>Manager Finance and Business Support Audit &amp; Risk Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Summary Statement of Public Debt</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Finance Manager</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.2 Meetings
The Audit & Risk Committee meets on a quarterly basis to review and approve the Treasury Report and discuss the previous quarter’s treasury activity. The Committee comprises of elected Council members.

9.3 Treasury Management Committee
The Treasury Management Committee meets on a quarterly basis prior to the Audit & Risk Committee meeting and is a group consisting of the Chief Executive, Manager Finance and Business Support, Finance Manager and an Independent Treasury Advisor.
10. DELEGATED AUTHORITIES & KEY INTERNAL CONTROLS

10.1 Delegated Authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alter policy document</td>
<td>Audit &amp; Risk Committee recommends to Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorise bank facilities</td>
<td>Audit &amp; Risk Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open/close bank accounts</td>
<td>Cheque signatories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheque and ANZ Direct signatories</td>
<td>as approved by Audit Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve annual borrowing programme</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve borrowing strategy</td>
<td>TMC (as approved by Audit &amp; Risk Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve investment strategy</td>
<td>TMC (as approved by Audit &amp; Risk Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve risk management strategy</td>
<td>TMC (as approved by Audit &amp; Risk Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve use of risk management instruments</td>
<td>Audit &amp; Risk Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve new investments</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrange new loans</td>
<td>Manager Finance and Business Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage financial investments</td>
<td>Manager Finance and Business Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers of stock/register new debt issues</td>
<td>Seal register signatories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.2 Key Internal Controls

Council’s system of internal controls over treasury activity include:

- Adequate segregation of duties among the core treasury functions of deal execution, confirmation, settling and accounting/reporting. There are a small number of people involved in treasury activity and accordingly strict segregation of duties is not always achievable. The risk from this is minimised by the following processes:
  - a documented approval process for treasury activity.
  - regular management reporting.
  - Organisational, systems, procedural and reconciliation controls to ensure:
    - all treasury activity is bona fide and properly authorised.
    - checks are in place to ensure Council’s accounts and records are updated promptly, accurately and completely.

More specifically, key internal controls are as follows:

10.3 General

Organisational Controls

- The Manager Finance and Business Support has responsibility for establishing appropriate structures, procedures and controls to support treasury activity. Detailed procedures supporting the key controls contained in this document are contained in Council’s Treasury Procedures Manual.

Cheque / Electronic Banking Signatories

- Preprinted, prenumbered cheques are kept in safe custody.
- Cheques are signed through the system using access controls and passwords.
- Signatories approved by Audit & Risk Committee.
- Dual signatures are required for all cheques.
- Cheques must be in the name of the counterparty crossed “Not Transferable” via the Council bank account and paid to order.
- Dual signatories are required for electronic banking and access to the electronic banking system is limited and password protected.

Authorised Personnel

- All counterparties are provided with a list of personnel approved to undertake transactions, standard settlement instructions and details of personnel able to receive confirmations (see Appendix 7).
Recording of Deals
∑ All deals are recorded on properly formatted deal tickets by the Finance Manager. Deal summary records for borrowing, investments, interest rate risk management and cash management transactions are maintained and updated promptly following completion of the transaction.

Confirmations
∑ All inward letter confirmations are received and checked by the Finance Clerk against the approved deal ticket and treasury spreadsheet records to ensure accuracy.
∑ Deals, once confirmed, are filed (deal ticket and attached confirmation) in deal date order by the Finance Clerk.
∑ Any discrepancies arising during deal confirmation checks which require amendment to the Council records are signed off by the Manager Finance and Business Support.

Settlement
∑ In instructing the transfer of funds a facsimile signed by two cheque signatories being one of either the Manager Finance and Business Support or Chief Executive is provided to the dealing bank. The Bank’s confirmation letter, when received, is checked to the authorised deal ticket and treasury spreadsheet.
∑ The Finance Manager is denied access to settlement instructions after transaction settlement approval is granted.

Reconciliations
∑ Any discrepancies arising during bank statement reconciliation are dealt with by the Finance Clerk and signed off by the Finance Manager.
∑ Any discrepancies arising during deal confirmation checks are dealt with by the Finance Clerk and signed off by the Manager Finance and Business Support.
∑ The Finance Manager reviews monthly reconciliation of the treasury spreadsheet to the general ledger, carried out by the Finance Clerk.
∑ Interest income as per the treasury spreadsheet is reconciled by the Finance Clerk to the bank statements to ensure income is received.

10.4 Borrowing
In addition to the controls listed under Section 10.2, the following controls apply to borrowing:
∑ Borrowing activity is undertaken within borrowing limits specified in Section 3 of this policy.

10.5 Investments
In addition to the controls listed in Section 10.2, the following controls apply to investments:
∑ Investment activity is undertaken within counterparty limits specified in Section 7 of this policy.
∑ Normally financial investments are held to maturity date. Where investments are liquidated prior to maturity, approval is obtained from the Manager Finance and Business Support.
∑ All financial investments mature into Council’s main current account.
∑ All deliverable certificates of investment (eg bank bills) are held in safe custody with Council’s dealing bank.
∑ NZ government stock, treasury bills, local authority stock and debentures are registered with the RBNZ. The Council receives notice of the stocks transferred into its name from the RBNZ. This notice is checked to Council’s treasury spreadsheet by the Finance Clerk.

10.6 Incidental Arrangements
In addition to the controls listed under Section 10.2, the following controls apply to incidental arrangements:
∑ The use of incidental arrangements is confined to managing the interest rate risk on Council’s borrowing and are used within the confines of the parameters and instruments specified in Section 3 of this policy.
∑ The use of incidental arrangements requires formal prior approval of Council.
∑ Standard master agreements for incidental arrangements are completed by Council with its dealing banks.
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### APPENDIX 1

**Policy Cross-Reference to Local Government 2002**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act Section Reference</th>
<th>Brief Description of Requirement</th>
<th>Borrowing and Investment Policy Section Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S101 (1)</td>
<td>Principles of financial management - prudent debt levels</td>
<td>Sections 1, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 (3)</td>
<td>Local authorities not required to use specific funding mechanisms</td>
<td>Section 4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 (h)</td>
<td>Short term borrowing, reserves</td>
<td>Sections 3.1, 3.3, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 (a)</td>
<td>General policy on investments</td>
<td>Section 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 (b)</td>
<td>Mix of investments</td>
<td>Section 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 (c)</td>
<td>Acquisition of new investments</td>
<td>Sections 4.2, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 (d)</td>
<td>Revenue from its investments</td>
<td>Sections 4.3 - 4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 (2) (iii) (c)</td>
<td>Proceeds of sale of assets</td>
<td>Sections 4.3 - 4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 (d)</td>
<td>Outline of procedures for management and reporting of investments</td>
<td>Sections 4.3 - 4.7, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 (e)</td>
<td>Management of risks associated with investments</td>
<td>Sections 4.2 - 4.8, 6, 7, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Content of borrowing management policy</td>
<td>Section 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104 (a)</td>
<td>Interest rate exposure policy</td>
<td>Sections 3.5, 4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104 (b)</td>
<td>Liquidity policy</td>
<td>Section 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104 (c)</td>
<td>Credit exposure policy</td>
<td>Sections 3.3, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104 (d)</td>
<td>Debt repayment policy</td>
<td>Section 3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104 (e)</td>
<td>Borrowing limits</td>
<td>Section 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104 (f)</td>
<td>Giving of security</td>
<td>Section 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>General power to borrow</td>
<td>Section 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Power to enter into incidental arrangements</td>
<td>Sections 3.5, 4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Prohibition on borrowing in foreign currency</td>
<td>Section 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 (h)</td>
<td>Prohibition on borrowing money</td>
<td>Section 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Security for loans</td>
<td>Section 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>Provisions relating to sinking funds</td>
<td>Section 4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 (e)</td>
<td>Financial systems</td>
<td>Sections 9, 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2

Approved Financial Investment Instruments

Investment instruments available in the market (excluding equities and property) can generally be discussed under four broad categories relating to the issuer of these instruments.

1. New Zealand Government
   - Treasury bills are registered securities issued by the Reserve Bank of New Zealand (RBNZ) on behalf of the Government. They are usually available for terms up to a year but generally preferred by investors for 90 day or 180 day terms. They are discounted instruments, and are readily negotiable in the secondary market.
   - Government stocks are registered securities issued by the RBNZ on behalf of the Government. They are available for terms ranging from one year to twelve year maturities. Government stock have fixed coupon payments payable by the RBNZ every six months. They are quoted on a semi-annual yield basis and are priced on a discounted cashflow basis. They are readily negotiable in the secondary market.

2. Local Authorities
   - Local Authority stocks are registered securities issued by a wide range of local government bodies. They are usually available for maturities ranging from one to ten years. A fixed coupon payment is made semi-annually to the holder of the security. They are negotiable and can usually be bought and sold in the secondary market.

3. Registered Banks
   - Call and term deposits are funds accepted by the bank on an overnight basis (on call) or for a fixed term. Interest is usually calculated on a simple interest formula. Term deposits are for a fixed term and are expected to be held to maturity. Term deposits are not negotiable instruments. Termination prior to maturity date can often involve penalty costs.
   - Registered certificates of deposit (RCD) are securities issued by banks for their funding needs or to meet investor demand. They are registered at the RBNZ or held on behalf of by the dealing bank. Details include the name of the investor, face value and maturity date. Ownership can be transferred by electronic transfer only. RCDs are priced on a yield basis and issued at a discount to face value or a grossed up basis. They are generally preferred over term deposits because investors can sell them prior to maturity without suffering penalty interest costs common to term deposits.
   - Bank bills are bills of exchange drawn or issued, usually by a corporate borrower and accepted or endorsed by a bank. The investor is exposed to bank credit risk when investing in such instruments. Bank bills are readily available for any maturity up to 180 days, although 30 to 90 day terms are more common. They are quoted on a yield basis and priced on a discount basis. Investors in bank bills can sell the bills prior to maturity date.

4. Corporates
   - Corporate bonds are generally issued by companies with good credit ratings. These bonds can be registered securities or bearer instruments. There are two types of bond, the medium term note (MTN) and the floating rate note (FRN). The MTN has a fixed coupon payment that is paid semi-annually to the holder of the security. They are priced on a semi-annual yield basis and are issued at a discount/premium to face value. The interest on the FRN is set on a floating rate basis usually off the 90 day bank bill bid rate. Corporate bonds are negotiable and can be bought and sold in the secondary market.
   - Commercial Paper (CP). Promissory notes are issued by borrowers who usually have a credit rating and standing in the market that is sufficient to enable the notes to be issued without endorsement or acceptance by a bank. The notes are usually underwritten by financial institutions to ensure that the borrower obtains the desired amount of funds. CP Promissory notes are usually issued with maturities ranging from 30 days to 180 days to over one year. The common maturities are for 30, 60 and 90 days. The face value of the note is repaid in full to the bearer on maturity.
APPENDIX 3

Approved Borrowing Instruments

1. BANK SOURCED BORROWING

1.1 Bank Bill facilities

Revolving credit facilities are similar from a borrower’s perspective except interest is paid in arrears rather than upfront as in the case of bank bills. Revolving credit facilities are usually for a term of up to three years but may be for as long as five years and like bank bills drawings under the facility are priced off the bank bill bid rate. Most facilities allow for the borrower to draw up to the facility amount in various tranches of debt and for various terms out to a maximum term of the maturity date of the facility. Like bank bills most borrowers use this facility to borrow on a 90 day basis.

1.11 Short Term Money Market Lines

Short-term money market loans or cash loans can be committed or uncommitted. A borrower pays for a guarantee of the availability of the funds in a committed loan in the form of a line fee. In an uncommitted loan, funds are provided on a best endeavours basis and no line/commitment fee is payable. In addition to a line fee, a margin may be charged on any line usage. The minimum amount for a cash loan is $1,000,000. Smaller loans can be arranged, although the interest rate quoted will be a reflection of the size of the loan. The main use of cash loans is to cover day-to-day shortfalls in funds. The interest rate is governed by the term of the borrowing and the implied or implicit credit rating of the borrower. Cash loans are short term only and are normally drawn for a term of one (overnight) to seven days. Interest collection can be daily.

2. CAPITAL MARKETS PROGRAMMES

Corporate bonds commonly in existence in the New Zealand market have essentially the same characteristics as government stock. These are a source of longer-term fixed or variable rate finance that can be sold either in bearer or registered form (normally registered). Bonds are normally issued with coupon interest paid in arrears on a six monthly basis for fixed rate instruments, and three monthly for floating rate instruments. Local authority bonds are issued by a variety of local governments by tender or private placement. The bonds are registered securities. They are repayable on a fixed date, and are generally issued for terms ranging from one to fifteen years.

Local authority bonds are priced on a semi annual basis and issued at a discount to face value. A fixed coupon payment is made semi annually to the holder of the security. The pricing formula is the same as government bonds.

The term bond is usually reserved for securities with terms longer than one year, to clearly distinguish between short term (CPNotes) and long term (Bonds, MTNs and FRNs) debt instruments. CPNotes and Bonds usually constitute unconditional, unsecured and unsubordinated obligations of the issuer, except indebtedness given by preference by operation law.

3. STRUCTURED AND PROJECT FINANCE

Project and structured financing matches up debt to suit the quantifiable income stream from the project. This type of financing is appropriate for the funding of standalone assets which are able to be ring-fenced and over which security can be taken. The sort of assets to which this usually applies are assets which are transferable, and for which an international equity market exists e.g. infrastructural assets. The owner of the asset usually retains an equity interest in the asset.
APPENDIX 4

Approved Interest Rate Risk Management Instruments

1. Borrowing and Interest Rate Risk Management Instruments
   - Definitions

1. Borrowing and Interest Rate Risk Management Instruments:
   The following borrowing and interest rate risk management instruments are available following approval by the Audit & Risk Committee:
   - Fixing through physical borrowing instruments e.g. fixed rate bonds including those sourced from the LGFA and bank term loan.
   - Floating through physical borrowing instruments e.g. short term Floating Rate Notes and bank borrowing.
   - Forward rate agreements and bond forward rate agreements.
   - Interest rate swaps.
   - Swaptions.
   - Purchase of interest rate options products including caps and bond options.
   - Interest rate collar type option strategies.

The interest rate risk management instruments detailed below are not permitted for use:
   - Selling interest rate options for the primary purpose of generating premium income because of its speculative nature.
   - Structured or leveraged interest rate option strategies where there is any possibility of the Council’s total interest expense increasing in a declining interest rate market or where the Council’s total interest cost is increasing faster than the general market rate.
   - Interest rate futures contracts, mainly for administrative ease.

2. Investment and Interest Rate Risk Management Instruments:
   The following interest rate investment and interest rate risk management instruments are available following approval by the Audit & Risk Committee:
   - Fixing through physical investment instruments e.g. term deposits.
   - Floating through physical investment instruments e.g. call deposits.
   - Forward rate agreements.
   - Commercial Paper.
   - Fixed rate bonds.
   - Medium term notes.
   - Interest rate swaps.
   - Purchase of interest rate options products including floors.
   - Interest rate collar type option strategies.
   - A matrix containing the authorised investment parameters is contained in Appendix Eight.

The interest rate risk management instruments detailed below are not permitted for use:
   - Selling interest rate options for the primary purpose of generating premium income are not permitted because of its speculative nature.
   - Structured or leveraged interest rate option strategies where there is any possibility of Council’s total interest income decreasing in an increasing interest rate market or where Council’s total interest income is decreasing faster than the general market rate.
   - Interest rate futures contracts, mainly for administrative ease.
3. Definitions

BKBM
The bank bill mid market settlement rate as determined at 10:45am each business day on Reuters page BKBM. This is the standard rate for the settlement of interest rate swaps, forward rate agreements and interest rate floors, caps and collars.

Bond Options
Council when purchasing a bond option has the right but not the obligation to buy or sell a specified government stock maturity on an agreed date and time and at an agreed rate.

This product is used where either there is some uncertainty in the underlying debt exposure or the outlook for interest rates is favourable but the policy requires some form of protection.

Forward Rate Agreement
An agreement between Council and a counterparty (usually a bank) protecting Council against a future adverse interest rate movement for a specified period of time. Council and the counterparty agree to a notional future principal amount, the future interest rate, the benchmark dates and the benchmark rate (usually BKBM). This definition includes the bond forward rate agreement where the benchmark rate is the underlying government bond yield.

This product is particularly useful where the underlying debt exposure is certain and Council’s dominant view is that yields will rise above current levels.

Interest Rate Collar Strategy
The combined purchase (sale) of a floor or cap with the sale (purchase) of another floor or cap. This can be a zero premium cost strategy. See the interest rate option for further details.

This product can be used by both an investor and a borrower. From a borrower’s perspective, this product is transacted to provide a limited amount of participation in a downward movement in interest rates to an agreed strike rate. If the interest rate continues to move downwards, Council cannot participate in any movement beyond the strike rate. If interest rates move in an unfavourable direction (upwards) then the predetermined strike rate provides certainty through a known worst case rate.

For an investor, the zero cost collar allows some participation in an increase in rates and provides a worst case rate if interest rates decline.

This product outperforms the forward rate agreement if rates fall but underperforms if rates rise. This product would be used by a borrower, for known exposures, where the interest rate is expected to decline moderately from current levels.

Interest Rate Options
The purchase of an interest rate option gives the holder (in return for the payment of a premium) the right but not the obligation to invest (described as a floor) or borrow (described as a cap) at a future date for a specified period. Council and the counterparty agree to a notional future principal amount, the future interest rate, the benchmark dates and the benchmark rate (usually BKBM). Interest rate option products include caps, floors, swaptions and bond options.

From a borrower’s perspective, these products offer Council maximum flexibility, protecting Council from a rise in rates but allowing full participation in a fall in rates. When used by an investor, this product protects Council from a decline in rates and allows full participation in rising rates.

This product is used where either there is some uncertainty in the underlying debt exposure or the outlook for interest rates is favourable but the policy requires some form of protection.

Interest Rate Swap
An interest rate swap is an agreement between Council and a counterparty (usually a bank) whereby Council pays (or receives) a fixed interest rate and receives (or pays) a floating interest rate. The parties to the contract agree notional principal, start date of the contract, term of the contract, interest rate and the benchmark rate (usually BKBM).

This product is particularly useful where the underlying debt exposure is certain and Council’s dominant view is that interest rates will rise above current levels. As an investor, the swap is used when the dominant view is that rates will fall from current levels.
Swaption

The purchase of a swaption gives Council the right but not the obligation to enter into an interest rate swap, at a future date, at a specific interest rate.
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Monthly Treasury Report
Sample Interest Rate Risk Management Report
Refer excel spreadsheets
APPENDIX 6
Sample Deal Tickets
1. Cash Management
2. Investment
3. Bank Borrowing
4. Stock Issuing
5. Interest Rate Risk Management
6. Foreign Exchange
### Waimakariri District Council

#### Cash Management Deal Ticket

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealer:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterparty:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealer:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New/Renew:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrow/Invest:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid/Received:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Bills / Promissory Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face Value:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Price:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawer:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptor:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturity Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term Deposit:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturity Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Instructions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spreadsheet Updated:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entries Passed:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Ticket/Spreadsheet:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Waimakariri District Council
### Investment Deal Ticket

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Time:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reference Number:**

**Dealer:**

**Counterparty:**

**Dealer:**

### Discounted Instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Face Value:</th>
<th>Instrument Type:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purchase Price:</th>
<th>Maturity Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yield:</th>
<th>Term:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Interest Amount: | |
|------------------||
|                  | |

### Coupon Bearing Investments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Face Value:</th>
<th>Purchase Price:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coupon:</th>
<th>Maturity Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yield:</th>
<th>Settlement Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Value:</th>
<th>Interest Amount:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Interest Accrued: | |
|-------------------||
|                   | |

### Settlement Instructions:

### Spreadsheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Updated:</th>
<th>Approval:</th>
<th>Confirmation:</th>
<th>Entries Passed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Received:</th>
<th>Check Ticket/ Spreadsheet:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waimakariri District Council
Bank Borrowing Deal Ticket

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealer:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Counterparty:       
Dealer:       

New/Renog:       
Amount:       
Base:       Rate:       
Margin:       

Bank Bills
Face Value:       Purchase Price:       
Drawer:       Acceptor:       
Rate:       Maturity Date:       
Term:       

Settlement
Instructions:       

Approval:       
Confirmation:       
Entries Passed:       
Checked:       

Received Funds:       
Check Ticket/Spreadsheet:       
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Waimakariri District Council
Stock Issuing Deal Ticket

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Time:</th>
<th>Reference Number:</th>
<th>Dealer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Loan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Previous Loan Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Public Debt Aging Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year:</th>
<th>Amount:</th>
<th>Year:</th>
<th>Amount:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Debt:


### Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counterparty:</th>
<th>Amount:</th>
<th>Maturity:</th>
<th>Rate:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Approval:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confirmation:</th>
<th>Entries Passed:</th>
<th>Checked:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Received Funds:</th>
<th>Check Ticket/ Spreadsheet:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Waimakariri District Council
## Interest Rate Risk Management Deal Ticket

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealer:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Counterparty: |             |
| Dealer:       |             |

### Forward Rate Agreement
- **Currency:**
- **Face Value:**
- **Borrow/Invest:**
- **FRA Rate:**
- **Start Date:**
- **Maturity Date:**

### Interest Rate Swaps
- **Currency:**
- **Receive/Pay Fixed:**
- **Rate:**
- **Q, S, A**
- **Start Date:**
- **Maturity Date:**
- **Rate Set Dates:**

### Interest Rate Options
- **Currency:**
- **Purchase/Sale:**
- **Cap/Floor Rate:**
- **Q, S, A**
- **Premium Amount:**
- **Premium Points:**
- **Start Date:**
- **Maturity Date:**
- **Rate Set Dates:**

### Settlement Instructions
- **Spreadsheets Updated:**
- **Approval:**
- **Premium Paid:**
- **Confirmation:**
- **Entries Passed:**
  - **Received:**
  - **Check Ticket/Spreadsheet:**
  - **Receipt:**
  - **Entries Passed:**
Waimakariri District Council
Foreign Exchange Deal Ticket

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealer:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Counterparty: |                                                      |
| Dealer:       |                                                      |

| Currency:     | Amount we Sell:                                      |
| Currency:     | Amount we Buy:                                       |
| Value Date:   | Rate:                                                |

Bank's Contract Number: __________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-deliveries</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Currency:</th>
<th>Amount:</th>
<th>Dealer:</th>
<th>Currency Balance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spreadsheet Updated: __________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval:</th>
<th>Confirmation:</th>
<th>Entres Passed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received:</td>
<td>Check:</td>
<td>Ticket/Spreadsheet:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 7

Standard Settlement Instruction Letter

(date)

The Manager
Bank
P O Box XX
XXXXXX

Dear Sir/Madam,

Management has recently undertaken a review of its treasury operations resulting in the adoption of a new treasury policy. Pursuant to the new policy I wish to advise the following details as standard for dealing with Council:

∑ Council Details
   Phone       (03) 313 6136
   Facsimile   (03) 313 4432
   Street Address 215 High Street
                 Rangiora
   Postal Address Private Bag 1005
                 Rangiora 8254

∑ Authorised Dealers
   Paul Christensen - Finance Manager (primary contact)
   Jeff Millward – Manager Finance and Business Support (secondary contact)

∑ Confirmations
   Confirmations for all transactions are to be addressed to:
   Liz Innes – Accounts Officer

∑ Authorised Confirmation Signatories
   Jim Palmer - Chief Executive
   Jeff Millward - Manager Finance and Business Support
∑ Bank Account

All New Zealand Dollars are to be credited to the following account:

- Account Name:
- Bank:
- Branch:
- Address:
- Account No:

This advice will be updated on an annual basis or as any changes necessitate.

Please acknowledge receipt of this advice by signing and returning the enclosed duplicate.

Yours sincerely

Jim Palmer
Chief Executive
Waimakariri District Council
Interest Rate Risk Management Report - Fixed Rate Debt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debt Maturity</th>
<th>0-1 Year</th>
<th>1-2 Years</th>
<th>2-5 Years</th>
<th>5 Years plus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Fixed Rate Debt</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion to Floating Rate using Risk Management Instruments</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Converted to Floating</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum discretion at MFT level</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance Check</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current floating rate is: #DIV/0!
Current market fixed rates are: #DIV/0!
Fixed rate debt issued at: #DIV/0!

Hedge Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Maturity Date</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 1: Authorised Investment Criteria for Financial Market Investment Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorised Asset Classes</th>
<th>Overall Portfolio Limit as a Percentage of the Total Portfolio</th>
<th>Approved Financial Market Investment Instruments (must be denominated in NZ dollars)</th>
<th>Credit Rating Criteria – Standard and Poor’s (or Moody’s or Fitch equivalents)</th>
<th>Limit for each issuer subject to overall portfolio limit for issuer class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Government</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Government Stock Treasury Bills</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Unlimited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial Paper Bonds/MTNs/FRNs</td>
<td>Short term S&amp;P rating of A1 or better</td>
<td>$3.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long term S&amp;P rating of BBB or better</td>
<td>$1.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long term S&amp;P rating of A- or better</td>
<td>$2.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long term S&amp;P rating of A+ or better</td>
<td>$3.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long term S&amp;P rating of AA- or better</td>
<td>$4.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated Local Authorities</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Commercial Paper Bonds/MTNs/FRNs</td>
<td>Short term S&amp;P rating of A1 or better</td>
<td>$3.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long term S&amp;P rating of BBB or better</td>
<td>$1.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long term S&amp;P rating of A- or better</td>
<td>$2.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long term S&amp;P rating of A+ or better</td>
<td>$3.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long term S&amp;P rating of AA- or better</td>
<td>$4.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authorities where rates are used as security</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Commercial Paper Bonds/MTNs/FRNs</td>
<td>Short term S&amp;P rating of A1 or better</td>
<td>$2.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long term S&amp;P rating of BBB or better</td>
<td>$2.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Registered Banks</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Call/Deposits/Bank Bills/Commercial Paper Bonds/MTNs/FRNs</td>
<td>Short term S&amp;P rating of A1 or better</td>
<td>$10.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long term S&amp;P rating of BBB or better</td>
<td>$1.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long term S&amp;P rating of A- or better</td>
<td>$2.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long term S&amp;P rating of A+ or better</td>
<td>$3.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long term S&amp;P rating of AA- or better</td>
<td>$4.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Owned Enterprises</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Commercial Paper Bonds/MTNs/FRNs</td>
<td>Short term S&amp;P rating of A1 or better</td>
<td>$3.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long term S&amp;P rating of BBB or better</td>
<td>$1.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long term S&amp;P rating of A- or better</td>
<td>$2.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long term S&amp;P rating of A+ or better</td>
<td>$3.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long term S&amp;P rating of AA- or better</td>
<td>$4.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporates</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Commercial Paper Bonds/MTNs/FRNs</td>
<td>Short term S&amp;P rating of A1 or better</td>
<td>$3.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long term S&amp;P rating of BBB or better</td>
<td>$1.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long term S&amp;P rating of A- or better</td>
<td>$2.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long term S&amp;P rating of A+ or better</td>
<td>$3.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long term S&amp;P rating of AA- or better</td>
<td>$4.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financials</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Commercial Paper Bonds/MTNs/FRNs</td>
<td>Short term S&amp;P rating of A1 or better</td>
<td>$3.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long term S&amp;P rating of BBB or better</td>
<td>$1.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long term S&amp;P rating of A- or better</td>
<td>$2.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long term S&amp;P rating of A+ or better</td>
<td>$3.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long term S&amp;P rating of AA- or better</td>
<td>$4.0 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The combined holdings of corporates and financials shall not exceed 70% of the portfolio

The combined holdings of entities rated BBB and/or BBB+ shall not exceed 25% of the portfolio
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1. SUMMARY

1.1. This report presents to Council the draft 2018-2048 Infrastructure Strategy. This document forms part of the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan and is one of the principal documents relied on for the content of the Consultation Document.

Attachments:
   i. Draft 2018-2048 Infrastructure Strategy: Trim number 171129129930

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report: Trim Number 180119004562.

(b) Receives the attached Draft 2018-2048 Infrastructure Strategy: Trim number 171129129930.

(c) Notes that the 2018-2048 Infrastructure Strategy will be adopted as part of the process to finalise the Long Term Plan in June 2018.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. The requirement for Local Authorities to develop a 30 year infrastructure strategy as part of their long term planning processes was introduced in 2014 as an amendment to the Local Government Act 2002.

3.2. The draft 2018-48 Infrastructure Strategy will be finalised for incorporation into the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

3.3. The Infrastructure Strategy draws from the Council’s Activity Management Plans (AMP) and includes all major asset types covering Utilities and Roading Assets, Greenspaces and Community Facilities, along with other Council properties. Essentially, it is a summary of the key issues drawn from each AMP.
3.4. The Infrastructure Strategy demonstrates how we will manage our major assets (e.g., roads, water, wastewater, stormwater, greenspace and community facilities) and address the key issues over the next 30 years, including:

∑ Catering for a district population of 97,000 by 2048, and anticipating Rangiora’s population reaching 30,000, Kaiapoi’s population increasing to 15,000, and a combined population for Woodend/Pegasus of 12,000

∑ Meeting increasing standards for drinking water and stormwater, as well as responding to community expectations that lowland streams, rivers and groundwater be better managed

∑ Assessing the risks arising from major natural hazards (especially an Alpine Fault rupture) and Climate Change, and ensuring we build resiliency into our infrastructure and our finances to respond

∑ Ensuring the renewal of assets and the changing needs of the community are taken account of in levels of service that our infrastructure provide. The major service level change contained in this strategy relates to the Multi-Use Sports Facility

∑ Developing sustainable environmental practices - the Infrastructure Strategy suggests that during 2018/19 the Council should consider its sustainability policies and practices.

3.5. A key aspect of the Strategy is demonstrating how we plan to maintain and renew our assets over their lives and how this will be funded. The Council’s first infrastructure strategy was produced in 2015 and covered a 100 year planning timeframe. This long term approach was well received by SOLGM and Audit NZ. A whole of life (150 year) approach has been taken for asset planning in the 2018-28 draft Infrastructure Strategy, so it further extends the lifecycle assessment and demonstrates how our funding strategy ensures there will be sufficient funds available when our assets reach the end of their economic life.

3.6. Because of the rapid growth of the District in the past 20 years most of the Infrastructure of the District is relatively young with 3 Water asset lives averaging about 20 years. Therefore, the renewal peak for these assets is not until 2070 through to 2120. It is important we make appropriate financial provision now to accommodate this.

3.7. The Management Team/CE has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. To be sought via the associated Consultation Document.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. As set out in the associated Financial Strategy and Key Assumptions and Risks in the Long Term Plan.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy

The Infrastructure Strategy must form part of the LTP and therefore be subject to the LTP’s public consultation process.

6.2. Legislation

The Local Government Act 2002, section 101B, states:
1) A local authority must, as part of its long-term plan, prepare and adopt an infrastructure strategy for a period of at least 30 consecutive financial years.

(2) The purpose of the infrastructure strategy is to—

(a) identify significant infrastructure issues for the local authority over the period covered by the strategy; and

(b) identify the principal options for managing those issues and the implications of those options.

(3) The infrastructure strategy must outline how the local authority intends to manage its infrastructure assets, taking into account the need to—

(a) renew or replace existing assets; and

(b) respond to growth or decline in the demand for services reliant on those assets; and

(c) allow for planned increases or decreases in levels of service provided through those assets; and

(d) maintain or improve public health and environmental outcomes or mitigate adverse effects on them; and

(e) provide for the resilience of infrastructure assets by identifying and managing risks relating to natural hazards and by making appropriate financial provision for those risks.

(4) The infrastructure strategy must outline the most likely scenario for the management of the local authority’s infrastructure assets over the period of the strategy and, in that context, must—

(a) show indicative estimates of the projected capital and operating expenditure associated with the management of those assets—

(i) in each of the first 10 years covered by the strategy; and

(ii) in each subsequent period of 5 years covered by the strategy; and

(b) identify—

(i) the significant decisions about capital expenditure the local authority expects it will be required to make; and

(ii) when the local authority expects those decisions will be required; and

(iii) for each decision, the principal options the local authority expects to have to consider; and

(iv) the approximate scale or extent of the costs associated with each decision; and

(c) include the following assumptions on which the scenario is based:

(i) the assumptions of the local authority about the life cycle of significant infrastructure assets:

(ii) the assumptions of the local authority about growth or decline in the demand for relevant services:

(iii) the assumptions of the local authority about increases or decreases in relevant levels of service; and

(d) if assumptions referred to in paragraph (c) involve a high level of uncertainty,—

(i) identify the nature of that uncertainty; and

(ii) include an outline of the potential effects of that uncertainty.

(5) A local authority may meet the requirements of section 101A and this section by adopting a single financial and infrastructure strategy document as part of its long-term plan.

(6) In this section, infrastructure assets includes—
(a) existing or proposed assets to be used to provide services by or on behalf of the local authority in relation to the following groups of activities:

(i) water supply:
(ii) sewerage and the treatment and disposal of sewage:
(iii) stormwater drainage:
(iv) flood protection and control works:
(v) the provision of roads and footpaths; and

(b) any other assets that the local authority, in its discretion, wishes to include in the strategy.

The Council, in preparing its Infrastructure Strategy, has applied its judgement to the extent to which each of the issues noted in the legislation need to considered and documented in the Infrastructure Strategy. The Council has included all significant assets in its strategy including its greenspace, community facilities, libraries, elderly persons’ housing and Council service centres.

6.3. Community Outcomes

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

There is a health and sustainable environment for all.

Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality.

Veronica Spittal
Senior Policy Analyst
Waimakariri District Council

2018 – 2048 Infrastructure Strategy

January 2018
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1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview
The Waimakariri District, located to the north of Christchurch on the Canterbury Plains, has a population of 59,200 with 99% of people living within a 30 minute drive from one another. More than 80% of the population is concentrated in the eastern part of the District with its largest towns being Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Woodend/Pegasus. Oxford is the largest town in the western part of the District.

The District also has a large number of people living on small holdings in the rural zone with approximately 3,500 households living in rural areas on lots of between 0.5 and 4 hectares. Many of these properties have their own sewerage system and some have their own water supply systems.

The District’s close proximity to Christchurch makes it an attractive location for those wanting to live near a city but enjoy the country environment.

The Waimakariri District has been one of the fastest growing districts in the country over the past thirty years, more than doubling its population in that time. Accordingly, the average age of its infrastructural assets is relatively new. While wastewater systems in the larger settlements were laid from the 1930’s onwards, the majority of the underground infrastructure has been laid within with the last thirty years. As a result, a significant increase in underground infrastructure replacement is not forecast until about 2070, with a steady rise from then until the peak in about 2120. Peak expenditure is forecast to be nearly 2.5 times current renewals expenditure.

This means that the Council’s main focus for the next 30 years is on catering for growth, ensuring the renewal of assets is supported by an appropriate funding strategy, and that the Council is addressing increasing community expectations of the standard of services provided.

Planning for Growth
The population assumptions Council has used in the preparation of this Strategy are based on the Statistics New Zealand projections and we have assessed the medium/high variant as the most appropriate scenario to base growth projections upon. The WDC medium/high variant projects a population for the year 2028 of 74,500 and 2048 of 97,000 people.

Since the mid to late 1990s, the Council has signalled where the District should expand to cater for growth. For the next thirty years residential growth is expected to occur predominantly in Rangiora, Woodend/Pegasus, and to the north and west of Kaiapoi. Commercial development is expected in the town centres of Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Pegasus along with new commercial areas developed in north Woodend and Kaiapoi adjacent to State Highway 1.

The areas proposed to grow have been identified and planned for collaboratively in conjunction with Environment Canterbury, Christchurch City, Selwyn District, Ngai Tahu, the New Zealand Transport Agency and the Canterbury District Health Board through the Greater Christchurch.
Partnership. This has helped ensure there is a co-ordinated and equitable approach to providing for growth, and has provided more certainty to each local government council about their infrastructure investment decisions.

For Waimakariri District, having confirmed where growth should occur, has given confidence for major infrastructure investment decisions. In the past 10 to 15 years two major infrastructure investment decisions have exemplified this:

- The construction of the $36 million Eastern Districts Sewerage Scheme that connects and treats wastewater from nine eastern towns and communities and disposes of the effluent through a 1.5 kilometre long ocean outfall discharge. The Eastern Districts Sewerage Scheme not only has capacity for future growth, but it has also improved the environment by replacing discharges to lowland rivers and streams or disposal onto land.

- A $16 million major upgrade of the Rangiora water supply that includes a new deep artesian water source and in-ground infrastructure that should provide sufficient capacity for a doubling in the size of Rangiora’s population.

Co-ordinated Greater Christchurch growth planning has also supported the New Zealand Transport Agency’s construction of the recently completed Western Belfast By-pass motorway and the under-construction Northern Arterial which is due for completion in 2020, ensuring the District remains well connected to Christchurch for the duration of this Infrastructure Strategy.

A programme of work is also underway and will be completed within the next ten years to increase the capacity of the District’s arterial roads to cater for the increasing volume of traffic connecting to the State Highway network.

The Council’s commitment over the past decade to major investment in infrastructure to cater for growth means that for the next thirty years the backbone of the major infrastructure is in place, and therefore future work focuses on ‘plugging-in’ new growth areas to the existing systems.

Due to strong growth and the need to rebuild and strengthen community infrastructure following the 2010-2011 Canterbury earthquakes, the District is now very well served with community facilities. With three major swimming pools all built, or rebuilt, within the last ten years, there are very good aquatic facilities to serve the community.

Further, the $12 million Ruataniwha - Kaiapoi Civic Centre was completed in early 2015, the Rangiora Town Hall strengthened and extended in 2015 for $11 million and the Oxford Library rebuilt and extended in 2017 for $2.6 million, providing good capacity for their catchments over the next 30 years.

The Council has strengthened every community building to at least 67% of the current earthquake building code. As a result, the Council’s community facilities have been upgraded to a good standard for the foreseeable needs of the community.

Changing Government Priorities, Legislative Environment and Community Expectations

The increase in expectations about the standard to which services are provided has accelerated in recent years. National standards and National Policy Statements require both national drinking water standards to be met, as well as higher standards for stormwater and sewage treatment and disposal.

Drinking Water:

In respect of meeting national drinking water standards, over the past ten years the Council has completed a programme of work that has seen the majority of upgrades completed or programmed. By June 2018, only two of the Council’s small water supplies remain to be completed which will occur by the end of 2019.

However, the Havelock North Drinking Water Supply Inquiry Stage 2 report recommends that Standards are further increased and, while decisions have yet to be made, the Council has provided a further $3 million in its Draft 2018-28 LTP to provide ultra-violet treatment to all its drinking sources and funding has also been provided to enable chlorination of all water supplies, should that be mandated.

Wastewater:

The Council has a resource consent to discharge effluent from its Eastern District Sewerage Scheme ocean outfall to mid-2039. This Infrastructure Strategy assumes that when the consent for this discharge expires it will be renewed with similar conditions, as well as those for the land-based discharges for the Oxford, Fernside and Loburn Lea schemes, unless development activity sees the latter two schemes amalgamated into the Eastern Districts Sewerage Scheme. Other than providing additional treatment capacity within the Scheme to cater for growth, the Infrastructure Strategy has not made any provision for increased levels of treatment to
effluent, although consideration of this will occur in the lead-up to the consent renewal prior to 2039.

**Fresh Water Management:**

The National Policy Statement for Fresh Water Management and associated Land and Water Regional Plan requires the Council to upgrade its stormwater discharge in respect of its urban stormwater systems.

Essentially, the National Policy Statement is requiring all urban stormwater discharges to be treated before entering any waterway. This has major implications for the Council as all its urban stormwater discharges flow into streams and rivers. While more recently developed areas of the District have appropriate stormwater treatment and retention ponds in place, all of the areas developed before about 2000 will be subject to new standards.

The Council is working with other councils trying to assess the impact of the National Policy Statement and the Land and Water Regional Plan and how the requirements can be given effect to in a cost effective manner. It will take a number of years to develop appropriate policies and practical treatment solutions and will involve working extensively with mana whenua. The Council has an excellent relationship with Ngāi Tūāhuriri Runanga and will work very closely with the Runanga to develop acceptable solutions.

The Infrastructure Strategy anticipates that meeting the appropriate standards and responses to national policy will be developed over the next ten years, and a further $20 million (in 2018 dollars) has been provided in the Strategy between 2026 and 2035 to start implementing some of the physical works required to improve the quality of stormwater discharges from existing urban areas. Unless practical environmental solutions are developed at an affordable cost, over time, potentially up to $100 million may need to be spent to meet these higher standards. The Council will continue work closely with its partners on finding affordable solutions.

The Council is also responding to increased community expectations that lowland stream environments are improved and groundwater will be protected. The Council is working with Environment Canterbury through a joint committee that includes community representatives, as part of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy. The joint committee is developing standards and a programme of work to improve the efficient use of water and land management practices that will, over time, improve the quality of lowland stream and groundwater resources. During 2018 a plan will be prepared that outlines the proposed initiatives.

**Flood Protection:**

The District, located predominantly on flood plain, is subject to significant flood events. Following community concerns about the effects of the 2014 flood event the Council has allocated $20 million towards flood mitigation works across the District. Further, detailed flood modelling is being undertaken to help inform where future development should occur and what the potential effects of large flood events are.

**Planning for Natural Hazards and Climate Change**

While the gently-sloping Canterbury Plains make infrastructure provision less challenging than in other parts of the country, the District is susceptible to flooding and tsunami in lower lying areas and to the threat from an alpine fault rupture or a local earthquake, especially in liquefaction-prone areas along the Canterbury coastline.

The Council’s engineering practices ensure all new and replaced assets are built to standards that take account of known risk factors and are designed for resilience. Examples include:

- In liquefaction-prone areas, installation of shallow pressure sewerage systems in new development areas, or requiring the ground to be strengthened before pipes are laid
- Adopting resilient infrastructure standards including the use of ductile materials
- Assessing critical components and links in the networks and prioritising their renewal and ensuring, where possible, the system has redundancy built-in so that it can continue operating even if part of the system is damaged
- Building key facilities on strong ground and ensuring they meet high earthquake building standards
- Having sufficient generators in place to supply key infrastructure in the event of prolonged power outages.

The 2010/2011 Canterbury earthquake series provided a good insight into the damaging effects of earthquakes, and the Council now has a good understanding of how its assets will perform in a major earthquake event. The Council expects it will spend over $139 million recovering from the 2010 and 2011 earthquakes. Much of the Council’s recovery spend has been invested into improving the resilience of its assets and strengthening buildings to higher standards.
Risk assessments have identified that a major earthquake, either an Alpine Fault rupture or a major local earthquake, would generate the greatest damage to the Council's assets. There is a 30% probability of a magnitude 8.0 Alpine Fault rupture occurring within the next 50 years. In the context of the Council's LTP and Infrastructure Strategy this is relevant.

The Council has developed and adopted a Risk Assessment and Financing Strategy to assess the financial effects of major natural disasters based on an expected worst-case scenario, which is a major earthquake.

The Council estimates the loss or damage to Council assets, along with the costs to recover from a major earthquake, to be about $210 million. The Council will rely on several funding sources to recover from a major earthquake; namely continuing Crown and NZTA funding support, as well as having prudent insurance arrangements in place. The Council will also incur a share of the cost.

Any Council share of the recovery costs would need to be funded by borrowing as, in the short to medium term, the Council does not anticipate having any significant cash or investment assets available to realise and contribute to a recovery. Accordingly, the Council has resolved to provide borrowing head-room in its LTP to cater for an event. The desired outcome is that after the borrowing headroom has been allowed for the Council will still live within its Treasury and Borrowing Policy limits.

The Risk Assessment and Financing Strategy considers the unlikely, but possible, scenario where because of another major natural disaster in the country, or insurance region, insurance cover may not be in place when a major event occurs that seriously impacts the District. If there was a major earthquake elsewhere, before an event impacted this District and insurance cover was lost, the Council’s share of recovery costs would be about $104 million.

The Council has provided $84 million of 'head room' in its borrowing policy, and, in doing so, will need to undertake a prioritisation process for recovery. This would mean that the Council would restore the vast majority of its infrastructure assets and all its highest priority community facilities, such as town halls, libraries and aquatic facilities, but that the repair of some lower priority assets would be subject to an assessment of the funds available, desired levels of service, and the District’s future needs.

Climate Change:
The effects of climate change are likely to impact sea levels, ground water levels, rainfall and temperatures within the District, among other things.

The Council is factoring the effects of climate change into infrastructure sizing, particularly new stormwater pipes to take account of intense rainfall events. The Council is also undertaking flood modelling factoring in potential sea-level rises of about one metre. Future work will include modelling and understanding the impacts of increasing groundwater levels due to sea level rise.

The models are helping guide where further development should occur and what level building platforms should be set to. The results will be reflected in future District Plan rules.

Embedding Sustainability into Decision Making
In 2012 the Council developed a draft Sustainability Policy. However, the Council needs to make more progress in considering sustainability in terms of the District’s environment and also the practices adopted by the Council in its operations.

The Council proposes developing a sustainability strategy and policy in 2018/19 and establishing base-line information to assess and improve performance.

Renewal of Assets and Increased Levels of Service over the next 30 Years
The Council has modelled its infrastructure and developed a renewal programme that stretches of the next 150 years. The renewal profile and funding strategies have been developed simultaneously to ensure planned asset renewal and its funding is carefully considered. The following summarises the asset renewals and service improvements planned over the next thirty years.

3 Water Assets:
The average age of the Council’s underground network infrastructure is relatively young with wastewater, water and stormwater main reticulation assets having average ages of 23, 20 and 17 years respectively.

The programme of renewals shows that some earthenware sewer pipes laid in the 1930s and some asbestos cement water pipes laid between 1950 and 1970 are reaching the end of their useful lives, but the rate at which they are required to be replaced is not likely to place a burden on the District.

For the next 50 years there is not expected to be a significant change to the current expenditure of around $4.7m per annum expenditure on renewals
Between 2070 and 2120 expenditure on renewals of existing infrastructure will rise quite sharply, but the planned steady funding regime over the next 50 years will see sufficient funds collected from rates, through depreciation funding, to ensure these future renewals can be funded without any significant loans needing to be raised for this work.

Infrastructure renewal work is usually co-ordinated with other works occurring in the same road corridor to limit disruption. This may mean bringing some pipe renewals forward but also some assets may not be replaced for up to 5 - 10 years after they are scheduled to be, provided the condition of the assets is such that they are still functioning adequately.

Expenditure increasing the level of services for 3 Water assets arise predominantly from changing government priorities, increasing legislative requirements and community expectations, as was outlined earlier in this Executive Summary.

**Roading and Town Centres:**

The Skew Bridge that crosses the Cust Main Drain near West Kaiapoi is programmed for a $7 million upgrade and realignment in 2020/21, and the Infrastructure Strategy anticipates that the Old Waimakarirri Bridge will need renewal in about 2045 and the Council’s share of that will be about $10 million. Other significant bridges in the District will not need replacing in the next 30 years.

The Council’s other major roading improvements relate to improvements to the arterial links from the west of Rangiora and Southbrook to the State Highway and Kaiapoi via Fernside and Flaxton Roads.

The Council recognises that it needs to continually invest in roads, cycleways, pedestrian and amenity areas within the town centres. In this Infrastructure Strategy the Council has also provided a further $10 million (in 2018 dollars) in 2035 for further improvements, as required, and about $6 million for the further provision of car parking in Rangiora town centre, along with $4 million for park and ride facilities.

**Recreation, Green Space and Community Facilities:**

There are no proposals for the major renewal of any community facilities in the next 30 years because of the major enhancement and earthquake strengthening work undertaken following the 2010/11 earthquakes, combined with the fact that most other major community facilities are less than 20 years old.

The main change in levels of service being considered is the provision of the multi-use sports facility that covers over 6,000 m² and includes 4 indoor courts with the potential to add 2 more in the future. There is also a preference to incorporate centralized space for a fitness gym along with associated exercise classes, sports administration, sports coaches, meeting and conference space for local clubs and community groups. The facility incorporates spectator seating around the perimeter of the indoor court spaces as well as retractable seating for around 500 people. The Draft LTP 2018-28 includes a provision of $27.85 million in years 2018-20 for the facility to be built in Coldstream Road, Rangiora.

The Council has provided for an extension to the Rangiora Library to cater for growth with the proposed extension expanding the Library’s area from 1,415 m² to 2,615 m² at a cost of $7.2 million in 2025. A new Library and community facility is also planned for the Woodend/Pegasus area in 2027/28 at an estimated cost of $4.8 million.

The Council has invested in artificial surfaces for sports practices and playing surfaces at Kendall Park and a hockey turf at Coldstream Road. Given the development of hockey turfs in Greater Christchurch no other artificial playing surfaces are planned in the next ten years.

The other significant community infrastructure issue that this Infrastructure Strategy considers is the need for more Council office space. The Rangiora Service Centre needs to have its heating and ventilation systems upgraded and additional space is need to accommodate growth in staff of 30-40 people over the next 10 years. A provision of $3.99 million has been included in the Draft 2018-28 LTP to enable this work to be carried out.

The Council also leases commercial office space to accommodate about 50 – 60 staff and that space is available until 2029. By about 2025 the Council will need to decide whether it wishes to extend its current Council offices or continue to lease commercial office space. For the purposes of this Infrastructure Strategy a $20 million provision has been included in 2029 for the extension of current Council offices, although a decision on what option is best would not need to be made until nearer 2025.

**30 Year Capital Expenditure Forecast**

Figure 1.1 shows that over the next 30 years the Council expects spending of approximately $55 million per year for the first 3 years. This includes the proposed multi-use sports facility. Later years have a relatively consistent level of capital expenditure. This is on average between $25 million and $35 million per annum.
Renewal expenditure over the 30 year period averages approximately $10 million per annum in total (in 2018 $) and will be funded from accumulated depreciation reserves and NZTA roading subsidies.

The balance of capital expenditure will be funded by development contributions (where it is growth-related) and the remainder by way of loans and rates.

**Figure 1.1 2018 to 2048 capital forecast for combined assets (excluding earthquake repairs)**

Keeping it Affordable

The Council has developed its Financial Strategy as part of the development of its Draft LTP 2018-28 which reflects the directions contained in the LTP and Infrastructure Strategy and to model the financial effects on the Council and the District.

The Financial Strategy is aimed at responding to the needs of the community in an affordable way, while funding long term projects so that future generations, who benefit from community infrastructure, pay their share. As the District’s population grows, the demands for increased levels of service grow, as do the requirements of national standards. These cost drivers are a constant pressure on increases in rates.

In addition, an ageing population means that there is an increasing proportion of ratepayers who are on fixed incomes, placing greater pressure on the affordability of annual rates increases.

The key components of the Council’s strategic direction are to:

∑ Reinstate the Council’s community assets to pre-earthquake condition
∑ Restrict operating expenditure movements to the rate of Local Government Cost Inflation, excluding catering for population growth and improved levels of service
∑ Maintain debt within policy limits, while maintaining headroom for significant natural disasters long term
∑ Maintain the current prudent financial management while still providing high quality levels of service for both current and future generations.

**Funding Depreciation**

Because the peak of asset renewals occur later in the 21st Century the Council’s policy for the funding of depreciation means that it can comfortably fund renewals from accumulated depreciation funds.

The Council’s policy is to ring fence funding of depreciation into separate accounts so that the funds can only be applied to the renewal of infrastructure.

The Council has based the level of funding required on modelling that reflects the Council being able to invest funds at a rate greater than inflation (without having to pay taxation on interest earned) and this means that when assets are due for renewal funds will be available.

**Conclusion**

The Council’s Infrastructure Strategy has been developed based on the best information available to it and the Council has used assumptions based on what it reasonably considers could occur over the next 30 years. Undoubtedly, the actual outcomes will vary to those contained within this Infrastructure Strategy as better information comes to hand.

The Council will continue to monitor and review the information available to it and will refine and update its Infrastructure Strategy every three years to reflect any significant changes.
2.0 INTRODUCTION

This is the Waimakariri District Council’s second Infrastructure Strategy. It has been prepared from the Council’s suite of Activity Management Plans, which were presented to Council for feedback in December 2017 and are to be adopted in February 2018. It forms part of the 2018 – 2028 Long Term Plan.

The issues discussed reflect the current planning environment and the Council’s and community priorities across the District.

The financial forecasts are estimates and the reliability of the forecasts decreases beyond ten years and towards the 30 year planning horizon.

2.1 Strategy Layout

The Strategy document sections and corresponding LGA Amendment Act 2014 sections are shown in table 2.1.

Table 2.1 Strategy layout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Section</th>
<th>LGA 2002 as amended (Section 101B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provides a summary of the key issues addressed within the document (1) and 2(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Identifies the purpose of the Strategy and the core infrastructure included within it 6(a) and 6(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provides context by describing the District and the Council, and illustrating the linkage between strategic documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Identifies the external factors influencing the Council’s IS management approach including demographic changes, changing government priorities and legislation, community expectations, natural hazards and climate change and sustainability 3(b) to 3(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Describes the core infrastructure provided by the Council, its current performance and community response to this, the way identified risks are managed, proposed levels of expenditure for renewals and capital works, and strategic issues and priorities 3(a) to 3(e), 6(a) and 6(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Describes the Council’s 30 year management strategy 3(a) to 3(c) and 4(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Identifies significant issues and the response options to these, and documents benefits, assumptions, cost, timing and funding source 2(a) and 2(b), 4(b) and 4(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Identifies the costs associated with the actions proposed and the way these will be managed 4(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Purpose

(1) A local authority must, as part of its long-term plan, prepare and adopt an infrastructure strategy for a period of at least 30 consecutive financial years.

The stated purpose of the Infrastructure Strategy is to:
(A) Identify significant infrastructure issues for the local authority over the period covered by the strategy; and
(B) Identify the principal options for managing those issues and the implications of those options.

Section (6) defines *infrastructure assets* as including:

a. existing or proposed assets to be used to provide services by or on behalf of the local authority in relation to the following groups of activities:
   i. water supply:
   ii. sewerage and the treatment and disposal of sewage:
   iii. stormwater drainage:
   iv. flood protection and control works:
   v. the provision of roads and footpaths; and

b. any other assets that the local authority, in its discretion, wishes to include in the strategy.
2.3 Waimakariri District Core Infrastructural Assets

In addition to the mandatory requirements, the Waimakariri District Council Infrastructure Strategy includes those activities that involve the provision of either a significant number of infrastructure assets, such as the Green Space activity, or a few very significant assets such as the Solid Waste and Property, Library and Aquatic Facilities activities. Without these inclusions the Infrastructure Strategy would be incomplete in its reflection of the Council’s asset-based activities because the Green Space and Aquatics activities are currently a significant area of maintenance and operating expenditure, and some of the key infrastructure issues facing the Council relate to the Solid Waste activity. The Council also considers it to be a valuable exercise for the strategic planning of these discretionary activity areas to be extended to a 30 year timeframe.

The Council does not manage any flood protection and control works assets located within the District as these are managed by Environment Canterbury.

The Waimakariri District Council’s core infrastructure assets are shown in table 2.2.

Table 2.2 Waimakariri District infrastructure assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Replacement Value</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Net Book Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water supply</td>
<td>Water extraction, treatment and distribution</td>
<td>$142.6M</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>$143M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>Wastewater collection, treatment and discharge</td>
<td>$236.6M</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>$236.6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater drainage</td>
<td>Stormwater collection and discharge</td>
<td>$90.6M</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>$90.6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads and footpaths</td>
<td>Transport related infrastructure such as roads, footpaths roading drainage, streetlights and signs, and bridges *excludes land under roads</td>
<td>$938.6M</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>$752M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid waste</td>
<td>Collection, transfer and disposal of household and business waste</td>
<td>$5.3M</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>$4M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Green space and community buildings (including aquatic centres, libraries and Council service centres)</td>
<td>$72M</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>$57.7M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,485.9M</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,284.2M</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The replacement and net book values shown above for all of the asset groups is at 30 June 2017. These figures exclude land value.
3.0 CONTEXT

3.1 Waimakariri District

The Waimakariri district lies to the north of the Waimakariri River and covers some 225,000 hectares, extending from Pegasus Bay in the east to the Puketeraki Range in the west. It is bounded to the north by Hurunui District. The major urban areas are Rangiora and Kaiapoi, which are located within commuting distance of Christchurch City. Smaller towns exist at Woodend, Oxford and Pegasus and there are beach settlements at Waikuku Beach, Woodend Beach and The Pines Beach and Kairaki. Despite rapid population growth, Waimakariri has retained its rural/small town character with just over one-third of ratepayers living in rural areas and rural villages located at Cust, Sefton, Ohoka and Tuahiwi.

A large portion of the Waimakariri district has fertile flat land, or highly productive rolling downs. Much of the land to the east of Rangiora is reclaimed swamp, which is still subject to poor drainage and occasional flooding. The district's western landscape is hilly and dominated by Mt Oxford, Mt Richardson, Mt Thomas and Mt Grey.

It is anticipated that dairying will continue to play a significant role in the district’s economy, although growth in dairying may be slower than in recent years.

Waimakariri has been one of the fastest growing districts in New Zealand during most of the past 30 years. This growth was due to a consistently high rate of residential construction, stimulated by in-migration from Christchurch and further afield. Unprecedented levels of house building occurred in the 2013 calendar year, peaking at 1,278 new dwelling consents, due in part to the loss of housing in the district because of red zoning and in part to the impact of the earthquakes on Christchurch.

The district is expected to remain one of the top growth areas in the country even though consents started to ease back in the 2014 calendar year.

Current growth (2015 - 2017) is tracking at 660 new dwelling consents per annum and is still above the long run average of 400 per annum.

3.2 The Council

The Waimakariri District Council was established in 1989 as a territorial authority and replaced three former territorial authorities. Part of the Hurunui County area also came within the Council’s jurisdiction due to boundary adjustments. The district is divided into three electoral wards represented by a mayor, ten Councillors and four Community Boards.

The Canterbury Earthquakes have had a significant impact on the population and functioning of some communities within the district, particularly Kaiapoi, The Pines Beach and Kairaki, and the Rangiora and Kaiapoi town centres. Infrastructure repair and development, carried out under the umbrella of the Council’s Earthquake Recovery Programme, has been a key focus of Council business since 2010, however much of this work has now been completed.

In its role as Local Authority, the Waimakariri District Council will comply with any relevant New Zealand legislation. The Council’s vision and community outcomes are strategic statements that guide its decision-making in implementing the 2018-28 Long Term Plan and 30 Year Infrastructure Strategy. The community outcomes are recorded in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan document.

The Council’s stated vision is:

To make Waimakariri a great place to be, in partnership with our communities
3.3 Linkage with Other Documents

Figure 3.1 Infrastructure Strategy linkages with other documents
4.0 CHALLENGES & EMERGING ISSUES

The task of building, operating and maintaining infrastructure assets in an affordable manner is influenced by external factors; the most significant of these being population growth, community expectations for service, the legislative environment the Council operates within and mitigation of natural hazards, climate change and environmental degradation. Emerging technologies may have more of an impact in the future, particularly with regard to roading.

4.1 Providing Appropriately for Growth

The district’s rate of development and associated population growth affects the demand for infrastructure and services. Within the next 20 years demographic changes, such as the aging of the population, will also have a significant influence on the services provided.

Projected Population Growth:

In just over 30 years the District's population has more than doubled, from 25,811 in 1986 to approximately 59,200 in 2017. Council has reviewed the population projections prepared by Statistics NZ in conjunction with recent and reasonably foreseeable growth based on development activity. This review tested what could happen if the level of building consents continued at approximately 450 per annum, decreasing over time to 350 to reflect demographic trends; steady internal/international migration; and a net decrease in natural population (deaths exceeding births) which is forecast to occur between 2043 to 2048. This modelling resulted in the WDC medium/high variant.

Due to uncertainty with population projections and the assumptions that Stats NZ use, it was thought prudent to use two scenarios to create low and upper bounds to consider as part of the growth management and infrastructure strategies, these being Statistics NZ medium and WDC medium/high scenarios.
Table 4.1 2017 to 2048 population projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>30 June 2017 Stats NZ estimate</th>
<th>30 June 2028 projection</th>
<th>Forecast population increase to 2028</th>
<th>30 June 2048 projection</th>
<th>Forecast population increase to 2048</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WDC medium/high variant</td>
<td>59,200</td>
<td>74,500</td>
<td>15,300</td>
<td>97,000</td>
<td>37,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stats NZ medium variant</td>
<td>59,200</td>
<td>71,500</td>
<td>12,300</td>
<td>86,200</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Council acknowledges changes in geo-political landscapes and national migration policies may affect these growth estimates. Statistics New Zealand requires users to cite they have produced their projections according to a set of agreed assumptions and advise that extending the projections beyond 2031 may result in the population becoming unrealistically high or low by 2048. The Council intends to closely monitor its medium/high variant projections and revise these accordingly.

Population Distribution:

Since the mid to late 1990s, the Council has signalled where the District should expand to cater for growth. In the past 20 years most growth has occurred in Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Woodend and with the building of the new town Pegasus. Recent land use changes include considerable rural residential development, an increase in the number of small holdings in the rural zone and increased dairying across the district.

Planning has established infrastructure boundaries around the main towns, as shown in figure 4.2, which has effect until 2028.

Commercial growth is centred in Southbrook with about another 70 hectares of zoned land yet to be developed. Other commercial development is expected in the town centres of Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Pegasus along with new commercial areas developed in north Woodend and Kaiapoi adjacent to State Highway 1. This is also depicted in figure 4.2.

The priority areas within the boundary may be seen as the first to be ‘filled up’ but not all land within this boundary is easily serviceable and/or of market appeal and other areas may be more likely to develop before these.

The priority areas are shown in the District Plan. These, together with existing zoned undeveloped land, provide sufficient capacity to provide for the anticipated population increase over the 30 year planning period.

Figure 4.2 Priority areas for residential growth
During 2016/17 the Council embarked on a District Plan Review and District Development Strategy. The District Plan review replaces the rolling review that has been ongoing since the first generation District Plan was made operative in 2005.

The draft *Our District, Our Future - Waimakariri 2048, District Development Strategy* provides a spatial framework to guide the anticipated growth in the District over the next 30 years, and was formally consulted on from mid-June to mid-July 2017. A summary of submissions, and hearings for those wishing to speak to their submission was heard by a Council hearing panel during August 2017. A final Strategy based on comments received and any further information, will be considered by Council for adoption in 2018.

Directions signalled in this draft Strategy were underpinned by environmental and cultural constraints and opportunities, community feedback, expert advice, and background reports.

The draft Strategy confirmed that residential growth is expected to continue to occur predominantly in Rangiora, Woodend/Pegasus, and to the north and west of Kaiapoi over the next 30 years. The proximity of the district to Christchurch City suggests that demand for some form of large block residential properties is likely to continue. The draft District Development Strategy considered ways to best meet that demand and identified a need to better manage small holdings.

Figure 4.3 shows the projected population increase for the district to 30 June 2048 divided into the areas where growth is anticipated. Infrastructure planning to accommodate future growth of the towns has been based on these projections.

### Demographic Changes:

Figure 4.4 provides a broad indication of the pattern of age group change that has occurred recently and can be anticipated. The impact of population aging can be seen by the level of proportionate growth among older age groups. There is a projected increase in the percentage of people living in district by 2028 aged 65 years and over by StatsNZ (24%) and WDC Scenario (24.5%). The median age is also projected to increase from 42 years in 2013 to 44 years in 2028. By 2048, StatsNZ project that approximately 30% of people in the District will be aged 65 years and over.
Figure 4.5 shows the distinctive characteristics of the Waimakariri population at the time of the 2013 Census and the projected (WDC Scenario) population in 2028 and 2048. The higher proportion of young children (0-14 years) is illustrated and the lower proportion of people in the 20–39 age groups. The projected data shows the (possible) aging of people in the 40–59 age groups from 2013 through to 2028 and 2048. The biggest change expected in household family type projections is an increase in two and one person households.

The Council’s adopted demographic profiles for age structure and household characteristics have been generally accurate over the last 20 years. These will continue to be monitored and assessed and planning for levels of service adjusted accordingly.

Council’s Response to Growth
Over the past decade Council has invested heavily in both strategic planning and constructing core infrastructure assets to cater for the significant growth the district has experienced.

A lot of its ‘macro’ planning has been undertaken in conjunction with other councils in greater Christchurch. This has helped ensure there is a co-ordinated and equitable approach to providing for growth and has provided more certainty to each council about their infrastructure investment decisions.

At a district level Council has developed structure plans for most of the key development areas predicted around the existing towns. Council’s current
position is that it has a significant amount of core infrastructure in place to allow for growth.

This previous investment in core infrastructure means that for the next 30 years the 'backbone' of the major infrastructure is in place and the only work now required is to 'plug-in' new growth areas to the existing systems.

**Summary of Council’s Response:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Council’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predicting level and distribution of growth for infrastructure planning</td>
<td>Adopting a corporate growth prediction (WDC median/high variant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing a District Development Strategy that signals directions for growth over the next 30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modelling key 3 water infrastructure networks to ensure sufficient capacity is available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessments of community demand for community facilities and greenspaces to project future requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting peak demands for water supply</td>
<td>Programmed work for providing additional wells and storage reservoirs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring capacity of the Eastern District Sewerage Scheme to provide for population growth until end of consent and beyond</td>
<td>Extensions of treatment ponds in Rangiora and Woodend completed in 2018 to provide additional treatment capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programme of other treatment capacity upgrades is in place to cater for further growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering for increased volumes of solid waste</td>
<td>Proposing in the 2018-28 LTP additional kerbside collection services to minimise waste going to the landfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expansion planned for Southbrook Resource Recovery Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing indoor court space to cater for increased population and changes in sporting demand</td>
<td>Proposing in the 2018-28 LTP to provide a new multi-use sports facility to be built at Coldstream Road, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing sufficient sports grounds</td>
<td>Sufficient available land to build sports grounds to meet demand for the next 30 years. Grounds will be developed as demand requires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing community facilities to match projected population projections</td>
<td>Proposing in the 2018-28 LTP to extend the Rangiora Library, and build a library/community meeting space in Woodend/Pegasus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing traffic congestion in/out south Rangiora</td>
<td>Completing the programme upgrades from State Highway 1 via West Kaiapoi to Skewbridge, Flaxton, and Fernside Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protecting land to enable a new eastern arterial in Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortfall in Council office space</td>
<td>Leased office space in the short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exploring options to provide sufficient space, including extending the Rangiora Service Centre in the longer term (from 2029/30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Changing Government Priorities, Legislative Environment and Community Expectations

Higher regulatory standards arising from new national standards and regional plans have resulted the need to upgrade infrastructure, particularly in terms of water supply and stormwater discharges.

The current levels of service that Council provides for its infrastructure assets are also being put under pressure by increasing community expectations for an increase in the level of provision.

In some cases the Council will need to engage with specific communities to ascertain the acceptable balance between providing a higher level of service and the cost of doing so.

Summary of Council’s Response:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Council’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achieving NZ Drinking Water Standards</td>
<td>Accelerating water supply upgrade programmes to ensure full compliance with the current standards by 2018/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing standards are likely following the Havelock North Drinking Water Supply Inquiry</td>
<td>Making provision in the draft 2018-28 LTP for Ultra Violet treatment for all drinking water supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overflows from the wastewater network in wet weather events</td>
<td>Securing consents for overflow discharges Implementing a programme of works in Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Oxford to reduce the likelihood of overflows in wet weather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Land Water Regional Plan requirements for urban stormwater discharge standards by 2025</td>
<td>Working collaboratively with Canterbury Councils to develop affordable and viable solutions to meet the Plan’s requirements Preparing global stormwater discharge consents for each urban area Programme of significant upgrades to existing stormwater discharges to achieve compliance provided for in this Infrastructure Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations that lowland stream environments and groundwater will be protected and enhanced</td>
<td>Working in partnership with Ecan and the community to develop Canterbury Water Management Plans to help improve water efficiency and environmental sustainability Programme of works proposed to enhance the Kaiapoi and Cam River catchments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations that higher standards of flood protection will be provided in high rainfall events</td>
<td>Extensive flood modelling work completed to identify at-risk areas and influence where growth should occur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Planning for Natural Hazards and Climate Change

While the gently-sloping Canterbury Plains make infrastructure provision less challenging than in other parts of the country, the district is susceptible to flooding and tsunami in lower lying areas and to the threat from an alpine fault rupture or a local earthquake, especially in liquefaction-prone areas along the Canterbury coastline.
Risk assessments have identified that a major earthquake, either an Alpine Fault rupture or a major local earthquake, would generate the greatest damage to the Council’s assets. There is a 30% probability of an 8.0 magnitude Alpine Fault rupture occurring within the next 50 years. In the context of the Council’s Long Term Plan and Infrastructure Strategy this is relevant.

There are legislative requirements under the Resource Management Act 1991 and the Local Government Act 2002 for territorial authorities to have particular regard to the effects of climate change, providing good-quality public services that are appropriate to anticipated future circumstances and adopting a precautionary approach.

Environment Canterbury’s paper Canterbury’s Weather and Climate highlights that the following climate changes are expected for Canterbury:

- **Coastal changes** - sea level rise and associated ground water rises, increased frequency and intensity of storm surges and wave impacts, and changes in the dominant direction of waves.
- **Temperature** - increased temperatures, particularly during winter, fewer frost days, increased frequency and intensity of heat waves, and extended periods of drought on the Canterbury Plains.
- **Rainfall, flooding and snow** - more intense rain falling less frequently, more frequent very heavy rainfall events, significant decreases in seasonal snows, increased flows in the large alpine-fed rivers such as the Waimakariri River and more severe winter flooding events, particularly in these rivers. Less rain will fall in the east affecting groundwater recharge and foothills-fed rivers such as the Ashley/Rakahuri River.
- **Winds** – increased frequency of extreme winds in winter and dry westerly winds and greater frequency and intensity of storms.

### Issue | Council’s Response
--- | ---
Increasing the resilience of Council infrastructure to natural disasters | Adopting resilient infrastructure standards including the use of ductile materials
Identifying critical components and links in the networks and prioritising their renewal and building in redundancy so that it can continue operating even if part of the system is damaged
Building key facilities on sound or improved ground
Having sufficient generators in place to supply key infrastructure in the event of prolonged power outages
Developed a Risk Assessment and Financing Strategy to estimate the financial impact of a major natural disaster and determine how recovery can be funded
Maintaining comprehensive insurance arrangements
Providing financial ‘head-room’ in the Councils borrowing policy so that the Council can fund recovery even in the unlikely event insurance is not available, and still live within Borrowing limits
Developed comprehensive flooding modelling to assess potential flood impacts and where further land development should occur
### 4.4 Moving Towards a Sustainable Future

In 2012 the Council developed a draft Sustainability Policy.

Sustainability is defined as the capacity to endure. In ecology, the word describes how biological systems remain diverse and productive over time. Long-lived and healthy forests or wetlands in their natural condition are examples of sustainable biological systems that are capable of retaining their natural condition without human intervention.

For humans, sustainability is the potential for long-term maintenance of well-being which has environmental, economic and social dimensions. Healthy ecosystems and natural environments provide vital goods and services to the community. However, people use natural resources to sustain life which impacts on the condition of the natural environment.

There are two major ways of reducing human impact and enhancing ecosystem services.

- Environmental management – this approach is based on information gained from science that informs decisions about protection and conservation of the natural environment.
- Management of human consumption of resources – this approach is largely based on information gained from economics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Council’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving the Council’s sustainability</td>
<td>Developing a sustainability strategy and policy in 2018/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establishing base-line information to assess and improve performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Council’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building in allowances to current flood modelling and new stormwater networks for climate change effects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing for the implications of sea level rise and changing weather patterns in asset management planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making appropriate District Plan provisions in relation to known active faults, flooding and sea level rise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.0  CORE INFRASTRUCTURE  

5.1  3 Waters Introduction  

Asset Systems:  
The Council’s asset management systems for recording and analysing Council assets are under development. All assets are recorded in the corporate Asset Management System (AMS) noting details of address, replacement costs, asset age, materials, condition and other relevant data as provided. Where appropriate relevant assets are also recorded in Council’s Geographical Information System (GIS). Planned implementation of as yet unused modules within the AMS system that Council uses are expected to improve Council’s ability to analyse asset data.  

Renewals:  
The average age of the Council’s 3 waters underground infrastructure is young with wastewater, water and stormwater reticulation mains having average ages of 23, 20 and 17 years respectively. Consequently for the next 50 years, no significant increase in renewals expenditure is expected for the major underground assets of wastewater, water and stormwater.  

From 2011 Council has started developing and utilising a risk based programme to inform renewal investment decisions. The risk based models incorporate the following criteria to establish a relative likelihood and consequence of failure:  
- Condition rating (includes CCTV survey data)  
- Burst and blockage history  
- Seismic vulnerability to liquefaction  
- Asset criticality.  

Pipes with a high criticality rating are assigned different risk profiles than lower criticality pipes. In practice this means that highly critical pipes will be planned for replacement before the end of their theoretical life, while less critical pipe assets will be left in place for some time beyond their theoretical life. It is expected that over the years as more data on the actual life of different pipes classes and the surrounding ground conditions they exist in, is gathered, this process will become increasingly accurate at optimising pipe renewals.  

The model delivers to Asset Managers a prioritised list of candidates for pipe renewals for consideration. Budgets are then developed factoring in any operational benefits of renewal, and consideration of co-ordination with other works that may be planned in the same corridor, to limit disruption.  

Linked to the renewals model is a funding model, and used together they provide a view of the annual budget necessary to ensure that long term funding for future asset replacement is available. Figure 5.1 shows that view for the combined water supply, wastewater, drainage and stockwater assets, over the expected lifecycle of the majority of those assets of 150 years. The value of stockwater assets is so small compared to the other three assets types the only effect is a slight thickening of the top blue line.  

The vertical bars show the expected annual renewals expenditure through to 2165. There is a sharp rise in overall expenditure commencing in about 2070 through to a peak in about 2120. This reflects the fact that most of the below ground assets in the district have been built over a relatively short space of time, and will therefore reach the end of their lives over a similarily short space of time, in about 100 years’ time. The amount of annual expenditure can be read against the left hand axis of the graph. The green line is also read against the left hand axis. This represents the recommended average annual amount of funding that needs to be put away into a dedicated fund to ensure that money is available to meet the demands of the peak expenditure, without the fund going into debt. The red line is read against the right hand axis and shows the total value of the fund over the 150 year period.  

The graph includes all asset class renewals, not just pipes. Reservoirs, pump stations, water supply headworks etc, some of which will go through a number of lifecycles over the 150 year period are all included, and, in part, account for the steady annual expenditure of approximately $4.7 M per annum for the first 50 years.
Legislative Environment:

The Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan includes a number of objectives and policies for the 3 Waters activities, summarised as:

- Wastewater (seeking improved effluent treatment and aspiring to avoid discharging into the ocean)
- Stormwater (improved treatment of discharges to improve water quality, and aspiring to avoid contaminated stormwater entering natural waterways)
- Water supplies (management of abstraction quantities reflecting a desire to reduce unnecessary urban water consumption).

These aspirations are required to be considered in various planning activities under the Resource Management Act 1991. As such they could affect the future of the 3 Waters activities and will possibly, in the longer term, impact on Council’s costs and the nature of services delivered.

5.2 Water Supply

The Service We Provide:

The water supply activity involves the management, operation and maintenance of the district’s water supplies in a way that protects and enhances the health and well-being of the community and minimises the effect on the environment.

Waimakariri District Council will own and operate 14 separate water supplies, once Pegasus and Woodend are joined, which provide water to approximately 79% of the population, or about 47,000 people. There are a total of about 18,800 connections.

Schemes are either ‘on demand’ (no restriction is placed on supply), ‘restricted’ (a specific amount of water per day is made available to the customer), or ‘semi-restricted’ (connections are limited to a flow of 13 L per minute which is close to an on demand supply).

The Ashley Rural Water Supply, which supplies water to about 1500 properties within the WDC boundaries, north of the Ashley River, is owned, managed and operated by the Hurunui District Council. This water supply services the Ashley, Sefton and Loburn residential village areas and a number of rural residential lifestyle blocks.

The physical assets consist of wells, pumps, pipelines, reservoirs, and treatment facilities.

The Council also provides stockwater to enable livestock farming on dry land. The 831 kilometre long water race system is provided to a large portion of farmed land in the District, generally west of Rangiora, east of Oxford and between the Waimakariri and Ashley-Rakahuri rivers, comprising approximately 1,650 properties.

Managing Community Expectations:

Council operated water supplies achieved a 92% satisfaction rating in the Council’s 2016 Customer Satisfaction Survey. Satisfaction has notably improved since the Rangiora source was changed to the artesian Kaiapoi source, and chlorination was stopped.

There may be considerable push-back from the community should legislative changes require all urban supplies to be chlorinated.
comprehensive communications programme may be necessary to explain the background and reasons that have driven the possible reintroduction of chlorination in the face of clear community preference to have untreated drinking water at source.

**Legislation and Regulation:**

The key pieces of legislation governing this activity are the *Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act 2007*, the *Local Government Act 2002*, and the *Resource Management Act 1991*.

Changes are expected from the Havelock North Drinking Water Supply Inquiry, but no indication of the extent of acceptance by the Government of the Inquiries’ recommendations is yet available.

**Asset Condition and Performance:**

The overall condition of 3 Waters assets is considered to be good with most not due for replacement until after 2070. At this stage the current level of replacements is appropriate to maintain the service performance levels. Asbestos cement and early PVC pipes, which are the most vulnerable to failure, are the primary focus for replacement.

Pipe performance is currently used as a proxy for a comprehensive pipe asset condition assessment, with pipe bursts being recorded and used as an input to the pipe renewals programme. However, it is proposed to develop and start to implement a process for sampling and testing water mains for condition assessment during the period of the 2018-2028 LTP.

Currently WDC asset lives are assumed to be the same as industry standard theoretical lives (Ref. NZ Infrastructure Asset Valuation and Depreciation Guidelines, Edition 2.0 2006), although some adjustments are made based on local experience. Further modifications to base lives will be made as more information on the behaviour of local pipes is collected.

Confidence in the data that Council has about the condition of both water supply reticulation and facility assets has been assessed under the methodology in the International Infrastructure Management Manual and graded as ‘C’. Data is based on sound records, procedures and investigations, but the data is incomplete. Accuracy is estimated at +/- 25%. This assessment is not considered to present high levels of risk, as the majority of 3 Waters assets are reasonably young.

Capacity and performance of water supply schemes is monitored through the use of hydraulic water models. These models are also used to establish what capital works may be needed to accommodate growth, and meet levels of service. A comprehensive 2014 study identified programmes of work necessary to meet these objectives, with construction of the works ongoing. Most models have been recently updated and re-run and any additional works are budgeted within the Council’s Long Term Plan. This includes the provision of additional storage, where required, to maintain levels of service as well as reticulation or source upgrades.

The Kaiapoi wastewater model is currently being updated to reflect the post-earthquake infrastructure.

**Managing Risk and Increasing Resilience:**

A range of different types of risk assessments has been carried out for the district’s water supply schemes. The operational risk assessment has previously generated a programme of work focussed primarily on improving security of supply and meeting the current Drinking Water Standards. The programme has recently been accelerated, and the remaining schemes that do not meet the current standards, Oxford Rural No1, Poyntzs Road and Garrymere, are expected to be compliant during the 2018/19 financial year.

The recent publication of the Havelock North Water Supply Inquiry Stage 2 report has prompted the inclusion of provisional budgets for installing UV treatment on all deep bore water supplies, (where not already in place), and chlorination equipment for all supplies not currently chlorinated to enable treatment of all supplies. This approach is precautionary, as there is no indication yet of what legislation will follow from the Inquiry report. Should legislation prove to require chlorination, implementation of a supply that is not currently chlorinated will not be undertaken without informing the community. Chlorination of a supply that is not currently chlorinated in the absence of legislation would be subject to consultation of the affected community, before any decision was made by Council.

Pipe vulnerability and criticality assessments provide input data to the renewals programme. Renewals are therefore prioritised so that assets are replaced in accordance with highest risk and criticality. It is expected that all at risk pipes will have been replaced by 2030.
The Disaster Resilience Assessment considers the risk to above ground assets from a broad range of potential natural disasters. Funding has been allocated in the draft 2018-2028 LTP to enable an improvement programme of work to be initiated, based on recommendations from the assessment.

The effect of climate change poses some risks to Council’s water supplies, with potential effects near the coast from sea level rise, and away from the coast, from potentially lower levels of groundwater recharge. However, most of the water sources in the district are from deep wells that are unlikely to be significantly impacted by climate change in the short to medium term. The risk of rising groundwater on the pipe networks in the eastern parts of the district will need to be assessed.

Studies are planned for the effects of sea level rise on water and groundwater near the coast within the first three years of the LTP.

**Renewing Infrastructure:**

The 150 year replacement forecast for water supply in figure 5.2 shows the required risk-based renewals expenditure across all the water supply schemes to ensure current levels of service continue to be met based on the outputs of the renewals model. Expenditure has been smoothed. The recommended annual funding shown has been set at a level that will prevent the renewals fund going into debt.

The outputs of the renewals model are not strictly adopted across all schemes for all services, but are used as a tool to inform required levels of funding when setting budgets for the LTP, (refer to section 5.1 for further information about the way the outputs from the renewals model are incorporated into Council’s budgets).

The rise in expenditure forecast from 2070 to the peak on 2120 relates to the end of life of the assets constructed with the development of Pegasus, the Rangiora supply upgrade and development following the earthquakes.

The renewals expenditure prior to 2070 include replacement of asbestos cement pipe installed between the 1950’s and 1970’s in Kaiapoi, Rangiora and Oxford, and early PVC pipe which has a shorter life than later generations of plastic pipe, installed in rural schemes such as Oxford Rural No’s 1 and 2.

Figure 5.2 150 year replacement cost forecast for Water Supply (in 2018 $)

Figure 5.3 shows the replacement forecast for stockwater. The renewals fund for this activity has been treated differently than for other activities, with the level of funding set to allow the fund to accumulate some debt between 2066 and 2153. This avoids the fund accumulating excessive amounts around 2040. Since the annual expenditure and funding level for renewals is relatively small (as shown on the left hand axis), servicing the debt is not expected to be onerous.
Providing for Growth and Changes to Levels of Service:

The water source supply for the coastal towns of Kaiapoi, Woodend and Pegasus is from ample and ‘secure’ artesian aquifers. The same source is used to supply Rangiora, via a pressure main from Kaiapoi. Finding additional water to cater for growth for these communities is therefore not seen as a significant issue. Should legislation remove the concept of a ‘secure’ water source, treatment may need to be applied to these water sources.

A new ‘secure’ source for the Oxford Rural No.1 scheme was commissioned in 2016 and an additional source is expected to be brought online in 2018/19 which will improve security of supply and provide some capacity for growth.

Recent headworks projects have increased capacity and security of supply for the Oxford Urban scheme, and this has also enabled the Oxford Rural No 2 to be connected to this scheme, thereby meeting the Drinking Water Standards for the Oxford Rural No 2 scheme.

Other small schemes in the district currently have sufficient source capacity, although the sources may change for Poyntzs Rd and Garrymere as a consequence of the drive to meet the Drinking Water Standards.

Proposed Total Capital Expenditure:

The projected capital expenditure associated with the Water infrastructure assets is graphically represented in figure 5.4. The figures shown for each of the five year blocks between 2028/29 to 2047/48 are the average annual expenditure over that period.

Individual significant projects that contribute to the relatively high spend in the 2018/19 year are finalising the Woodend/Pegasus upgrade works, the Rangiora source upgrade, Poyntzs Rd source upgrade and Oxford Rural No 1 source upgrade. The higher expenditure shown in 2023/24 relates to the Bramleys Rd well. In 2025/26 it is attributed to the Oxford Rural No 1 back up well, the Bay Rd/Gammans Creek reservoir replacement and the Lehmans/Oxford Road link main.

Figure 5.4 Projected Capital Expenditure - Water
Current Strategic Issues and Priorities:
∑ Completion of the works programme to meet the current New Zealand Drinking water Standards in 2018/19.
∑ Responding to any legislative changes regarding the Drinking Water Standards that may require treatment to be carried out on all water supplies.
∑ Source protection improvements through collaborative engagement with Environment Canterbury and other stakeholders.

Future Challenges and Emerging Issues:
∑ The effects of climate change on demand for water.
∑ Water supplies are not metered and unless there is a legislative requirement to do so, the Council considers that currently the costs exceed the benefits of doing so. This will need to be reviewed periodically.
∑ There are no disruptive technologies currently evident that would materially change the way that community drinking water supplies are managed in the district. Council staff are however, looking to work with the University of Canterbury to test new technology on non-disruptive water pipe condition assessments throughout the district to complement the intrusive testing that has been carried out previously.
∑ The regulatory authority to protect source water quality lies with Environment Canterbury, but the Council is expecting to take more interest in protecting the quality of the aquifers that supply water to the majority of the district’s inhabitants.
5.3 Wastewater

The Service We Provide:
The wastewater activity involves the management, operation and maintenance of the district’s wastewater schemes so that sewage is collected, conveyed, treated, and disposed of in a way that protects and enhances the health and well-being of the community and minimises the effect on the environment.

The Council provides four separate wastewater schemes that collectively enable the disposal of sewage from about 66% of the properties in the district. The remaining 20,000 people in the district are serviced by private wastewater schemes, or privately owned septic tanks on rural properties.

The schemes involve the conveyance of sewage from properties to the treatment plants, the management of those treatment facilities and discharge to meet environmental standards. The Eastern District Sewer Scheme (EDSS) connects nine towns and communities in the eastern part of the District and disposes of effluent via a 1.5 kilometre ocean outfall.

Oxford, Fernside and Loburn Lea communities each have their own treatment plant, and all three discharge to land.

The physical assets comprise gravity pipelines, manholes, pump stations, pumps, pressure mains, treatment facilities and buildings.

Managing Community Expectations:
97% of the people who responded to the sewerage-related questions in the Council’s 2016 Customer Satisfaction Survey were satisfied with Council operated sewerage schemes.

The issues most likely to cause community concern are wet weather overflows from the network and the quality of waterways. Overflow issues are already being improved in Rangiora, through the Rangiora Capacity Upgrade programme. The planned Kaiapoi Capacity Upgrade programme will address overflow issues in Kaiapoi. Due to budget constraints and a desire to keep rate increases manageable, this program has been deferred until year 5 of the Long Term Plan. Three of the Council’s four discharge consents are to land and therefore do not impact on receiving water quality. These issues are therefore not likely to become contentious.

In contrast, the Eastern District Sewerage Scheme ocean outfall discharge to sea may be an issue when the consent renewal is due, and Council will need to engage comprehensively with interested groups and particularly with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga during the consenting renewal process.

Legislation and Regulation:
The key pieces of legislation governing this activity are the Local Government Act 2002 and the Resource Management Act 1991.

The previous government initiated a national three waters review in mid-2017 which is to be continued by the incoming government. This may impose some challenges on the Council, but it is too early in the process for any account to be taken of possible outcomes in this Infrastructure Strategy.

Council has not currently been required to obtain consent for wastewater overflows in wet weather events. Should this situation change, obtaining a consent is not considered to be a difficulty, as the levels of service that the Council is working towards achieving are slightly higher than the levels of service that Christchurch City is expected to achieve for its overflow discharge consents. It is extremely unlikely that any consent conditions imposed upon Waimakariri would be more onerous than what the Council is already aiming to achieve.

Asset Condition and Performance:
The sewerage pipe network is primarily assessed for condition via the 20 year cycle, rolling wastewater CCTV programme started in 2008. Assessment priority is based on criticality and operational issues and is also integrated with the road reconstruction programme. The CCTV condition information is complemented with maintenance activity records from the field recording wastewater mains blockage and overflow records. Confidence in the data, assessed under the methodology in the International Infrastructure Management Manual is a grade “B”. Data set accuracy is estimated at +/- 10%.

Confidence in the data regarding facility assets has been assessed as a grade ‘C’. Data is based on sound records, procedures and investigations, but the data is incomplete. Accuracy is estimated at +/- 25%. This assessment is not considered to present high levels of risk, as the majority of 3 Waters assets are reasonably young.

Currently WDC asset lives are assumed to be the same as industry standard theoretical lives (Ref. NZ Infrastructure Asset Valuation and Depreciation
Guidelines, Edition 2.0 2006), although some adjustments are made based on local experience. Further modifications to base lives will be made as more information on the behaviour of local pipes is collected.

Council has two significant wastewater upgrade projects under construction and the third is planned in the near future. They are:

- Treatment Plant upgrades at Rangiora
- Reticulation upgrades in Rangiora
- Reticulation upgrade in Kaiapoi (planned)

Further upgrades at the Woodend treatment plant were completed in 2017.

Completion of the above works will enable levels of service to be met, particularly with respect to overflow frequency in wet weather events, and capacity for growth to be available.

Managing Risk and Increasing Resilience:

A range of different types of risk assessments has been carried out for the district's wastewater reticulation schemes.

The Council's current level of service for the network is no overflows in a 2 year storm for existing areas developed before the year 2000 and none in a 5 year storm for new development areas. Part of the Central Rangiora Upgrade project provides for additional capacity to achieve this level of service. Modelling work is also planned for the Kaiapoi network to determine the upgrades required to achieve levels of service. A $19m ten year budget is included in the LTP for this upgrade starting in 2018/19, but with major expenditure planned to commence in 2023/24.

The Council's resource consent for effluent discharge from its ocean outfall will expire in 2039. This permits a maximum discharge of 57,000 m$^3$ per day, which equates to approximately 20,500 households. Under the 'medium high' population projection scenario that has been used in the growth modelling, this limit could be reached as early as 2028. This Infrastructure Strategy assumes that when consent renewal is required it will be renewed without any substantial change to the current treatment and disposal approach.

It is also assumed that the consent for the land-based discharge from the Oxford scheme will be renewed with similar conditions when it expires. The same assumption applies for the Mandeville and Loburn Lea schemes unless development activity occurs that results in the amalgamation of these schemes into the Eastern Districts Sewerage Scheme.

An additional study is being undertaken to review the capacity of the EDSS as a whole, and identify any future pressure points, including the discharge consent.

The treatment plant in Fernside is currently at risk of discharging untreated or partially treated effluent due to overloading in wet weather. Budget provision has been made in 2019 through to 2021 to resolve this situation.

Historically there have been problems at Oxford with overflows during larger rain events, and while a holding pond was constructed in 2014/15 to address this issue, further investigation of the high infiltration and inflow within the network is planned.

The vulnerability assessment and criticality assessments provide input data to the renewals programme. Renewals are therefore prioritised so that assets are replaced in accordance with highest risk and criticality. Following from this, it is expected that all at risk brittle pipes in areas subject to liquefaction will have been replaced by 2030.

The Disaster Resilience Assessment considers the risk to above ground assets from a broad range of potential natural disasters. Funding has been allocated in the draft 2018-2028 LTP to enable an improvement programme of work to be initiated, based on recommendations from the assessment.

The effect of climate change poses some risks to Council wastewater schemes, with the long term potential for an increase in wastewater overflows from more severe wet weather events. Sea level rise, and associated potential groundwater rise, could also significantly increase infiltration into the reticulation network of coastal towns, lowering levels of service.

Preliminary sea level rise and coastal groundwater modelling is planned within the first three years of the LTP. These will provide an understanding of any emerging pipe network issues associated with changing groundwater levels for Kaiapoi and other coastal settlements.

Renewing Infrastructure:

The 150 year replacement forecast for wastewater service in figure 5.5 shows the required risk-based renewals expenditure across all the
wastewater supply schemes to ensure current levels of service continue to be met. Expenditure has been smoothed. The annual funding shown has been set at a level that will prevent the renewals fund going into debt.

The rise in expenditure from 2070 to the peak in 2120 relates to the end of life of the assets constructed with the development of Pegasus Town, the Rangiora supply upgrade and development following the earthquakes.

Within the next 30 years the programme of renewals includes some earthenware sewer pipes laid in the 1930s which are reaching the end of their useful lives. Additionally, a number of early wastewater mains were laid at the back of residential properties rather than in public roads. This will present some challenges when these assets are to be replaced, but technologies such as putting linings into existing pipes may extend the life of some pipes by 50 years or more.

**Figure 5.5 150 year replacement cost forecast for Wastewater (in 2018 $)**

---

**Providing for Growth and Changes to Levels of Service:**

Growth projections have been updated using the projections provided corporately as a baseline, with subsequent work carried out to identify new works or upgrades that will be required in the future to continue to meet the agreed levels of service.

The Eastern District Sewerage Scheme was previously expected to provide a trunk network to enable disposal via the ocean outfall and treatment capacity for the next 70-100 years, but growth has been significantly greater than anticipated since the original report was written. A review of the overall capacity of the Eastern Districts Sewer Scheme is to be undertaken to ensure there are no pressure points which may need addressing. This review will further inform the situation with regard to the discharge consent. Under the most recent growth scenario the discharge consent flow limit of 57,000 m³ per day could be reached as early as 2028. If the review confirms this, consideration will need to be given to consent renewal before the consent expiry date of 2039.

A key issue in the previous Infrastructure Strategy was to increase trunk sewer mains within the towns to connect new growth areas and to increase the capacity of the treatment ponds to cope with the extra volume of sewage needing to be treated. With upgrades either completed, underway or planned for the main towns of Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Woodend, sufficient capacity will be available in the reticulation and treatment plants for these towns until at least 2038.

Recently completed upgrades to the Oxford treatment plant have improved its capacity to deal with wet weather but issues remain with respect to unacceptable volumes of Infiltration and Inflow (I and I) during rain events. This compromises the capacity of both the reticulation and treatment plant, and restricts the potential for growth. An investigative programme is planned to determine if I and I can be cost-effectively reduced.

The Fernside wastewater treatment plant has no capacity for growth but the planned resolution of the consenting risk will also provide appropriate growth capacity.

The Loburn Lea system also has no capacity for growth. Any development proposals would be required to show how wastewater services would be provided.
Proposed Total Capital Expenditure:
The projected capital expenditure associated with the Wastewater infrastructure assets is graphically represented in figure 5.6. The figures shown for each of the five year blocks between 2028/9 to 2047/48 are the average annual expenditure over that period.

Individual significant projects contributing to the 2018/19 year spend are stage 3 of the Central Rangiora Capacity Upgrade and the Charles Street rising main in Kaiapoi.

For the 2019/20 financial year, the principal projects are stage 4 of the Rangiora Capacity Upgrade, the Kaiapoi Cridland street sewer repairs and resolution of the Fernside sewer consent issues.

Current Strategic Issues and Priorities:
∑ When the current upgrade programme in Rangiora and Kaiapoi is completed, the Council's wastewater systems will generally be able to provide the required levels of service and deal with planned growth, with relatively minor future expenditure.
∑ The future of the outfall consent has the potential to be a significant issue.
∑ The Infiltration and Inflow issue in Oxford creates some uncertainty about future costs which will not be resolved until further investigative work is carried out.
∑ The Fernside consenting issues will need to be addressed during the term of the 2018/28 LTP, although budget has been allowed for this.

Future Challenges and Emerging Issues:
∑ The future of the outfall consent, and the effect of climate change on the network, particularly in Kaiapoi, are the main strategic issues.
∑ There are no disruptive technologies currently evident that would materially change the way that wastewater systems are managed within the district.
∑ Ensuring that consent conditions for wastewater infrastructure are always met, and continuing to investigate and explore ways to minimise stormwater Infiltration and Inflow into the wastewater system, is the most effective approach to sustainability for the wastewater activity.
5.4 Stormwater

The Service We Provide:
The Council provides drainage systems to provide for public safety, protect property and drain excess water from roads, and minimise adverse effects on the receiving environment.

There are seven rural and five urban rated drainage areas within the district. Together the 12 drainage schemes cover approximately 10% of the district’s land area but service approximately 90% of the district’s population.

In the urban schemes, assets include piped stormwater networks, treatment devices, basins, stormwater pump stations and open drains. In the rural schemes Council maintains drains and waterways.

Managing Community Expectations:
Of those who responded to the stormwater questions in the Council’s 2016 Customer Satisfaction Survey, 78% of respondents were satisfied with drainage services. This is less than the target of 90%.

This result will be in part the consequence of significant rain events in 2014 and 2017, but there are also increasing expectations from small holdings property owners wanting urban residential levels of service in the rural zone. The recent and ongoing works programme to reduce flooding following high rainfall events should assist in resolving expectations there. There may be still some communities of dissatisfied small holding property owners where engagement is required to consider options and costs for meeting their expectations about higher levels of service.

Legislation and Regulation:
Stormwater activities have reference to a number of Acts but principally are concerned with the Land Drainage Act 1908, the Local Government Act 2002 and the Resource Management Act 1991, and various Regional Council documents, particularly the Canterbury Regional Land and Water Plan.

The Land and Water Regional Plan (LWRP), which gives effect to the National Policy Statement for Fresh Water Management, requires the Council to apply for discharge consent for all of its urban stormwater discharges to be treated before entering any waterway, and if applied as signalled in the LWRP will require discharge standards to be met by 2025.

While more recently developed areas of the District have appropriate stormwater treatment and retention ponds in place, all of the areas developed before about 2000 will be subject to new standards.

The cost of retro-fitting stormwater treatment to the Council’s existing urban networks is likely to be high (crudely estimated at in excess of $100m). The uncertainty arises in part from most of the worldwide work in this area still being experimental. Some improvements can only be effected by change that is led at a national level, for example, a national decision to phase out the use of copper brake pads.

Asset Condition and Performance:
The stormwater pipe network now has a programme of CCTV inspections under way. The early results from this programme will indicate whether the rate of CCTV inspection should be increased.

Confidence in the data, assessed under the methodology in the International Infrastructure Management Manual is a grade ‘D’. Data set accuracy is estimated at +/- 40%.

Confidence in the data regarding facility assets has been assessed as a grade ‘C’. Data is based on sound records, procedures and investigations, but the data is incomplete. Accuracy is estimated at +/- 25%.

These assessments are not considered to present high levels of risk as the majority of 3 Waters assets are reasonably young.

Currently WDC asset lives are assumed to be the same as industry standard theoretical lives (Ref. NZ Infrastructure Asset Valuation and Depreciation Guidelines, Edition 2.0 2006). Modifications to base lives will be made as more information on the behaviour of local pipes is collected.

The 2014 floods within the District highlighted a number of capacity problems with the stormwater systems. The subsequent programme of works to resolve the issues is under way with completion planned for 2026, but the 2017 wet winter, with instances of heavy localised rainfalls in areas different to the 2014 storms, has identified additional capacity problems with parts of the network. It is expected that many of these issues can be resolved utilising existing drainage maintenance budgets and by bringing some previous planned works forward. This will be confirmed when the...
assessment work is finalised. If necessary, budget for additional works will be sought through subsequent Annual Plans.

Design standards for stormwater works are based on preventing flooding above floor levels in a 50 year flood event and to prevent nuisance flooding in events up to a 1 in 5 year storm. Stormwater modelling incorporates 1 metre of sea level rise and a 16% increase in rainfall intensity from climate change. Where relevant, all new stormwater systems are sized to manage these increased flows and higher outlet levels.

The Land and Water Regional Plan requires Council to obtain consents for discharge of its urban stormwater. Under these consents Council will be required to improve the performance of its stormwater systems and raise the quality of the water it discharges into streams and rivers. This will be challenging as technologies to deal with the contaminants are not yet well developed.

The Council is working closely with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga in assessing potential solutions. Testing of innovative stormwater treatment options will be coordinated through the Canterbury Regional Stormwater Forum so that trials can be cost-effectively resourced and funded from amongst the various members and the results shared. Forum participants include Environment Canterbury, the University of Canterbury, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and other Canterbury territorial local authorities.

Managing Risk and Increasing Resilience:

A range of different types of risk assessment has been carried out for the district’s drainage supply schemes. The 2014 operational risk assessment identified 27 high risk issues across the district’s drainage schemes but no extreme risks.

Of the high risks identified, 15 relate to potential earthquake damage to assets, and need further evaluation to better define the actual degree of risk, four relate to flooding from malfunction of flap valves, for which an improvement programme has been implemented, one relates to Tsunami risk, and seven are flood risks related to asset failure or insufficient capacity. Projects to resolve some of these flood risks have been identified and planned for, but the Kaiapoi network remains at some risk. Individual projects that have arisen from the 2014 flood event have improved the situation, but a network performance assessment for different return period events has not yet been carried out. This work is planned within the first three years of the 2018/28 LTP.

The risk of poor performance of the district’s open drain network because of blockages is managed via the Drainage Maintenance Contract. This includes both a regular programme of drain cleaning and a prompt response to calls from landowners advising that drains on their land need cleaning.

The Disaster Resilience Assessment considers the risk to above ground assets from a broad range of potential natural disasters. Funding has been allocated in the draft 2018-2028 LTP to enable an improvement programme of work to be initiated, based on recommendations from the assessment.

The risk from new developments increasing runoff and adding to pollutant load is managed by requiring developers to include stormwater attenuation and treatment facilities within development proposals, which meet the requirements of the Land and Water Regional Plan. Flood risk for new homes is dealt with by setting minimum floor levels based on 50 year flood levels.

A financial risk arises from the retro-fitting of urban stormwater networks with treatment facilities that will be required by the urban stormwater discharge consents. There is considerable uncertainty about the solutions that may need to be utilised, and while the current LTP includes a budget of $21.4m, costs may possibly be in excess of $100m. A further uncertainty arises from the proposal to apply for consents seeking to delay the implementation of improvement works. If the Regional Council rejects this approach, funding provided in the budget in 2026/27 would need to be brought forward.

Climate change poses risks to Council wastewater schemes as it has the potential over the long term to increase pressure on flood protection infrastructure and stormwater systems and damage coastal infrastructure. Drainage systems near the coast may become problematic.

Preliminary sea level rise and coastal groundwater modelling is planned within the first three years of the LTP. This will provide an initial understanding of any emerging issues associated with changing groundwater levels that may affect Kaiapoi and other coastal settlements’ drainage infrastructure.
Renewing Infrastructure:
The 150 year replacement forecast for drainage in figure 5.7 shows the required risk-based renewals expenditure across all drainage schemes to ensure current levels of service continue to be met. Expenditure has been smoothed and the annual funding has been set at a level that will prevent the renewals fund going into debt.

Stormwater assets are relatively young compared to water and wastewater. Generally it was not until the 1990's that full stormwater systems were installed with development.

The peak showing in 2120 relates to the end of life of recent development assets such as those in Pegasus Town.

As for wastewater, a number of early stormwater mains were laid at the back of residential properties rather than in public roads and will present some challenges when these assets are to be replaced. Realignment into the road reserve or the use of alternative technologies such as relining, which can extend the life of pipes by 50 years or more, may be required.

Figure 5.7  150 year replacement cost forecast for Stormwater (in 2018 $)

Providing for Growth and Changes to Levels of Service:
Growth projections have been updated using the projections provided corporately as a baseline, and subsequent modelling carried out to identify new works or upgrades that will be required in the future to continue to meet the agreed levels of service.

New developments are required to include infrastructure that will ensure the discharge from the development is treated to the quality standards required by the Land and Water Regional Plan, and that discharge does not occur at a rate greater than that which existed before the development. Stormwater treatment and attenuation ponds to achieve this are typically built or funded by each developer in the various development areas. This means nearly all the growth-related costs for capital works fall directly to the developer and minimal growth-related works are shown in the Council’s stormwater activity management plans.

Proposed Capital Expenditure:
The projected capital expenditure associated with the Stormwater infrastructure assets is graphically represented in figure 5.8. The figures shown for each of the five year blocks between 2028/9 to 2047/48 are the average annual expenditure over that period.

The high level of service expenditure showing in the first three years of the 2018-28 Long Term Plan relates to the ongoing flood mitigation and protection work triggered by the 2014 flood event. This includes Parnhams and Feldwick drain catchment improvements, Pentecost Rd stormwater main and the North Brook improvements (Janelle to White).

The 2025/26 increase is for planned long term flood response work at Rangiora’s West Belt and at Dockey Creek, while in the following years the expenditure represents anticipated works required to meet the global stormwater consent conditions.
Current Strategic Issues and Priorities:

- The key strategic issue is the potential cost and difficulty in meeting the expected consent conditions required by the LWRP for discharge of urban stormwater.

- The Council is working with other councils to develop and assess cost effective methodologies that will deliver the required water quality. This work is expected to take a number of years to develop and will involve working extensively with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Runanga.

- Developing technologies may assist with this work.

- As methods are developed and field tested the high level estimate of $100 million will be able to be refined. When the first of the consents has been obtained there will be more certainty about the timeframe required to achieve the standards.

- In the interim the Infrastructure Strategy anticipates that appropriate policy responses and implementation methodologies will be developed between now and 2025/26, when a budgetary provision of 21.4 million (in 2018 dollars) commences and is spread over the following ten years.

Future Challenges and Emerging Issues:

- The issue of improving existing urban stormwater quality is likely to remain a challenge for a considerable length of time, but the outcomes from the Land and Water Regional Plan requirements, will over time, ensure that water quality in the streams and rivers that receive urban rainwater runoff will improve.

- Managing expectations of small holdings owners with respect to levels of service for stormwater is also likely to be ongoing.
5.5 Roads and Footpaths

The Service We Provide:

The Council provides, maintains and renews sealed and unsealed roads, bridges and culverts, footpaths, on and off road cycleways, bus stops and seats and shelters to enable people and businesses to move around for employment, recreation, shopping, social activities and business purposes. It also provides road signs, markings and street lighting to ensure that travel is safe and convenient. The Council improves the road network to meet changing needs and develops plans to ensure the road network is able to cater for future growth.

As at 1 July 2017 the network included approximately 970 km of sealed roads, 575 km of unsealed roads, 292 bridges and 329 km of footpaths. Virtually all urban roads and 55% of rural roads are sealed and nearly all travel (97.2%) is on the sealed road network.

Managing Community Expectations:

The Council’s focus on meeting future customer expectations is on continuing to provide for growth in traffic numbers, for example, providing additional parking, working to improving travel time reliability and safety and providing for alternative transport modes.

Of those who responded to the roading-related questions in the Council’s 2016 Customer Satisfaction Survey:

∑ 81% of respondents were satisfied with town footpaths and 59% with small settlement footpaths
∑ 84% were satisfied with town roads, 71% with small settlement roads, 77% with sealed rural roads and 60% with unsealed rural roads
∑ 34% were satisfied with the provision for cycling which was the highest level of satisfaction recorded since 2001.

Dissatisfaction rates ranged between 12 and 16%, except for cycling provision and the Rangiora Town Traffic Flow System which were both 29%.

Legislation and Regulation:


The Government Policy Statement (GPS) sets the framework for government transport directions. This policy is revised every three years and these revisions can substantially change the emphasis on roading and funding.

The 2018 GPS is currently under development and the incoming government has extended the time for public input to June 2018. The change in government following the 2017 election has meant that the incoming government’s priorities may result in changes to the emphasis and priorities in the new GPS. It is too early to tell what those changes might be.

Asset Condition and Performance:

Generally the roading asset is in good condition. The major pavement condition measure, smooth travel exposure, exceeds the Council targets of 75% greater than the target smoothness for urban roads and 95% for rural roads. The average footpath condition has also improved, due to a consistent ongoing replacement programme, with only 1.3 % of footpaths rated as being very poor and 6% poor. Just 3.3% of bridges are rated poor or very poor.

On the whole the roading network is performing well and it generally meets accepted standards. In particular, road pavements rate well compared with the national average for roughness and condition. However, high population growth and conversions to dairying in the district will continue to put pressure on the road network. This means some individual roads will show accelerated wear due to increased traffic growth, particularly those used by heavy vehicles. Funding levels will need to keep up with this growth to ensure the roading network continues to perform well.

Managing Risk and Increasing Resilience:

The most significant potential risks to the roading network are likely to be as a result of a major natural disaster, such as an earthquake or major flooding event.
Other risks include political, economic and management. By maintaining a resilient network, short term adverse changes can be managed. Adding robust monitoring processes and auditing these and their implementation regularly, helps to provide maximum information on the state of the network in real time, and the ability to respond appropriately and in a timely manner.

Risk to the operation of the roading network is managed through the development and ongoing review of the roading risk register, as well as through emergency response planning, seismic screening of bridges, lifeline disaster resilience assessment and detailed assessments of critical assets.

In general, the short term effect of emergency events on the road network can be mitigated by:

- Ensuring robust emergency management systems are in place
- Ensuring the network has alternative routes available wherever possible, particularly for arterial roads.

Council will continue to place emphasis on drainage maintenance and improvements to minimise impacts of major flooding events, while day to day management of bridge maintenance ensures flood events will cause no significant damage to infrastructure.

Renewing Infrastructure:

The roading network has few large scale infrastructure items that would potentially impact on Council budgets, as most replacements are done in sections allowing the cost to be evenly spread year on year as depicted in Figure 5.9. The only exceptions to this are large bridges. The key structures in Waimakariri are the Ashley Bridge which was replaced in 2014, the Old Waimakariri Bridge and the Waimakariri Gorge Bridge. The Waimakariri Gorge Bridge is shared with Selwyn District, and managed by them. There are no plans to replace the bridge within the next 30 years.

The Skew Bridge, is programmed for a $5 million upgrade/ realignment or replacement in 2018-2020, and following this work should not require renewal within the period of the Infrastructure Strategy. The Old Waimakariri Bridge, which links Christchurch and Waimakariri, is programmed for replacement between 2044 and 2046 at a cost of $20 million, half of which is to be funded by the Council.

Roading and footpath renewals are programmed with the objective of achieving:

- A net benefit to the national and/or local economy from the renewals
- The lowest life-cycle cost for the asset (where it is uneconomic to continue repairing the asset)
- An affordable medium-term cash flow
- Other savings by co-ordinating renewal works with other planned works within the road reserve or adjacent to it
- Reduced risk, including the risk of failure and associated financial and social impacts and increased risk of crashes or other health risk.

The steady increase in renewals, shown in figure 5.9, reflects the new assets the Council anticipates acquiring as subdivision occurs. The peak in expenditure in the three years from 2044 to 2046 relates to the Council’s share of replacing the Old Waimakariri Bridge.

Figure 5.9 150 year replacement cost forecast for Roading and Footpaths (in 2018 $)

Providing for Growth and Changes to Levels of Service:

The main roading performance issues relate to connecting the eastern part of the District with Christchurch and making sure local arterial roads have
sufficient capacity to cope with the anticipated growth in traffic volumes. This includes ensuring safety considerations are taken into account particularly on key routes and at intersections. Land has been protected to provide for a north-west by-pass of Rangiora and possibly an eastern by-pass however the latter is not expected to be required before 2040.

Work is programmed over the next two to three years to improve the arterial link from the west of Rangiora and Southbrook commercial area to the State Highway and Kaiapoi via Fernside and Flaxton Roads. As population grows so does the likelihood and number of crashes. A number of safety projects have been planned, including the re-alignment of Skew Bridge, to allow for the increased volume and speed of traffic to and from the new arterial road at Silverstream.

Other projects reflect the move towards providing alternatives to increased road construction and more cars. Council is already providing for an increased demand in cycle facilities and is looking longer term into Park ‘n’ Ride in Rangiora and Kaiapoi to encourage increased public transport uptake. Ongoing improvement to cycle lane facilities, such as the Belfast to Kaiapoi route ($1m allocated in 18/20) will provide further opportunities for alternatives for commuters, particularly with the uptake of e-bikes.

There has also been increased pressure on parking. Council has allowed $4m in 2019/20 for carparking in Rangiora and a further $2m in 2022/23. Success in a transport mode shift may change the need for this.

A greater proportion of older people in the population in coming years could increase the demand for footpaths and other pedestrian facilities and see an increase the number of mobility scooters and other mobility devices being used on footpaths. There could be a proportionate reduction in peak-hour travel and increase in off-peak travel.

One key project by the New Zealand Transport Agency is the State Highway 1 bypass of Woodend. It is intended that this alignment will be built around 2025–2030 but this will need to be reviewed periodically. No specific inclusion has been made for this bypass in the Infrastructure Strategy as it will be funded by NZTA, however Council has allowed for it in its strategic planning for Woodend.

The One Network Road Classification (ONRC) system introduced in the 2015-18 planning period by NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) has the potential to impact on the subsidy received by the Council. The system aims to provide consistent customer levels of service throughout the country, but recognises that individual communities may have other expectations. Where the community desires a higher level of service than that defined through the ONRC, Council will have to decide whether or not to fund the additional cost of providing the desired service.

**Proposed Total Capital Expenditure:**
The projected capital expenditure associated with the Roads and Footpaths infrastructure assets is graphically represented in figure 5.10. The figures shown for each of the five year blocks between 2028/9 to 2047/48 are the average annual expenditure over that period.

The highest proportion of capital expenditure is required up until around 2022/23 by which time most of the currently planned new capital projects should have been completed. Expenditure over the 30 years is at its lowest around 2024/26 after which time the focus will move onto renewal of existing assets. Level of service increases remain a consistently minor component of the work required throughout the period.
Current Strategic Issues and Priorities:
The key strategic issues identified in for the Activity Management Plan through the Business Case Approach also provide a framework for the Infrastructure Strategy. These include increased growth, road safety, and the effect of land use changes on network maintenance.

The key strategic priorities identified through the asset management process are those which address the key strategic issues. These include:

- Improvements to Southbrook Road and the eastern and western routes through Rangiora,
- Connections to State Highway 1 projects,
- Improved options for alternative transport modes,
- Improved safety on key routes, and
- Ensuring maintenance of the network is not negatively impacted by land use change.

Future Challenges and Emerging Issues:

- Developments in digital connectivity could result in more online shopping and teams of workers dispersed nationally and internationally. This could result in substantial changes in the ways individuals travel to work and shop, and the ways in which goods are distributed and delivered. Changes to the banking industry as a result of internet banking is an example of digital disruption changing the way business is conducted, which impacts on demand for travel.

- It also appears that major changes in the vehicles used for transport are likely to emerge over the next 30 years. Autonomous vehicles, electric vehicles and electric bikes are three examples of vehicle technologies which are currently emerging. Trials are planned for Autonomous Aerial Taxis (AATs) in Dubai in 2018, which is an example of a potentially emerging disruptive transport technology.

- It is difficult to predict the impacts that these, or other, yet to be developed, technologies might have on the transport system. Transport planners have coined the term ‘deep uncertainty’ to describe the difficulty in predicting the impact of new technologies and systems. The impacts will be influenced by a number of variables, centred around three major themes:
  - How well technology lives up to, or exceeds, current expectations, or moves into as yet unexpected areas
  - How willing society at large is to accept and adopt new technologies
  - Any legislative changes which are enacted to enable, or restrict, the implementation of new technology.

The three fundamental strands to achieving a more sustainable transport future are reducing the demand for travel, using more sustainable modes and using more sustainable vehicles.

Demand for travel can be reduced by:

- Providing the facilities and activities that people want to attend and participate in close to where they live. In the Waimakariri District that would involve encouraging the development of employment, recreation, and retail facilities within the district to reduce the need for residents to travel to Christchurch.
Encouraging “digital connectivity” to replace physical connectivity where appropriate. This may involve on-line shopping, or working from home with good quality digital communication.

More sustainable modes can be encouraged by:

- Locating facilities close to where people live so that walking and cycling are viable modes
- Providing safe, well connected, and pleasant infrastructure for walking and cycling, particularly to access key destinations
- Providing quality infrastructure for public transport, including bus stops, park and ride facilities, and public transport hubs
- Working with our Greater Christchurch Partnerships to provide a convenient, comfortable, and connected public transport system.

More sustainable vehicles can be encouraged by:

- Working with Mainpower and other providers to provide Electric Vehicle (EV) charging facilities in the main towns
- Investigating EV transport-as-a-service.

Over the longer term climate change could have an impact, although the actual impact on roading, both in accessibility and in physical deterioration within the district is unknown. Coastal ground water rise may reduce pavement strength. Rising sea levels can be mitigated by ensuring that transport infrastructure is built above predicted sea levels.

Town Centres

The Council recognises that it needs to continually invest in roading, and the pedestrian and amenity areas of its town centres, with work recently completed to the streetscapes in the Rangiora and Kaiapoi town centres. Land has been acquired in Rangiora to extend the existing Blake Street carpark and planning is currently underway for $4 million car parking building on this site.

The Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan is currently being reviewed. A number of projects are being considered to better align the retail and business areas with the river frontage and maximise this as a unique feature of the town.

In this Infrastructure Strategy the Council has also provided a further $10 million (in 2018 dollars) in 2035 for further improvements as required.
5.6 Solid Waste

The Service We Provide:

The solid waste activity involves the collection, transport, treatment and disposal of solid and hazardous waste in a way that protects and enhances the health and well-being of the community and minimises the effect on the environment.

The Council provides domestic rubbish bag and recycling bin collections to 73% of the district’s households and businesses in five towns, seven rural townships, and in some rural areas along the collection routes. A recycling-only collection service is provided to another 4% of the district’s properties (rural residential households). The Council operates a resource recovery park in Rangiora, a transfer station in Oxford and a cleanfill site. Aftercare is provided for five closed landfill sites and groundwater quality is monitored at four of these. Council is a joint venture partner in the Kate Valley Landfill and the rubbish accepted at the Southbrook Resource Recovery Park is transported there. The Council also has a role in facilitating waste minimisation behaviours within communities. This includes funding waste minimisation and sustainability programmes in schools and businesses.

The assets comprise transfer stations, including kiosks and other buildings, refuse pits, hazardous waste storage facilities, access roads and hardstand areas, underground reticulation (water supply, waste water and stormwater), landscaping, fencing and gates, as well as fencing, gates and groundwater monitoring bores at the cleanfill sites and closed landfills, and resource consents for all sites.

Managing Community Expectations:

Of those who responded to the solid waste questions in the Council’s 2016 Customer Satisfaction Survey:

∑ Almost 95% of respondents were satisfied with the kerbside recycling service

∑ 74% were satisfied with the kerbside refuse collection

∑ There was no marked change in satisfaction in recycling services from the 2013 survey and a slight decline in satisfaction with refuse collection services.

∑ Between 95% and 98% of people were satisfied with the location and ease of use for refuse disposal, and the service provided by staff, at the Southbrook Resource Recovery Park and the Oxford Transfer Station

∑ On average, 94% of people were satisfied with the opening hours at the Southbrook Resource Recovery Park and 70% were satisfied with the opening hours at the Oxford Transfer Station.

There has been increasing demand for 3-bin services in urban areas and for urban services in more rural areas, such as bin collection services, from new residents moving into the district.

The Council is proposing in its draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan to change its current level of service for waste collection by introducing an optional multiple bin kerbside collection service to all properties within existing kerbside collection areas in 2019/20.

More environmental awareness may translate to lower demand for Council collection services, increased demand for education and in-home diversion solutions; or alternatively this could result in higher demand for Council to provide more in the way of diversion services at kerbside.

Legislation and Regulation:


The Waste Minimisation Act 2008 requires councils to promote effective and efficient waste management and minimisation within their districts and to adopt, implement and fund Waste Management & Minimisation Plans (WMMP). The Act also gives powers to the Governor General to direct councils to alter provisions in their WMMPs and to the Minister for the Environment to set performance standards for councils. The Act allocates a proportion of the Waste Disposal Levy collected at municipal landfills to councils and requires councils to only spend their share of the levy monies on ‘matters to promote or achieve waste minimisation; and in accordance with their WMMPs’. There are provisions in the Act for a Council’s levy to be withheld in specific circumstances. Any of these provisions could impact on the Solid Waste activity and the services provided.

In preparing their WMMP’s councils must have regard to the New Zealand Waste Strategy (NZWS), or any government policy on waste management and minimisation that replaces the Strategy. The previous government’s
focus in the NZWS has been on reducing the harmful effects of waste and improving the efficiency of resource use, although this could change in the future. The introduction of waste minimisation targets would, for example, require council’s to give effect to those changes in their WMMP’s at the next review deadline. The Climate Change Response Act 2002, the Climate Change (Waste) Regulations 2010 and Amendments to the Climate Change (Unique Emissions Factors) Regulations are implemented through the Emissions Trading Scheme. The purpose of the Emissions Trading Scheme is to reduce the amount of greenhouse gases emitted in New Zealand. As a shareholder in the Kate Valley Landfill, the Council participates in the scheme, reports on and pays for landfill gas emissions.

Possible changes to National Environmental Standards and District Plan rules could also have implications for how waste is managed locally and nationally. Changes in land use can influence the quantity and type of waste generated, for example, changing large blocks of rural land to smaller residential blocks intensifies population, increases public expectations about accessibility to Council-provided recycling services and results in more waste being removed from properties rather than being buried in farm pits.

**Asset Condition and Performance:**

The majority of both transfer stations original infrastructure is approximately 20 years old and is in reasonable condition, although some components now require higher levels of expenditure to maintain their condition. The Southbrook Resource Recovery Park is 5 years old and in good condition.

The capacity of the rubbish pit, the recycling area and the second-hand shop at the Southbrook Resource Recovery Park are the main pinch-points owing to the increase in waste, recyclable and re-usable materials coming into the site. Shortfalls in capacity will need to be addressed within the next ten years.

Assumptions on rubbish pit capacity are based on both theoretical estimates and observed limitations. The assumptions on the recycling area and the second-hand shop capacity are based on observed limitations. Data confidence is high.

The proposed introduction of a multiple bin kerbside collection service in 2019/20 would change waste flows and volumes through the Southbrook RRP. Diversion of a portion of the organic component through this collection service would reduce landfill waste, however a rubbish pit upgrade is proposed to both increase diversion from landfill and address capacity issues.

Capacity limitations at the Sutherlands Pit cleanfill disposal site resulted in Council opening in 2017/18 a second cleanfill disposal site adjacent to Garterys Pit gravel extraction site.

**Managing Risk and Increasing Resilience:**

The primary risks to the solid waste activity are loss of or inability to access disposal sites, inability to access collection areas, lack of containers to transport waste, extended power outages, fire, spillage of hazardous waste, limitations on facilities to manage waste from severe events, lack of land to expand waste handling & transfer sites, and changing recyclables markets/values. The local and on-site risks are being managed through operational planning and proposed capital works.

An inability to access Kate Valley landfill, for example, if the access road became impassable in the event of an earthquake or large snow event, would result in rubbish and recycling building up in the pit and insufficient empty containers in which to store these materials on-site.

Climate change will not directly impact solid waste assets. Rising groundwater levels could increase the generation and spread of leachate from the Kaiapoi closed landfill. This would have to be mitigated to reduce the impact on groundwater quality.

The Rangiora closed landfill is adjacent to the Ashley-Rakahuri River and has stop banks on two of its three boundaries. An increase in severity and occurrence of flood events due to climate change increases the risk of floods undermining or washing out the stop banks and landfill site. The Council will need to work with Environment Canterbury to ensure the stop banks are maintained and adequate for use in the future.

Sufficient capacity exists in the cleanfill sites for 15 to 20 years with normal use. In the event of an emergency, such as an earthquake, the sites could reach capacity sooner than estimated. The Council does not own any
additional land that would be suitable for this purpose and will need to
develop an alternative strategy to deal with hard fill and clean fill. This could
potentially include processing concrete for sale as hard fill to save air space.

The Council will continue to work with neighbouring Councils and
organisations to develop a strategy to manage waste arising from severe
events such as earthquakes and flooding.

**Renewing Infrastructure:**

The solid waste renewals work required over the next 30 years is relatively
low given the overall condition of the major assets. The condition of the
transfer stations is very good overall, being 20 years into a 100 year life.

As shown in figure 5.11, the annual renewals budget will be set at a rate
necessary to build up the renewals fund in order to fund the large amount
of renewals work due in later years. Consequently depreciation will exceed
renewals expenditure resulting in a growing account balance until around
2085.

The peak occurring from 2097 to 2107 relates to the replacement of
buildings, concrete structures and other major infrastructure at the
Southbrook Resource Recovery Park and Oxford Transfer Station.

**Figure 5.11 150 year replacement cost forecast for Solid Waste (in 2018 $)**
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**Providing for Growth and Changes to Levels of Service:**

Council is a joint venture partner in the Kate Valley Landfill and this facility
has capacity to cater for the region’s residual solid waste that cannot be
recycled or re-used for the next 20 years. The property owned by the joint
venture partners has capacity for additional landfill sites once the original
site reaches its capacity and/or the consent expires.

Some expansion of and upgrades to the Southbrook Resource Recovery
Park are planned to cope with capacity issues driven by population growth.
The Oxford transfer station site has some area available to extend services
on its current footprint, but no major capital works have been factored in for
expansion of the site.

Changing age demographics have varying effects. Aged residents and
smaller housing units produce less waste but this could be offset by an
increase in home-medical waste, such as dialysis bags/ tubing and adult
incontinence products, and higher density housing. Aged care facilities and
retirement complexes may manage their waste without subscribing to
Council kerbside services, resulting in a decrease in Councils rating base and a change in waste flows through the Southbrook Resource Recovery Park.

Changes in demand will need to be carefully considered when planning future expansions of waste transfer stations and landfill sites, and their associated consenting requirements.

**Proposed Total Capital Expenditure:**

The projected capital expenditure associated with the Solid Waste infrastructure assets is graphically represented in figure 5.12.

**Figure 5.12 Projected Capital Expenditure - Solid Waste**

The capital expenditure in the first 10 years of the Infrastructure Strategy period relates to purchase of additional land and upgrade projects at the rubbish pit and the recycling & reuse area. These are driven by capacity issues caused by growth and by adopted diversion targets.

The figures shown for each of the five year blocks between 2028/29 to 2047/48 are the average annual expenditure over that period. The capital expenditure in the block from 2038/39 to 2042/43 is an allowance for construction of a waste sorting and processing facility.

**Current Strategic Issues and Priorities:**

- Availability of a landfill disposal site. There is a high level of certainty that the regional landfill will be available beyond the current consented life of the landfill and the Infrastructure Strategy period, because of its location, the airspace capacity it has to expand and the public/private partnership structure formed to manage the site.

- Increasing per-capita diversion from landfill. A step-change is needed to achieve this and includes:
  - The proposed multiple bin kerbside collection service which will divert food and garden waste from landfill for beneficial use as compost
  - Upgrade of the refuse pit to resolve capacity issues and/or to increase diversion from landfill
  - Upgrade of the recycling area and second-hand shop to increase capacity to cater for increased demand and expansion of diversion services.

- Affordability of services and waste disposal. This is addressed by the optional nature of the proposed user-pays rubbish bag/rated multiple bin service.

- Land availability and consenting for expansion of services, waste processing and cleanfill:
  - Once existing cleanfill sites are filled Council may not be in a position to provide clean fill disposal for contractors, which could increase construction costs
  - Once the total site capacity at the Southbrook Resource Recovery Park is reached, Council would have to find and consent an additional or alternative site to provide waste transfer services for the district.
Future Challenges and Emerging Issues:

New technologies and systems could have a significant impact on Solid Waste services, diversion activities, assets and funding models. Examples of possible changes/impacts are as follows:

- Electric collection vehicles could replace diesel trucks. Self-driving collection vehicles could replace standard vehicles, although this would not necessarily result in fewer collectors, as an attendant would be needed to ensure all bins/bags are collected.

- Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) technology improvements could enable pay-by-lift charges, and potentially pay-by-weight charges.

- The ability to track GPS location and interrogate video coverage from collection vehicles in real-time will enable customer services staff to answer resident’s concerns promptly, improving communication between Council, residents and the contractors.

- New technologies could mean recyclable materials could be partially processed on-site at the Southbrook Resource Recovery Park to reduce transportation costs and increase the value of materials.

- Changing market demands for recyclable materials may make it more cost-effective to divert more materials from landfill, and provide more opportunities for businesses to recycle or process waste such as plasterboard. Alternatively, falling values in the recyclables markets would result in the opposite drivers and may reduce diversion and increase waste to landfill.

If the Council wants to realise a more sustainable future it will have to encourage residents to change their habits and attitudes toward waste minimisation. Provision of a permanent education centre, and possibly a community garden-type area, will provide better opportunities for community education and will encourage the necessary change in attitudes.

There is an increasing trend for people to balance consumerism with environmental concerns, brought about by more environmental pressures and issues. This could possibly result in a future lower waste-per-capita generation as people move from recycling towards reducing their waste.
5.7 Green Space and Aquatic Facilities

The Service We Provide:

Green Space:
The Council provides a range of facilities and amenities to support community health, fitness and quality of life. These include community buildings, cemeteries, parks and reserves and streetscapes which provide the community with opportunities for leisure and social interaction.

The Green Space activities currently include:

- The provision of extensive park and reserve space in the form of neighbourhood parks, sports parks, natural areas, public gardens, cultural heritage sites (including cemeteries), civic spaces and streetscapes
- 27 community buildings in the form of halls, community centres, pavilions and meeting rooms
- Four privately leased holiday parks (camping grounds) at Ashley Gorge and Waikuku, Woodend and Kairaki Beaches (managed by Property)
- Rangiora Airfield
- 62 public toilet facilities, of which 61 are maintained by the Council.

Aquatics:
The pools are important venues providing for community health, fitness and quality of life. They also support educational activities such as teaching children and adults to swim.

The Aquatics activities currently include:

- Three 25 metre pools (Dudley, Oxford, Kaiapoi) and three learn to swim pools (two indoor and one outdoor), a leisure pool and spa at the Dudley Aquatic Centre and a seasonal paddling pool at Waikuku.

Managing Community Expectations:

In 2017 the Council prepared a Sports Facilities Strategy, Playground Strategy, Community Facilities Strategy and Public Toilet Strategy to provide strategic direction for these activities. As a result of these strategies being developed improvements to levels of service have been identified to ensure community expectations are being met, for example, a move towards improving the quality of some sports grounds to sand carpet sports fields and providing additional shade over selected playgrounds and providing additional funds for new public toilets.

These strategies have also identified national trends within the key Green Space assets such as a trend towards higher quality public facilities for recreation which is changing the way in which assets are being built and maintained.

The most significant change in levels of service being considered over the next 30 years is in relation to the provision of indoor court facilities. The recent Sports Facilities Strategy has identified the need for an additional four indoor courts to cater for participation in key sports such as basketball.

The trend towards pay for play activities also means more people are interested in shorter versions of more traditional sports which are often played indoors. These include 3 on 3 basketball and futsal.

The Council has progressed with developed design and has included in the Draft Long Term Plan 2018-28 a provision of $27.85 million for the construction of a multi-use sports facility to be constructed alongside the Coldstream hockey turf in Rangiora. This amount is based on the current developed design and costing for a four court indoor facility which has extra capacity to cater for a growing population.

Demand for walking and cycling facilities is growing in response to the aging population and technology improvements such as E-bikes. To cater for this, the Council is continuing to create new linkages by taking a network approach to land acquisition via subdivision.

To measure how Greenspace is managing community expectations it is included in the overall Council survey undertaken every three years to identify customer satisfaction. The last survey completed in 2016 identified the following points:

- 84% of respondents were satisfied with parks and reserves, 62% were satisfied with halls and pavilions, 67% with play equipment, 66%
with public toilets, 55% with swimming pools and 47% with cemetery maintenance.

Dissatisfaction rates ranged between 2 and 6% except for public toilets which was 22%.

In addition to this, Green Space undertake yearly surveys of users of the three main community facilities, as well as carrying out targeted consultation when required to identify the needs and issues associated with specific projects.

The Aquatics Facilities undertake customer satisfaction surveys every six months at each of the pools as well as being included in the overall Council survey undertaken every three years. These surveys continue to show very high satisfaction levels among pool users.

**Legislation and Regulation:**


There does not appear to be any significant legislative changes proposed or identified for the majority of the Green Space activities. Sustainability may be a major focus area for the new Government and Green Space have begun to implement sustainable practises where possible. Any changes to the Building Code and accessibility standards have the potential to impact on community buildings and Aquatic Facilities.

**Asset Condition and Performance:**

In 2013 a full condition assessment and validation of all recreation assets falling within the Green Space activity was undertaken. Staff have implemented an ongoing asset validation programme utilising mobile tablet technology which has allowed all assets, excluding community facilities, to be reassessed every 18-24 months. This allows realistic capital replacement budgets to be set to ensure the overall condition of these assets remains at a high standard. A full revaluation of Green Space assets was also undertaken in 2016.

The asset information currently available suggests that on average the condition of parks related assets is moderate to good. There are some areas where asset improvements can be made, including the condition of water features and irrigation.

The current condition of community facilities is generally very good, due in part, to the considerable investment the Council has made to improve these assets since the Canterbury Earthquakes. The Earthquake Strengthening Program has brought all community buildings up to, and in many cases above, 67% percent of National Building Standards. A number of other building improvements have also been made in conjunction with this work.

Generally Green Space assets are performing well and meeting the identified levels of service, however, the expected population growth throughout the district over the coming years will put pressure on existing community facilities and parks and reserves.

Green Space are continuing with the asset validation process of assets within the parks and reserves to ensure that these assets are maintained at an appropriate level. The Community Facilities will be included as part of this asset validation process.

The Aquatic facilities have continued to perform well and have seen continued high usage from the community. Aquatics staff have identified that there is still capacity at the pools for additional users.

**Managing Risk and Increasing Resilience:**

The four most significant risks to asset performance in the recreation, green space and community facilities portfolio are earthquakes, climate change, population growth and demographic changes. These are identified below:

The functionality of community facilities is more likely to be impaired by another significant earthquake although with almost all buildings being above 67% NBS this has to a certain degree been mitigated. The extent of any damage will ultimately depend on the size and nature of the earthquake event.

Climate change has the potential to affect both the flora and fauna within parks, natural areas and streetscapes. Increased costs could arise from implementing strategies to mitigate the effects of climate change, in particular drought and storm events. Climate change is most likely to impact on open space areas over summer periods when dry conditions will impact on the quality of grass cover (requiring greater irrigation to maintain grass cover). Coastal areas will also experience sea level rise which in time will impact on coastal reserve areas. Consideration of the species of shrubs and trees and grass
that can be used is already happening with more drought tolerant plants being chosen.

The significant growth throughout the district over the last several years has increased the demand on Green Space and Aquatic Facilities. Green Space has focused on maintaining asset performance to ensure Levels of Service and resident demands continue to be met.

Green Space and Aquatics are aware the needs and demands of the growing 65+ age group must be considered when designing and maintaining assets.

Renewing Infrastructure:

Renewals of green space assets occur when they are no longer able to meet level of service requirements. The rate of asset renewal is intended to maintain the overall condition of the green space infrastructure at a standard which reflects its age profile and ensures the community’s investment is maintained. The level of expenditure on asset renewals varies from year to year, reflecting the age and condition profiles of the assets, the on-going maintenance demand, customer service issues and the differing economic lives of individual assets comprising the overall asset.

There are no proposals for the major renewal of any community facilities in the next 30 years because of the major enhancement and earthquake strengthening work undertaken following the 2010/11 earthquakes, combined with the fact that most other major community facilities are less than 20 years old.

Figure 5.13 shows the renewals budget allocated according to the expected life of the asset. Currently the renewals budget is allocated according to the expected life of the asset, with regular condition assessments undertaken by staff.

The growth in the District has resulted in a significant number of additional Green Space assets being installed over recent years, which have an average life expectancy of between 30 and 50 years. This is represented by the overall rise in expected replacement costs after 2046 when a number of the new assets will begin to require replacement. The small spikes in the replacement data are a reflection of the installation of similar assets in new subdivision areas within the same timeframe.

Providing for Growth and Changes to Levels of Service:

The creation of the strategies for the four major Green Space asset groups; Sports Facilities, Public Toilets, Play Spaces and Community Facilities has further developed the understanding of Green Space as to the future growth and development predicted for the district for these asset types. These strategies have then informed proposed capital developments and levels of service to meet the forecasted growth and demand.

In each new sub-division area land is set aside for community and neighbourhood recreation areas to meet the identified levels of service and the development of these spaces is an important aspect of Green Space work.

The District is well served with sport and recreation reserves and no further expansion of these is planned in the next 30 years, reflecting the trend for reduced participation in organised sport and an increased focus on pay for play activities in high quality facilities. These has been confirmed in the
Sports Facilities strategy, which has also indicated a need for an indoor court facility within the district.

The Council has invested in two artificial surfaces for sports practices and playing surfaces over recent years. The surfaces are located at Kendall Park and the hockey turf at Coldstream Rd. The recently completed Sports Facilities Strategy has identified that rather than provide a third artificial surface, which had been identified in the 2015-25 Long Term Plan, the community would be better served by upgrading existing grass surfaces throughout the district. This would include irrigation upgrades, drainage upgrades and the development of specific training parks and sand carpet fields.

Continuing to develop existing reserves is also a priority, especially the 550 hectare Te Kohaka o Tuhaitara Reserve that borders the coast and the Silverstream Reserve, both of which have management plans in place for their progressive development.

Implementing the Council’s 2017-22 Walking and Cycling Strategy is also important as the aging population is expected to result in an increase in passive recreation activities such as walking and cycling.

Proposed Total Capital Expenditure:

The projected capital expenditure associated with the Green Space infrastructure assets is graphically represented in figure 5.14. The figures shown for each of the five year blocks between 2028/9 to 2047/48 are the average annual expenditure over that period.

The following chart indicates the highest amount of capital expenditure is expected over the period 2018 to 2022. The majority of the capital expenditure is related to the provision of the multi-use sports facility. Once this project has been completed, the main focus for capital expenditure is on the renewal of existing assets.

Current Strategic Issues and Priorities:

∑ Continuing to develop existing reserves, in particular Te Kohaka o Tuhaitara Reserve and Silverstream and Taranaki Reserves.

∑ Developing a multi-use sports facility.

∑ Upgrading existing sports surfaces.

Future Challenges and Emerging Issues:

Sport New Zealand has been active over recent years promoting effective sports and leisure planning practices nationally. This has led to best practice approaches such as facility-hubbing (multi-sport), multi-use courts, active open space designs and holistic asset plans being implemented at a regional and sub-regional level. These influences are likely to accelerate.
One of the most significant new technologies for Green Space is the use of E-bikes. These have become very popular and accessible and as the technology improves, people’s demand for off-road and on-road connectivity within the District is likely to increase.

Sustainability has been identified as a key issue for Green Space. The major aspects that have been identified as significant as part of this process are:

- Energy and water use is efficient
- Materials are reduced, reused and recycled, organic material is returned to the earth and planting matches climatic conditions
- Renewable energy sources are explored, reducing emissions and moving towards carbon neutrality
- Discharges to the environment are safe, and indigenous biodiversity is encouraged and protected.

Green Space have identified the following practises at both operational and management levels as contributing towards sustainable practise:

- Use of mulch created from tree matter removed as part of the Tree Maintenance contract for use within the Park and Reserves Maintenance Contract
- Specified sprays and herbicides applied under a spraying policy as part of the Park and Reserve Maintenance Contract to ensure that the correct product is being used and to minimise the impact on the surrounding environment;
- Inclusion within the tendering process for Green Space contracts to consider and give weighting where appropriate to the contractor’s sustainability practices and initiatives
- The planting of appropriate plants, shrubs and trees throughout the District to cope with the expected changes in climate.
5.8 Property

This section covers two distinct asset/activity areas - Housing and Service Centre/Administration activities.

5.8.1 Affordable & Elderly Persons’ Housing

The Service We Provide:

Council provides targeted low cost housing for the elderly at 7 sites, comprising 112 one bedroom units in 45 buildings. Council policy states the service is to be self-funding without direct ratepayer support. The application criteria targets super-annuitants over 65 years of age with low incomes and modest assets. This generally means tenants are eligible for the Accommodation Supplement to make housing costs more affordable.

The affordable housing portfolio comprises 7 near new 3 bedroom houses and provides below market rentals for families on restricted incomes to enable them to save a deposit on their own house over a period of 5 years.

Council owns a number of other houses purchased for other purposes, generally associated with land acquisitions for infrastructure such as roads. The strategy around these properties is generally to hold them only as long as needed to complete the new infrastructure work, or until improvements are completed that enable their on-sale in an optimal way.

Managing Community Expectations:

Occupancy rates are an indicator of performance and these have historically been maintained at approximately 98%. Current occupants typically have tenancy’s lasting 6 years, commonly terminated by ill health or death. The longest tenancy is currently 18 years.

No formal customer surveys have been conducted but most anecdotal feedback from tenants is positive and no evidence of any significant issues exists.

Only limited anecdotal feedback has been obtained from Affordable Housing tenants. The Affordable Housing initiative needs further review to establish clearer criteria for targeting participants and for methods of delivering the benefits sought. This will involve some wide-ranging consultation with Councillors, staff and the community.

Legislation and Regulation:


Likely influences on capital costs are:

- Increases in the mandatory insulation requirements
- General changes / tightening of requirements of the Building code
- Increasing requirements for Green Star rated building performance
- Implementation of a Warrant of Fitness for rental accommodation
- Seismic performance criteria (especially if extended to housing).

In addition, the incoming government is in the process of reviewing existing initiatives in relation to affordable housing and social housing which includes pensioner housing. One of the key Government funding mechanisms to support people on low incomes is the Accommodation Support. Changes to this funding mechanism could have a significant impact on the affordability of pensioner housing.

The new Government may also review the role of Local Government, Community Housing Providers and the availability of Income Related Rents Subsidy (IRRS). This could significantly change the rationale around the ownership, funding and operation of targeted pensioner housing and affordable housing.

Asset Condition and Performance:

A 2015 condition assessment rated the overall condition of the portfolio as; 25% as new (Ranui Mews in Kaiapoi built 2014), 14% rated excellent, 36 Good, 16% Average, with the balance (9%) being Poor & Very Poor.

Most of the poor or very poor elements or equipment have been addressed since the assessment.

Although there has not been a formal measure of asset performance, all the units are weather-tight and capable of being kept relatively warm, and complied with the building code when built or when last having had a significant works done.
Areas for improvement include better insulation and thermal performance, removal of asbestos when necessary and addressing items of functional obsolescence and unit configuration.

The current rentals are below market rates and therefore more affordable for tenants in relative terms. However, lifecycle cost analysis shows that current rents do not cover the full cost of owning and operating the asset and activity over time, when the full replacement program of buildings is taken into account. This is discussed further under ‘Key strategic issues and priorities’.

With regard to Affordable Housing, the effectiveness of the scheme is under review with only a modest number of participants that have completed their 5 year tenure going on to buy their own home.

Managing Risk and Increasing Resilience:
Following the earthquakes of 2010 and 2011 properties were inspected and any significant safety risks were mitigated. The current design of the building structures has demonstrated high levels of resilience to earthquakes, high winds and heavy precipitation. Detailed Engineering Evaluations (DEE’s) completed and are of relatively low risk. This is largely due to most being single story with timber framing as the primary structural elements. Some minor recommendations were made and these will be implemented, where other works are in progress.

The renewal / refurbishment program is focussed on making the units more energy efficient and removing health hazards such as asbestos.

Renewing Infrastructure:
Following the earthquakes of 2010 / 11, several complexes in Kaiapoi were Red Zoned and demolished. A new 26-unit complex was built to replace these however; this required the use of existing reserves and debt funding.

The bulk of the housing stock was built in the 1960’s and 1970’s. While they are generally in good condition, they suffer from functional obsolescence and require upgrades to address specific issues such as asbestos and to meet current and anticipated compliance requirements.

Replacement units are not anticipated for three decades however, once they are replaced, they are likely to be built with a greater emphasis on Environmentally Sustainable Design (ESD).

The average morbidity of housing in NZ is approximately 90 years of age, based on a 1990’s study. Actual asset life varies considerably on a site-by-site basis however, for planning purposes this provides a base assumption against which variations can be managed.

With most units half way through their anticipated life a program of internal renewals and upgrades is planned over the next decade to make them fit-for-purpose. In addition, roof renewals, sewer and other site infrastructure all need substantial renewals over the upcoming decade to keep the units serviceable for another 40 to 50 years. This with the unit upgrades amounts to $400,000 per year shown as the initial elevated spend in figure 5.16.

Figure 5.16 150 year replacement cost forecast for Housing (2018 $)

Following the ‘mid-life’ program of works it is anticipated that renewals expenditure will be modest and maintenance costs may be able to be reduced for a period.

Beyond 2048 significant expenditure is required to replace the units as they become uneconomic to repair. This is shown in the second larger spike.
The graph spreads the cost over a 20 to 30 year period, as a 90-year replacement date is a broad estimate. Actual site replacements create a much larger spike but over single years, not decades.

Providing for Growth and Changes to Levels of Service:
The Council service currently supplies about 10% of the rental demand demographic however, the numbers of people aged 65+ are expected to treble from about 11,000 now to about 30,000 in 30 years' time.

With the forecast expansion of the 65+ demographic it is reasonable to assume the demand for smaller homes or housing units is likely to increase. However, no significant work or analysis has been done on segmenting the future demographic demands associated with housing the elderly.

The self-funding requirement for the pensioner housing service means that the cost of any increase in the level of service is passed on to the tenants. Analysis shows that it is not economic to build new units without funding from the government, ratepayers or other external agencies. As a result, no plans have been made to increase the capacity of the service.

Housing NZ has recently expanded its one bedroom housing stock in the District with 28 new units currently being built / located in Rangiora for people over 50 years of age. However, no substantive work has been done by Council to gauge the likely level of demand for pensioner or affordable housing, for the future.

The aging of the population is an issue for Council’s pensioner housing service however, the cost of debt servicing new units along with operational costs make involvement by WDC unlikely. Currently there are no plans to expand the current asset base to meet this forecasted increase.

Proposed Total Capital Expenditure:
The capital expenditure forecast comprises renewal and replacement work and does not include any allowances for changed levels of service.

Some aspects of the works could be considered enhancements but these are generally associated with changed regulatory requirements, better materials and products, or expenditure on a better design that is equivalent to what would have been spent on a 'like or like' basis.

The total number of Units supplied is planned to stay the same at 112. No allowance has been made for growth as commented on in earlier sections.

Figure 5.17  Projected Capital Expenditure - Housing

With regard to the Affordable Housing portfolio, the relatively young age of these houses won’t require significant renewals over the 30 year period. Existing rental income is adequate to cover the long-term costs of ownership including the replacement of the units in about 80 years’ time.

Current Strategic Issues and Priorities:
The major challenge facing the service is its long-term financial viability. While the current portfolio debt is modest there are no funds available for the required renewals and refurbishment of units over the next 10 years or for the eventual replacement of the portfolio.

Projections show that the service will need alternate funding sources beyond 2052 to remain viable. Some work is currently progressing with regard to alternate strategies; however, significant rental increases over current levels are required to address the shortfall identified.

For most tenants 70% of the increase is covered by the Accommodation Supplement however, there will still be a net impact on tenants. To soften the impact of this the rent increase proposed is staggered over 6 years.
Further dialogue is occurring with Government agencies in light of potential shifts in policy by the new Government that might result in more direct support for pensioner housing. If this eventuates, the need for the rent increases may diminish.

**Future Challenges and Emerging Issues:**
Changing government policy provides both opportunities and some risks that are yet unclear. Some of these may affect current operations and decisions but are more likely to have an effect on the longer term horizon.

**5.8.2 Service Centres**

**The Service We Provide:**
The main Council Service Centre and administrative headquarters for Council is located in Rangiora. This includes three separate sites – the main Rangiora Service Centre at 215 High Street, the adjoining Ashley building and office space leased in the Farmers building. A small number of staff are located in Portacoms adjoining the Library, since the 2011 earthquakes.

Smaller Service Centres are located within the Library facilities at Kaiapoi and Oxford. These are covered in the following Libraries section.

Service Centres support administrative and governance functions, providing office and service centre spaces to meet the physical accommodation needs of:

- Council staff,
- customers and stakeholders,
- governance and spaces for public meetings and official occasions.

**Managing Community Expectations:**
In late 2016 a staff survey identified and confirmed a number of issues with the main Rangiora Service Centre (RSC) building, in that building systems were performing poorly and failing, and that the office layout and general fit out contributed to varying levels of dissatisfaction.

**Legislation and Regulation:**

Likely influences on capital costs are:

- General changes / tightening of requirements of the Building code
- Increasing requirements for Green Star rated building performance
- Seismic performance criteria.

**Asset Condition and Performance:**
The leased space Farmers building of approximately 800 m2 is new and in excellent condition, performing well and considered fit-for-purpose in terms of design and functionality.

The Ashley building in Rangiora was built in the 1980’s and repurposed as office space in 2008/09. The building was recently strengthened following the earthquake, with both floors refurbished and asbestos in the original ground floor shop plaster ceiling encapsulated. Overall, the building is in good to excellent condition.

The RSC was built in the early 1980’s. The exterior is in good condition but overall the interior is poor, due to aging infrastructure and wear and tear. The performance of Heating, Ventilation & Air Conditioning (HVAC) systems is only fair to poor, especially over summer months. The electrical system is dated and other building systems & interior fit-out features are performing poorly. The building is at capacity, but spatial layout of the office is poor with relatively low utilisation of space on a per-metre squared basis.

The four separate administration buildings in Rangiora (including the Farmers building) all require separate administrative functions and duplication of secondary facilities such as toilets and staff rooms.

The economies of scale that could be achieved are not taken advantage of in relation to effective spatial and facilities management. As a result of the separate buildings, some level of compromise is also likely for customer services and from an organisational perspective.

Anticipated growth over the next 10 to 30 years puts immediate pressure on finding a solution for office accommodation in Rangiora. The Portacoms are in good condition but struggle to maintain appropriate environmental conditions. They are viewed only as a temporary space solution.

**Managing Risk and Increasing Resilience:**
A range of compliance and functional obsolescence issues exist in the RSC, with some of these representing a high risk of failure.
Renewing Infrastructure:
The renewal profile for the RSC and Ashley building is based on a number of assumptions around long-term accommodation strategies. The draft LTP proposes $3.99 million be spent between 2018 and 2020 on addressing the identified building system deficiencies and increasing the utilisation of the building to accommodate another 30-40 staff to cater for anticipated growth over the next 10 years.

The end result will be a building with substantially new core infrastructure that will mean a period of modest renewal expenditure for several decades. Beyond this the assumption is that a replacement program of around 70 years will apply but modified where a substantial extension to the building is made – currently proposed for 2029.

Figure 5.18 150 year replacement cost forecast for Property (in 2018 $)

Providing for Growth and Changes to Levels of Service:
The Rangiora Service Centre has capacity constraints. The refurbishment project planned for the Service Centre over the first two years of the LTP addresses both deferred renewals and capacity issues over the LTP period, with capacity extended from 145 to around 195 people.

A key assumption is that Council will maximise the $500,000 investment in the fit-out of the Farmers Office space by continuing to occupy that space until the final lease expiry in 2029. This provides a critical decision point. Essentially, the Council has until 2025 to make a decision about how it will accommodate staff. For the purposes of this strategy it is assumed that all administration and customer service teams should be accommodated together in one building, along with allowances for growth through to 2048. The rationale for this is associated with improved customer service, better economies of scale and improved effectiveness as an organisation. This assumption and the range of options will need to be robustly tested before 2025.

A further key assumption that there is no material change to the structure or purposes of Local Government or the Council. If there were major changes then accommodation options would need reconsideration.

Options exist to build an entirely new facility in 2029 for all staff or an extension of the existing RSC building to achieve the same capacity.

No commercial office space exists large enough to meet Council’s requirements so a developer would need to build a purpose built facility significantly larger than any other commercial lease space in the town – if a lease option is pursued. A variety of risks associated with this approach.

It is unlikely that a private property owner could access capital at a lower cost than Council could and in addition, they would ultimately require a return on the investment above the cost of their capital to provide for profit and risk. While council remains open to opportunities, it seems likely that the most cost effective development and ownership structure is for the asset to remain with Council.

For the purpose of this Infrastructure Strategy, the base assumption is to extend the existing building and a $20 million provision has been included in the Infrastructure Strategy for 2029. This requires further investigation with the results reflected in the next LTP.
Proposed Total Capital Expenditure:
The following graph shows the indicative forecast out over 150 years. This picks up several cycles of replacements and includes allowances for various refurbishments that extend the life of existing buildings.
Ongoing renewals and refurbishments are proposed on a cycle of between 15 and 20 years with a larger mid-life spike where more significant renewals are catered for at intervals of around 35 years.

Figure 5.19    Projected Capital Expenditure - Property

Current Strategic Issues and Priorities:
The priority issue is the mitigation of anticipated asset failures in the RSC building that could compromise service delivery, compliance and staff health and safety.
Closely associated with the above is the need for additional capacity for staff and addressing a cramped and poor quality work environment that also may be having an effect on customer service.
Opportunities exist to significantly improve energy management and other operational functions due to new infrastructure and better design.

Future Challenges and Emerging Issues:
The plans to allow for future growth are challenging in that the economics around incremental expansion of a facility are generally poor.
The two strategies that can generally be applied are subletting the unused space until it is needed or paying a premium for both the initial build and subsequent extensions to allow for growth.
Council will need to grapple with these issues. Further investigations are also required in relation to the plans for future growth to validate assumptions and identify cost efficiencies.
5.9 Libraries

The Service We Provide:
The Library service is located at 3 main sites, Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Oxford. Small Service Centres are co-located at Kaiapoi and Oxford and are covered within this part of the Infrastructure Strategy.

Library services are provided to visitors and residents and include a variety of learning, information and recreation resources in print and electronic format, available to the public in the libraries at Rangiora, Kaiapoi, and Oxford, and via the libraries website: https://libraries.waimakariri.govt.nz

Qualified staff utilise quality resources and appropriate technologies to inform, inspire, empower, entertain and sometimes challenge library users. This helps to connect people to their community, their culture, their heritage, their futures and the world in which they live.

Managing Community Expectations:
During the 2016/17 year there were over 460,000 visitors to Rangiora & Kaiapoi Libraries with over 72,000 visiting the Library webpage.

Libraries’ customer satisfaction survey in June 2017 resulted in 97.5% of respondents rating themselves as being ‘satisfied’ or ‘very satisfied’ with library services.

Over 90% said they were satisfied or very satisfied with the building quality.

Legislation and Regulation:

Likely influences on capital costs are:

\[ \sum \text{General changes / tightening of requirements of the Building code;} \]
\[ \sum \text{Increasing requirements for Green Star rated building performance;} \]
\[ \sum \text{Seismic performance criteria} \]

Asset Condition and Performance:
The Kaiapoi and Oxford facilities are new buildings in excellent condition. These buildings are performing well and are fit-for-purpose, in terms of design and functionality.

Rangiora Library was mostly built in the 1990’s, with an adjoining building used as an art gallery and meeting room. The exterior is in good condition and overall the interior is in fair to good condition. Some equipment is in only fair condition such as the boiler, due to age and wear and tear.

Renewing Infrastructure:
Figure 5.18 shows the indicative renewals forecast over 150 years.

Figure 5.18  150 year replacement cost forecast for Libraries (in 2018 $)

The Oxford and Kaiapoi buildings are in effect new and the call on renewal expenditure is anticipated to be low through until 2048. Beyond this a 70-year cycle of building replacement is proposed.

Rangiora Library is nearing its capacity as the District’s population increases. A community facilities assessment completed in 2017 recommends that the Rangiora library’s footprint of 1,415 m2 be expanded by 1,200m2 to make a total capacity of 2,615m2 to cater for the population
in 2048. The project has a budget of $7.2 million and is planned for the 2024/25 year. Any renewal work for the Rangiora Library will be included in the building extension project.

**Providing for Growth and Changes to Levels of Service:**
Both Oxford and Kaiapoi buildings are in effect new and have good capacity to cope with growth over the next 30 years.
The Rangiora Library is close to capacity and a planned extension of the Library in 2024/25 will accommodate growth through to 2048.
A new Library and community facility is planned for Woodend/Pegasus area as the population for that community is anticipated to reach 12,000 by 2048.
It is proposed a new library and community facility be built in 2027/28 at an estimated cost of $4.8 million which should resolve any capacity issues along the eastern seaboard part of the District.

**Proposed Total Capital Expenditure:**
The renewals planned for the Rangiora Library as part of the refurbishment project will in part extend the life of existing building and the timing of ongoing renewals is heavily influenced by the substantial extension in 2024/25.

Ongoing renewals and refurbishments are proposed on a cycle of between 15 and 20 years with a larger mid-life spike where more significant renewals are catered for at intervals of around 35 years.

**Figure 5.19 Projected Capital Expenditure - Libraries**

**Current Strategic Issues and Priorities:**
The main strategic issue in the near future is catering for the growth in the community over the next thirty years and ensuring facilities are appropriate, hence the proposed expansion of the Rangiora Library and the building of a new facility in Woodend/Pegasus.
There is also the possibility that the proposed extension of the Rangiora Service Centre could in some way integrate with the Library extension and better utilise the connection through to Victoria Park. This will need to be assessed prior to the detailed design of the Rangiora Library commencing.

**Future Challenges and Emerging Issues:**
The design process for new buildings and refurbishments will need to establish clear criteria around the evaluation of benefits and costs of new technologies and design solutions and better understand the cost environmental impact of facilities over their full lifecycle.
6.0 THIRTY YEAR STRATEGY

6.1 The Organisation’s Priorities

The Council’s overall priorities are to continue to:
- Summarize appropriately for growth
- Achieve a balance between community expectations and affordability
- Plan for natural hazards and climate change
- Move towards a sustainable future.

Within this framework specific priorities, in no particular order, are to:
- Complete earthquake recovery and progress the regeneration programme
- Complete infrastructure expansion/improvements required to cater for population growth
- Manage flooding risk
- Allow borrowing headroom for natural disaster mitigation
- Progress applications for global stormwater consent
- Continue to provide a range of community and recreation spaces and facilities.

6.2 Asset and Service Management Strategy

In providing services to residents and visitors through the use of infrastructural assets, Council’s management strategy is to:
- Maintain the current agreed levels of service and ensure targets are met
- Complete programmed increases in levels of service for water, wastewater and drainage
- Maintain the assets in an acceptable condition
- Accommodate growth in the District by strategically aligning the provision of services to identified land use/availability
- Improve resilience
- Improve operational efficiencies
- Embed sustainability principles into Council practice.

This is achieved through developing and implementing a sustainability policy, tracking progress with the implementation of the Asset Management Policy adopted by Council in 2016 and funding operations, maintenance, renewals and new works programmes.

Operation and maintenance expenditure incorporates the day to day running of the infrastructure networks and allows these systems to carry on functioning to deliver the agreed levels of service, as well as operational efficiency to be improved.

Renewal expenditure is work that restores the systems to their original state rather than increasing the capacity or standard of the existing assets and is funded from a budget generated by the depreciation component of the rates.

New works are funded through a capital works programme developed using some or all of the following sources:
- Capacity assessments. These provide details about any shortfalls and new works are prioritised to address these. This is primarily driven by growth
- Levels of Service. These highlight any deficiencies in the quality of service provided to customers
- Risk Assessments. These provide information about the highest risks to each scheme based on a range of different events and causes. Works are programmed to mitigate extreme or high risks
- Criticality assessments. These provide a measure of the importance of an asset to the overall scheme. Highly critical assets have a lower threshold for action, such as proactive inspection and rehabilitation, compared to low criticality assets
- The Disaster Resilience Assessment Action Plan. This provides a prioritised list of actions to improve resilience against a number of potential disasters. These are included in new works programmes where necessary.

The average age of Council’s infrastructure is relatively new, with the vast majority of infrastructure not due for replacement until after 2050, and most of that renewal not due until late in the 21st century. The Council has introduced a Depreciation Policy that aims to provide for the replacement of the asset.
over its life and ensure sufficient funds are set aside to enable the long term renewal of assets.

The funding regime will see sufficient money collected from rates, through depreciation funding, to ensure renewals can be funded without any significant loans needing to be raised for this work.

Historically the Council has designed a renewals programme based on replacing assets nearing or at the end of their remaining useful life. As Council asset management planning becomes more sophisticated, the assessments and criteria informing renewal programmes are becoming more complex, moving the Council away from programmes predominantly based on theoretical design life assumptions to evidence-based performance programmes.

Like all other councils, the Waimakariri District Council must carefully manage its investment in infrastructure to ensure it gets value for every dollar and provide infrastructure in a lawful, functional and affordable manner. The Council is therefore moving away from a reactive replacement and maintenance approach by employing optimisation analysis and co-ordinating work programmes.

**Combined Renewals Forecast:**

The combined renewals forecast shown in figure 6.1 (without inflation) shows that the average replacement cost is approximately $15 million over the period of the 30 Year Infrastructure Strategy, and there is an expected peak of approximately $22 million in the 150 year forecast.
6.3 Cost Effective Delivery of Services

In terms of section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002 (Purpose of local government) there is a clear requirement:

(1)(b) to meet the current and future needs of communities 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) In this Act, good-quality, in relation to local infrastructure, local public services, and performance of regulatory functions, means infrastructure, services, and performance that are -

(a) efficient; and;
(b) effective; and;
(c) appropriate to present and anticipated future circumstances.

In order to ensure the delivery of services is efficient, effective and appropriate, the Waimakariri District Council has:

∑ Undertaken Section 17A service reviews for all of its core activities over the past two years
∑ Developed an asset management policy that requires all activity groups covered by the policy to prepare activity management plans that reflect the strategic directions outlined in the Council’s Infrastructure and Financial Strategies
∑ Established an asset management steering group responsible for implementing the policy, including the development of a corporate asset management improvement programme and procedural guide
∑ Prepared independently peer reviewed asset management plans that reflect asset criticality and contain continuous improvement programmes for maintaining and improving asset-based levels of service.
∑ Closely monitored growth and development demand and made financial provision for trunk infrastructure in its Long Term Plan to meet reasonably foreseeable servicing requirements in time;
∑ Adopted a Procurement policy to ensure the capital expenditure programme is managed through competitively tested market processes.

Some changes the Council has made to provide more efficient cost-effective services are as follows:

∑ The Council has recently incorporated all the asset and financial information within one software system to provide more reliable recording and reporting. When fully implemented this new system will also provide for better monitoring and analysis of assets, and development of improved capital and operational maintenance programmes

∑ The Council is changing some of its renewal techniques, for example, pull through linings are being used to extend the lives of sewer assets

∑ A “mobility” project which equips field staff with tablets that enable the direct entry of data

∑ Astroturf technology has replaced some grass playing field surfaces to extend playing time and avoid the need for recovery time. When combined with the proposed sports fields upgrade programme the Council will be able to make more efficient use of these assets and therefore respond better to increasing demand from a growing population.

Other changes the Council is implementing or considering are:

∑ Shared services/collaborative approaches/strategic partnerships such as the Christchurch Transport Investment Story – July 2017, which provides an integrated approach to planning, prioritising, implementing and managing the transport system in Greater Christchurch

∑ Offering hydraulic modelling services to a neighbouring smaller local authority on a consultancy basis, that will enable enhancement of technical skills within the Project Delivery Unit

∑ Introduction of optional additional kerbside waste collections in the form of wheelee bin services for refuse and organics, to augment the existing recycling service

∑ Amalgamating small water and wastewater schemes to reduce costs, increase resilience and in some cases provide a higher level of service. For example, the Fernside water supply is being joined to the Mandeville scheme, and the Woodend/Pegasus schemes are to be connected.

∑ Merging activities and supplies.
The Council has also benefitted from changes to Government purchasing systems which have provided it with greater purchasing leverage and access to cheaper electricity supplies.

In terms of sustainability, the Council takes account of the current needs of people and communities, the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations, and the need to maintain and enhance the quality of the environment.

The value and life expectancy of all assets are determined and used to value annual depreciation. This ensures that current ratepayers fund their portion of the use of an asset.

The Council also uses optimised decision making for its assets with the objective of achieving agreed levels of service at least cost. The process considers the costs of buying and maintaining assets over their complete lifecycle, and also includes risk assessment.

The Council applies differing levels of optimisation to projects, depending on the relative value (or effect on ratepayers) of a project, the risks, the degree of public interest, and when the works are planned.

The timing of a project is an important factor in selecting an appropriate level of optimisation, if the length of time before the project is undertaken substantially increases the likelihood of something changing, such as the predicted growth, the project cost, or even the need for the solution.

### 6.4 Significant Decisions Required

Taking a long term view to the management of infrastructural assets, the Council needs to make key decisions in a timely manner. In addressing community desires and priorities the following key decisions have been identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Decision</th>
<th>Indicative Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whether to provide $27.9M for a new multi-use sports facility in 2018/21 as provided for in the draft LTP</td>
<td>This year as part of LTP deliberations (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether to undertake a planned Rangiora Library extension</td>
<td>Within 4 years (2022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of provision for long term Council accommodation</td>
<td>Within 7 years (2025)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying site(s) for park n’ ride</td>
<td>Within 7 years (2025)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme of work to enhance urban stormwater discharges</td>
<td>Within 7-17 years (2025-2035)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether to build a new library community space to service Woodend/Pegasus</td>
<td>Within 9 years (2027)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether to upgrade the transfer station at the Southbrook Resource Recovery Park</td>
<td>Within 19 years (2037)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation of the need for the eastern arterial route</td>
<td>Within 21 years (2039)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Waimakariri Bridge consideration</td>
<td>Within 26 years (2044)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.0 SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

The Local Government Act 2002 Amendment Bill, Section 101B – Infrastructure Strategy states:

(2) The purpose of the infrastructure strategy is to:

(a) identify significant infrastructure issues for the local authority over the period covered by the strategy; and

(b) identify the principal options for managing those issues and the implications of those options.

In developing this 30 Year Strategy Council identified the anticipated significant infrastructure issues over the 30 years and considered each significant action and the benefits of the action. Projects that have been determined to be ‘significant’ generally have a value of $1M or more.

The significant infrastructure issues faced by Waimakariri District Council and the benefits and costs of these are outlined as follows.

7.1 Water Supply

The Council’s principal goal for the Water activity is:

To provide community water supplies that are affordable, safe and reliable and that provide capacity for anticipated growth, and for improved drinking water quality.

While there is an identified ongoing programme of capital works for the water supply activity, only one of the individual projects meets the agreed threshold of ‘significance’ due to the value, and probable level of community interest in it. Planned capital works include providing connections to new growth/development areas, renewing facilities and renewing water mains in private properties.

![Water Supply Capital Projects Pie Chart]
### Table 7.1 Key Water Supply capital projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>What are we doing?</th>
<th>What is the benefit?</th>
<th>How much will it cost? (in 2018 $)</th>
<th>When are we doing it</th>
<th>Growth</th>
<th>LoS</th>
<th>Renew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth LoS Renew</td>
<td>Upgrades to link Woodend water supply to the Pegasus water supply.</td>
<td>Improve resilience and operational efficiencies. Offset capital upgrades required if schemes remain separate.</td>
<td>$1.0M</td>
<td>Completion 2018-2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The successful pilot trial of converting the Pegasus headworks to a biological filter, is an indication that full scale conversion will be successful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative option/s:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue to operate Woodend and Pegasus water supplies as individual schemes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2 Wastewater

The Council’s principal goal for the Wastewater activity is:

To provide reliable and efficient wastewater treatment plants of sufficient capacity to cater for growth and to minimise harm to the environment from the discharge of contaminants to ground or water.

Table 7.2 Key Wastewater capital projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>What are we doing?</th>
<th>What is the benefit?</th>
<th>How much will it cost? (in 2018 $)</th>
<th>When are we doing it</th>
<th>Growth</th>
<th>LoS</th>
<th>Renew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Network Capacity and Legal Compliance</td>
<td>Rangiora wastewater network upgrades.</td>
<td>Meet levels of service, provide capacity for growth, improve environmental outcomes by reducing wastewater overflows, and replace some aging pipework.</td>
<td>$10.2M to complete</td>
<td>Current upgrades 2018 to 2052; Future upgrades 2049 to 2052</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions:</td>
<td>Growth will continue as forecast and the programmed works are sufficient to achieve the level of service by 2025.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>What are we doing?</td>
<td>What is the benefit?</td>
<td>How much will it cost? (in 2018 $)</td>
<td>When are we doing it</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>LoS</td>
<td>Renew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Compliance</td>
<td>Alternative option/s:</td>
<td>Delay network upgrades, don’t meet levels of service and acknowledge the corresponding delay in improving environmental and health risk outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora and Woodend wastewater treatment plant upgrades.</td>
<td>Ensure consent compliance with additional loading on treatment plants.</td>
<td>$4.5M to complete (Rangiora) $2.5M to complete (Woodend)</td>
<td>Current programme 2018-2020 Next stage 2025-2027</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions:</td>
<td>Growth on the network will proceed as forecast.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative option/s:</td>
<td>If growth in serviced properties is slower than projected then the upgrade may be deferred.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Network Capacity</td>
<td>Kaiapoi wastewater network upgrades.</td>
<td>Meet levels of service, provide capacity for growth, and improve environmental outcomes by reducing wastewater overflows.</td>
<td>$18.7M</td>
<td>2018-2032 Construction start 2023 ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions:</td>
<td>Modelling of network deficiencies confirms the estimated budget and indicative timeframe is appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative option/s:</td>
<td>Will depend on the outcome of network modelling to be completed by 2018 and the extent of deficiencies to be addressed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3 Stormwater

The Council’s principal goal for the Stormwater activity is:

*To develop public drainage infrastructure that is effective and efficient in reducing risks of flooding to residential areas and business zones.*

### Table 7.3 Key Stormwater capital projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>What are we doing?</th>
<th>What is the benefit?</th>
<th>How much will it cost in cost? (in 2018 $)</th>
<th>When are we doing it</th>
<th>Growth</th>
<th>LoS</th>
<th>Renew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal Compliance</strong></td>
<td>Global stormwater consent applications (stage 1).</td>
<td>Meet requirements of the Land and Water Regional Plan.</td>
<td>$150K</td>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assumptions:</td>
<td>The budget is sufficient to fully cover the application process and any investigations required to obtain the consents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative option/s:</td>
<td>Support the work of the Canterbury Stormwater Consent Steering Group in obtaining efficiencies and cost reductions to the consent process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global stormwater consent implementation (stage 2).</td>
<td>Meet requirements of the Land and Water Regional Plan, and improve</td>
<td>$21.4M provided (Could cost over $100M)</td>
<td>2025-2036</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>What are we doing?</td>
<td>What is the benefit?</td>
<td>How much will it cost in cost? (in 2018 $)</td>
<td>When are we doing it</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>LoS</td>
<td>Renew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Network Capacity</td>
<td>Flood mitigation and protection programme of works.</td>
<td>Protection of public and private property.</td>
<td>$4.1M (Rangiora) $9M (Kaiapoi) $2.5M (rest of district)</td>
<td>2018-2026 2018-2021 2018-2026</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions:
The Flood Team investigations to date have determined and made provision for the most cost effective and practicable option to address each issue.

Further investigations reveal other options that could alleviate known flooding issues.

Alternative option/s:
Maintain current levels of flood mitigation and protection.

Assumptions:
Ecan accept affordability is sufficient reason to delay starting implementation until 2025, and that full implementation will be a long term process.

Identify affordable approaches to stormwater management and treatment through on going negotiations with Ecan, Ngai Tahu and other industry and community stakeholders.
7.4 Roads and Footpaths

The Council’s principal goal for the Roads and Footpaths activity is:

To plan, develop, improve and maintain the District’s roads, footpaths, cycleways and passenger transport facilities to provide an affordable, integrated, safe, responsive and sustainable transport network. The activity contributes to the attainment of high quality natural, living and productive environments within the District and assists development of a strong sense of community.

Table 7.4 Key Roads and Footpaths capital projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>What are we doing?</th>
<th>What is the benefit?</th>
<th>How much will it cost? (in 2018 $)</th>
<th>When are we doing it</th>
<th>Growth</th>
<th>LoS</th>
<th>Renew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congestion and delays on the Northern Motorway approaching Christchurch</td>
<td>Park ‘n’ ride infrastructure.</td>
<td>Encourages use of public transport to travel to and from Christchurch, particularly at peak times.</td>
<td>$2M Rangiora $2M Kaiapoi</td>
<td>2025/27</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions:</td>
<td>People will continue to travel to Christchurch for work and education and this trend will continue to grow in proportion to population growth. This project is part of a wider Travel Demand Management programme promoted by the Greater Christchurch partners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative option/s:</td>
<td>Alternative locations for park’ n’ ride in Christchurch. Will not address future capacity issues on Waimakariri River bridge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>What are we doing?</td>
<td>What is the benefit?</td>
<td>How much will it cost? (in 2018 $)</td>
<td>When are we doing it</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>LoS</td>
<td>Renew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic safety - poor alignment with tight curves combined with narrow constrained bridge resulting in high crash history</td>
<td>Continue to build road capacity for private vehicles. Likely to be prohibitively expensive NZTA/Christchurch City Council provide this infrastructure instead of the Waimakariri District Council.</td>
<td>Reduced crash/injury risk.</td>
<td>$7M</td>
<td>2018/25</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic volumes on the route will continue to grow.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative option/s:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide signs to give warning and guidance to drivers but this will only partially mitigate the risk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage use of alternative routes such as Southbrook and Lineside Road. Will exacerbate existing capacity issues on this route.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy vehicles on West Belt result in loss of amenity and safety in residential areas. Congestion on existing Southbrook Road/ Lineside Road route</td>
<td>Skew Bridge upgrade/realignment, including associated road improvements.</td>
<td>Manage impacts of traffic growth on residential area.</td>
<td>$2M</td>
<td>2024-2026</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions:</td>
<td></td>
<td>The land will be able to be acquired.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volumes of through traffic, including HPMVs, will continue to grow.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other improvements to Fernside Road/ Flaxton Road/ Skewbridge route proceed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative option/s:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Smooth existing road but this is not a long term solution as sealed surfaces degenerate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The sealing of River Road is also not a long term solution as it:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>∑ does not readily connect to the residential area in north-west Rangiora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>∑ has a narrow formation and number of tight curves. This road alignment is not suitable for large numbers of heavy vehicles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Issue: Aging Infrastructure - Poor level of service for pedestrians and cyclists

**What are we doing?**
Share of replacing old Waimakariri bridge.

**What is the benefit?**
Ensure continuity of service.

**How much will it cost?**
$10M

**When are we doing it?**
2044-2046

**Assumptions:**
The bridge is planned for replacement about 2044.
Pedestrian and cycleway on motorway bridge will proceed and therefore reduce the demand for walking and cycling on the old bridge.
CCC and NZTA will approve funding for their share of the replacement.

**Alternative option/s:**
Extend the life of the bridge by carrying out more major maintenance and strengthening work although this option will only delay the need for replacement.

### Issue: Traffic Congestion on Southbrook Road

**What are we doing?**
New eastern arterial in Rangiora.

**What is the benefit?**
Manage impacts of growth.

**How much will it cost?**
$10M

**When are we doing it?**
2039-2041

**Assumptions:**
Significant growth to the north-east of Rangiora.

**Alternative option/s:**
Further optimise existing network eg: direct traffic to existing Woodend network. A significant proportion of traffic on Southbrook Road has an origin or destination within Southbrook, rather than travelling on SH71 (Lineside Road).
7.5 **Solid Waste**

The Council’s principal goal for the Solid Waste activity is:

*To provide an effective and efficient service for households and businesses to dispose of waste and encourage practices that minimise waste generation.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.5 Key Solid Waste capital projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Assumptions:

Waste quantities will continue to increase in proportion to projected population increases and business development, despite change to kerbside collection methodology, requiring upgrade of refuse pit in future (by 2042).

First upgrade will include space/facilities for increased diversion of 'dry' waste, renewal of rubbish pit floor, and diverting exit road away from service vehicle working area.

New technologies and markets will make diversion of more materials cost effective requiring facilities to enable diversion and potentially initial processing of those materials.

Future facility will include equipment to undertake automated sorting to replace the principally ‘manual mechanical’ sorting planned from first upgrade, this will enable more materials to be sorted and diverted from landfill.

Delay pit upgrade until necessary for capacity (2022 with no change to collection methodology; 2042 with diversion new collection methodology): future works will come at a higher cost, pit floor will need continual maintenance until that time (annual resurfacing, includes disruption to customers and transportation to landfill), no space in current pit configuration to allow diversion of materials, current H&S risks to customers sharing service area being managed through traffic control measures such as speed bumps & flexible bollards, potentially stop/go control of customer vehicles – preferential to have separation of customer vehicles from service vehicles.

Do not upgrade facilities in future to enable separation of a wider variety of materials.

Build facilities at a separate site: will need to include costs for land purchase, consenting, potential additional transportation costs

Form partnership to construct and operate facilities (either at SRRP or another location): cost-share approach.

### Alternative option/s:

- Delay pit upgrade until necessary for capacity (2022 with no change to collection methodology; 2042 with diversion new collection methodology): future works will come at a higher cost, pit floor will need continual maintenance until that time (annual resurfacing, includes disruption to customers and transportation to landfill), no space in current pit configuration to allow diversion of materials, current H&S risks to customers sharing service area being managed through traffic control measures such as speed bumps & flexible bollards, potentially stop/go control of customer vehicles – preferential to have separation of customer vehicles from service vehicles.
- Do not upgrade facilities in future to enable separation of a wider variety of materials.
- Build facilities at a separate site: will need to include costs for land purchase, consenting, potential additional transportation costs
- Form partnership to construct and operate facilities (either at SRRP or another location): cost-share approach.
7.6 Green Space and Aquatic Facilities

The Council’s principal goals for the Green Space and Aquatic Facilities activities are:

To provide sports grounds and reserves to enable many recreational opportunities for communities as well as protect and enhance areas of indigenous vegetation.

To provide buildings and halls as community focal points and meeting paces for events, gatherings and recreational activities.

To provide aquatic facilities to enable recreational and educational opportunities for communities.

To connect people with information, encourage social interaction, empower individuals and promote recreational reading.

Table 7.6 Key Green Space capital projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>What are we doing?</th>
<th>What is the benefit?</th>
<th>How much will it cost? (in 2018 $)</th>
<th>When are we doing it</th>
<th>Growth</th>
<th>LoS</th>
<th>Renew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sports Court Capacity</td>
<td>Multi-use sports facility.</td>
<td>Manage impacts of growth and levels of service shortfall.</td>
<td>$27.85M</td>
<td>2018-21</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions:
Trends regarding sports participation remain as predicted in the Indoor Court Feasibility Study. A Sports Facilities Strategy has also been completed in 2017 which has further supported the current and future need for indoor court provision.

Alternative option/s:
Not respond to the identified need which will lead to a reduction in levels of service.
7.7 Property and Libraries

The Council's principal goals for the Property, Housing & Libraries Space activities are:

To provide safe, warm and affordable housing for targeted elderly citizens and support a small targeted group of families saving for home ownership.

To support efficient and effective administrative and governance functions by providing office and service centre spaces that appropriately meet the physical accommodation needs of Council staff, customers, governance and other stakeholders, as well as spaces for public meetings and official occasions.

To provide a variety of high quality learning, information and recreation resources in print and electronic format, available to the public in the libraries at Rangiora, Kaiapoi, and Oxford, and via the libraries website

To inform, inspire, empower, entertain and sometimes challenge library users, connecting them with their community, their culture, their heritage, their futures and the world in which they live

Table 7.7 Key Property & Libraries capital projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>What are we doing?</th>
<th>What is the benefit?</th>
<th>How much will it cost? (in 2018 $)</th>
<th>When are we doing it</th>
<th>Growth</th>
<th>LoS</th>
<th>Renew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Capacity</td>
<td>New Library and community space Woodend / Pegasus.</td>
<td>Manage impacts of growth.</td>
<td>$4.8M</td>
<td>2027/28</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora Library extension.</td>
<td>Manage impacts of growth.</td>
<td>$7.2M</td>
<td>2022/23 to 23/24</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions:</td>
<td>Current provision will be able to cater for population growth until 2028. The proposed mix of Library provision will remain relevant despite the increasing access of individuals to technology.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative option/s:</td>
<td>Options exist to lease space in Ravenswood/ Pegasus but a new Council owned facility is a more cost effective approach long term.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Council HQ Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>What are we doing?</th>
<th>What is the benefit?</th>
<th>How much will it cost? (in 2018 $)</th>
<th>When are we doing it</th>
<th>Growth</th>
<th>LoS</th>
<th>Renew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Service Centre alterations.</td>
<td>Address functional obsolescence. Manage impacts of growth.</td>
<td>$2.3 M $1.6 m</td>
<td>2018/19 2019/20</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Service Centre extension</td>
<td>Manage impacts of growth.</td>
<td>$18 M</td>
<td>2029/30</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumptions:**
- WDC as an entity continues with a similar a structure over the 30 years.
- The Farmers office space lease cannot be extended beyond 2029.
- Provision will be able to cater to demand drivers of population growth until 2029.
- Leasing additional accommodation (both short term & in relation to the proposed extension to the existing building) could alleviate pressure but is less cost effective over the long term and compromises organisational performance and customer service.
- A completely new HQ / public space building is likely to be close to $40 million.
- If an extension to the HQ is approved the option of developing this in conjunction with the library extension would be explored.
### 7.8 Other Significant Projects

Several multi-disciplinary infrastructure projects, such as the earthquake recovery and regeneration programmes and town centre revitalisation, have been identified as significant capital projects because of the impact they have on the overall financial picture or their significance to the community. These have been included in the table below.

#### Table 7.8 Key Other Significant capital projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>What are we doing?</th>
<th>What is the benefit?</th>
<th>How much will it cost? (in 2018 $)</th>
<th>When are we doing it</th>
<th>Growth</th>
<th>LoS</th>
<th>Renew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-quake Infrastructure Recovery</td>
<td>General earthquake recovery (this includes roading, water, sewer, reinstatement of the Kaiapoi Riverbanks and wharf reconstruction).</td>
<td>Ensure continuity of service. Achieve stated LOS.</td>
<td>$6.8M (utilities) $4.8M (riverbanks &amp; wharf)</td>
<td>2018– 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions:</td>
<td>Marine precinct works progress in parallel with adjacent private development, as per current Wharf &amp; Marine precinct masterplan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative option/s:</td>
<td>Elements of the masterplan are scaled down, for example, floating pontoons are not developed or there are reduced levels of service for berthing options.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is substantial revision or additional scope associated with the Kaiapoi Town Centre 2028 Plan Refresh and town centre masterplan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative option/s:</td>
<td>Red zoned land remains undeveloped or is used for another purpose.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Regeneration</td>
<td>Regeneration of former Red Zones.</td>
<td>Enhanced environment.</td>
<td>$10.9M</td>
<td>2018-2024 and 2027-2028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>What are we doing?</td>
<td>What is the benefit?</td>
<td>How much will it cost? (in 2018 $)</td>
<td>When are we doing it</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>LoS</td>
<td>Renew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions:</td>
<td>All red zone land will be vested in the Council for maintenance and development as reserve land and other uses, as per the Recovery Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative option/s:</td>
<td>Red zone land remains undeveloped and maintained by Council.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centres Growth &amp; Revitalisation</td>
<td>Town Centre Strategies Implementation.</td>
<td>Manage impacts of growth.</td>
<td>$10M</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan (KTC2028) refresh implementation.</td>
<td>Enhanced environment.</td>
<td>$1.8M</td>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora Town Centre – public parking.</td>
<td>Manage impacts of growth.</td>
<td>$4M</td>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions:</td>
<td>Town centres continue to have a role for local and District populations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiapoi town centre will continue to recover.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora will continue to be the main service town for the District.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative option/s:</td>
<td>Restrain investment in town centre enhancement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Red zoned land remains undeveloped or is used for another purpose.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue to regulate for private on-site parking to meet demand or provide car parking further away from the Rangiora town centre.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7.9 Summary of Significant Infrastructure Issues

The following table is a summary of the most significant Council infrastructure projects planned for the next 30 years.

**Table 7.9 Summary of key capital projects 2018 to 2048**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Significant Infrastructure Projects</th>
<th>Approximate Date Required</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (in 2018 $)</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rangiora and Woodend wastewater treatment Plant upgrade (treatment pond extensions)</td>
<td>2018/19 to 2027/28 (Rangiora) 2025/26 to 2026/27 (Woodend)</td>
<td>$7M total ($4.5M Rangiora, $2.5M Woodend)</td>
<td>Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rangiora and Kaiapoi wastewater network upgrades</td>
<td>2018/19 to 2051/52 (Rangiora) 2018/19 to 2031/32 (Kaiapoi)</td>
<td>$28.9M total ($10.2M Rangiora, $18.7M Kaiapoi)</td>
<td>Growth/Renewal/LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Town Centres growth and revitalisation</td>
<td>2018/19 (Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan Refresh (KTC2028) implementation) 2019/20 (Rangiora public parking) 2035 (Town Centres strategies implementation)</td>
<td>$15.8 M total $1.8M $4M $10M</td>
<td>Growth/Renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Upgrade to link the Woodend water supply to the Pegasus water supply</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>$1M</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Earthquake recovery</td>
<td>2018/19 to 2019/20</td>
<td>$11.6M total ($6.8M utilities, $4.8M Kaiapoi Wharf &amp; Riverbanks incl. Murphy Park/rowing precinct)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rangiora Service Centre alterations</td>
<td>2018/20</td>
<td>$3.9M</td>
<td>Growth/Renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Significant Infrastructure Projects</td>
<td>Approximate Date Required</td>
<td>Estimated Cost (in 2018 $)</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7  | Flood mitigation and protection programme of works | 2018/19 to 2020/21 (Kaiapoi)  
2018/19 to 2025/26 (Rangiora)  
2018/19 to 2025/26 (District Rural) | $15.6 M total  
($4.1M Rangiora, $9M Kaiapoi, $2.5M rest of District – rural) | LOS |
| 8  | District Regeneration | 2018/24 and 2027/28 | $10.9M | LOS |
| 9  | Infrastructure replacements | 2018/19 to 2028/29 (all water supply asset renewals across the district)  
2018/19 to 2028/29 (all wastewater renewals across the district)  
2018/19 to 2028/29 (all drainage renewals across the district)  
2018/19 to 2028/29 (all roading renewals) | $16.9M (water supply)  
$25.0M (wastewater)  
$1.5M (drainage)  
$57.3M (roading) | Renewal |
| 10 | Multi-use sports facility | 2018/21 | $27.85M | Growth/LOS |
| 11 | Global stormwater consent applications (stage 1) and implementation (stage 2) | 2018/19 (stage 1)  
2025/26 to 2035/36 (stage 2) | $150K  
$21.4M (could cost over $100M) | LOS (compliance) |
<p>| 12 | Southbrook Resource Recovery Park reuse &amp; recycling area expansion and education centre | 2018/22 | $1.7M | Growth/LOS |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Significant Infrastructure Projects</th>
<th>Approximate Date Required</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (in 2018 $)</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Connecting road between River and Lehmans Roads</td>
<td>2024/26</td>
<td>$2M</td>
<td>Growth/LOS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 14 | Southbrook Resource Recovery Park refuse pit extension | 2018/21 (Southbrook RRP upgrade)  
2037/40 (Transfer Station upgrade) | $5.2M total  
$1.7M (stage 1)  
$3.5M (stage 2) | Growth/Renewal/LOS |
| 15 | Skew Bridge alignment/replacement | 2018/25                    | $7M                          | Renewal/Growth? |
| 16 | Northern motorway congestion – park n’ ride infrastructure | 2025/27                | $4M total  
($2M Rangiora, $2M Kaiapoi) | Growth |
| 17 | Rangiora Library extension | 2022/24                    | $7.2M                        | Growth/Renewal |
| 18 | Rangiora Service Centre extension | 2029/30                    | $18M                         | Growth |
| 19 | New Library and community space Woodend/Pegasus | 2027/28                | $4.8M                        | Growth |
| 20 | New eastern arterial in Rangiora | 2039 to 2041              | $10M                         | Growth |
| 21 | Share of replacing old Waimakariri bridge | 2044/46                  | $10M                         | Renewal |

All of the above projects are geographically represented on the following map (figure 7.1) apart from those projects which involve numerous different locations, for example, global stormwater consent applications. The project numbers on the map are the same as the project numbers in the first column of the table. Some projects are shown separately on the map where more than one location is involved.
Figure 7.1  Distribution of key capital work projects 2018 to 2048 by location (please note some details on the map need updating)
8.0 FINANCIAL ESTIMATES

The Local Government Act 2002 Amendment Bill Section 101B – Infrastructure Strategy states:

(4) The infrastructure strategy must outline the most likely scenario for the management of the local authority’s infrastructure assets over the period of the strategy and, in that context, must-

(a) show indicative estimates of the projected capital and operating expenditure associated with the management of those assets-

(i) in each of the first 10 years covered by the strategy; and

(ii) in each subsequent period of 5 years covered by the strategy.

The Council has developed a Financial Strategy in conjunction with the development of its’ 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

8.1 Funding Depreciation

As shown in figure 6.1, the Council has a significant asset renewal programme forecast to occur later in the 21st Century. The Council’s policy for the funding of depreciation means renewals can be comfortably funded from accumulated depreciation funds. The Council’s policy is to ring fence funding of depreciation into separate accounts so that the funds can only be applied to renewal of infrastructure. The modelling used to set the level of funding required reflects the Council’s ability to invest funds at a rate greater than inflation (without having to pay taxation on interest earned) and this means funds will be available when assets are due for renewal.

8.2 Rates, Borrowing and Capital Expenditure Trends

Figure 8.1 below shows the trends over the next ten years for rates, borrowing and capital expenditure. Expenditure on assets includes the costs for renewals, new levels of service and growth as forecast in the IS and LTP.

Figure 8.1 Rates, borrowing and capital expenditure 2018-2028 (including earthquake repair expenditure)
8.3 Interest as a Percentage of Total Rates Revenue

Figure 8.2 shows interest expense as a percentage of total rates revenue. The Council's policy limit, which is the limit the Local Government Funding Agency recommends, is that interest expense should not exceed 25% of total rates revenue. The graph shows the Council is well within these policy limits even after providing the headroom required to recover from a major natural event.

Figure 8.2 Interest to Rates Revenue

8.4 Total Expenditure

The projected capital expenditure associated with the significant infrastructure assets is graphically represented below. The figures shown for each of the five year blocks between 2028/33 to 2043/48 are the average annual expenditure over that period.

Figure 2.3 Projected capital expenditure for combined infrastructure assets

The projected operational and maintenance expenditure associated with the significant infrastructure assets is graphically represented below. The figures shown for each of the five year blocks between 2028/33 to 2043/48 are the average annual expenditure over that period.
8.5 Financial Impacts of the Infrastructure Strategy

The Council has developed its Financial Strategy as part of the development of its Long Term Plan.

The purpose of the Financial Strategy is to reflect the directions contained in the Long Term Plan and Infrastructure Strategy and to model the financial effects on the Council and the District.

The Financial Strategy is aimed at responding to the needs of the community in an affordable way, while funding long term projects so that future generations, who benefit from community infrastructure, pay their share. As the district's population increases, the demands for increased levels of service grow, as do the requirements of national standards. There is a constant pressure on rates to fund the increase in levels of service and renewal of a growing infrastructure base. In addition, an ageing population means that there is an increasing proportion of ratepayers who are on fixed incomes, placing greater pressure on the affordability of annual rates increases.

The key components of the Council’s strategic direction are to:

- Continue to progressively fund the cost of reinstating the Council’s community assets to pre-earthquake condition at levels that keep rate increases to a minimum and affordable;
- Restrict operating expenditure movements to the rate of Local Government Cost Inflation (LGCI), excluding catering for population growth and improved levels of service;
- Maintain debt within policy limits, while maintaining headroom to recover from significant natural disasters;
- Maintain the current prudent financial management while still providing high quality levels of service to both current and future generations.
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is for Council to consider funding provision in the Draft LTP of $27.85 million for a multi-use sports facility at Coldstream Road. Note that this figure includes a provision of $1.85 million for cost escalation as construction of the facility would be likely to be completed by around September 2020.

1.2. The financial provision would be spread over three financial years with $4.35 million required in 18/19, $20.5 million in 19/20 and $3 million in 20/21.

1.3. The gross floor area of the proposed facility will be 6057m2 and it will provide for 4 indoor courts, a fitness centre, sports administration areas and space for ancillary services such as physiotherapists.

Attachments:

i. Site plan Coldstream Road (Trim: 180123005342)

ii. Facility Concept Plan (Trim: 180123005340)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180118003759

(b) Approves the provision of $27.85 million in the Draft LTP for the construction of a multi-use sports facility at Coldstream Road, scheduled for completion around September 2020.

(c) Notes that there will be a community engagement process during the consultation period for the Draft LTP specifically on the Multi Use Sports Facility, including the proposed site layout at Coldstream Road.

(d) Approves Staff working with the North Canterbury Sports and Recreation Trust on the development of a Heads of Agreement for the management and operation of the facility.

(e) Notes that the Draft Heads of Agreement will be available for Council’s consideration prior to the finalisation of the 2018 LTP.

(f) Circulates this report to the Boards.
3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. Background

3.1.1. As part of the LTP process the Council decided to include funding of $100,000 to enable the development of a functional design brief for an Indoor Court Facility.

3.1.2. The completion of a Functional Design Brief was to facilitate more targeted engagement with the various groups who have expressed an interest in using an indoor court facility.

3.1.3. The Council approved the establishment of an Indoor Court Steering Group with the key responsibilities of:

- Developing a functional design brief for a four court indoor sports facility to include:
  - Obtaining cost estimates from Aecom Quantity Surveyors for the capital and operating costs
  - Working with North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust on operating income models
  - Investigating potential external funding sources
  - Recommending to Council the preferred location for such a facility

3.1.4. The Steering Group reported back to Council in September 2016 with a completed Functional Design Brief.

3.1.5. Council then considered a report on the location of such a facility and in December 2016 approved the location as being at Coldstream Road on land owned by the Council adjacent to the Hockey Turf.

3.1.6. Council then approved staff seeking expressions of interest for an architect to undertake a concept design for the building as well as site plan for the area of land that the Council owns at Coldstream and the land purchased on East Belt adjoining Main Power Oval.

3.1.7. The Council agreed in May 2017 to appoint Warren and Mahoney to prepare the site plan for the development of the Coldstream Road Council owned land and concept design in accordance with the functional design brief.

3.2. Site Plan

3.2.1. The brief for the site plan was to allow for the future development of another astro turf for hockey, space for 10 tennis courts, sports grounds, a future playground, and car parking and pedestrian access. There was also a requirement to allow for the potential staging of development.

3.2.2. The staging requirement is particularly important as it would allow, for example, the tennis development to be built independent of an indoor court.

3.2.3. It is also likely that the sports grounds will not be required for some years.

3.2.4. The attached site plan provides for an attractive tree lined frontage onto Coldstream Road and the car parking is in sections which provides a more attractive site than one large bitumen area would.

3.2.5. The plan also facilitates staged development and with the potential sports grounds at the rear of the site there is potential to lease that area of land for grazing or just to retain it as one large open grassed space which would be relatively inexpensive to mow.

3.2.6. The plan also allows for pedestrian and cycle connectivity to the East Belt land whenever a second cricket oval is developed.
3.2.7. The East Belt layout also retains the existing house on the site which potentially could be utilised as changing rooms or continue to be leased as a dwelling.

3.3. Concept design of the Indoor Court

3.3.1. The concept design allows for 6,057 sq metres of building as per the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Works</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Courts (4 no.)</td>
<td>3,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Fitness Areas</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing Areas</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports House</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception, Foyer &amp; Entranceway</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Management Area</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allied Health</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Use Rooms</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Wall Thickness</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.2. The following description of the building is from Richard McGowan the lead Warren and Mahoney architect on this project:

"The new Indoor Courts facility is perhaps unique in its siting and its potential to provide a vibrant focus for community sports. While the building is principally (and necessarily) designed to be efficient, cost-effective and functional, it occupies a key site and is visible in-the-round. Unlike a typical urban setting, there is no "out the back", instead all facades are visible which provides excellent opportunities for direct engagement with the community in every direction.

The opportunity to deliver a stand-out facility is very much enhanced by the location and setting offered by the site, from which the building can act as billboard for a community's aspiration. Views to the building from the two major approaches highlight the accessibility and variety of community sporting experiences available both indoors and in the surrounding outdoor competition spaces.

The building has been designed to fulfil Waimakariri's present needs but also with an eye directly to the future:

- It is energy efficient, spatially efficient and adopts a modular structural portal frame which allows cost-effective future additions as required
- The arrangement of internal functions has produced attractive proportions and an identifiably civic sense of place
- Indoor spaces are flexible, reconfigurable, and have a 360-degree outlook to excellent views
- Claddings are robust and highly insulated, with good natural daylighting and provision for future PV panels for on-site electricity generation
- A multi-use public outdoor space is fully integrated with the building providing shade, shelter and capturing sun and views for community events."

180118003759 Multi Use Sports Facility
3.3.3. The building has also been designed with the potential for future expansion. The end wall of the courts can be removed and a further one or two courts added. There is also potential to include a changing facility for teams using the outdoor sports fields to be added.

3.4. Timing for the project

3.4.1. The following table outlines the likely timing of the key stages of the programme with an estimated project completion of 30 September 2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commence design</td>
<td>01 July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete design</td>
<td>31 January 2019 (7 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement for construction complete</td>
<td>30 March 2019 (2 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction complete</td>
<td>30 September 2020 (18 months)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5. Operating Model

3.5.1. The concept is that the facility would be operated by the North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust (the Trust) who would have a formal operating agreement with the Council.

3.5.2. The Trust has indicated that it would meet all operating costs for the facility and pay an annual contribution to the Council in excess of $200,000. Note that this is not yet factored into the Draft LTP budget but it will be included in the final LTP.

3.5.3. The Trust has also indicated that in addition to supplying all of the equipment necessary to operate the facility it would also contribute $1 million to the building fit out. The details of this are yet to be formally agreed but the concept is that this would include payment for all of the items necessary for the operation of the building such as retractable seating, basketball/netball hoops etc.

3.5.4. If Council supports the inclusion of the funding in the Draft LTP, staff will work with the Trust to formalise an agreement on the operating and management of the facility and the funding that the Trust will contribute, for Council’s consideration.

3.6. Use of the facility

3.6.1. North Canterbury Basketball has over 5500 local players wanting to play on a full court facility. Currently within the district gym spaces to accommodate these sport and recreation options are located at Rangiora New Life School, Rangiora High School, Ohoka, Swannanoa, Kaiapoi High School, Rangiora Borough School, Southbrook School and Kaiapoi High School. These are all on Ministry of Education land.

3.6.2. Under the Vulnerable Children’s Act the Trust are unable to use these facilities during school hours for delivery of community programmes. Use of these facilities after school hours can also be restricted due to school extracurricular activities.

3.6.3. The only Waimakariri District Council-owned indoor sports facility is at the Woodend Community Centre which can be used throughout the day but it is at capacity and therefore difficult to accommodate any additional usage.

3.6.4. With our growing community the Trust is now seeing a strong cosmopolitan mix of people who are now placing demands on community resources to accommodate a much broader range of indoor sport and recreation options to go with the more traditional sports.
These include but are not limited to:

- Basketball
- Netball
- Futsal
- Roller Derby
- Archery Tag
- Indoor Hockey
- Korfball
- Handball
- Volleyball
- Badminton
- Exercise groups
- Table Tennis
- Indoor bowls

Opportunities are likely to arise for regional tournaments in any of the above listed sports.

3.6.5. The facility will provide useful space for a wide range of sports activities outside of the 4 courts. These will include:

- NCSRT administration offices
- North Canterbury Primary School Sports and Swimming Coordinator
- NCSRT Primary School Sports Coaches
- North Canterbury Basketball
- Sports House facilities
- Hockey Development Officer
- Meeting / Conference space for all local clubs/community groups
- Fitness centre
- High performance gym (also available for community use)
- Health Expos
- Sports Awards event
- Other large scale community events
- Pay and Play
- Changing facilities/showers/toilets for outside sports facilities (hockey, tennis)

3.6.6. The Community Green Space Unit recently commissioned a Sports Facilities Strategy. This purpose of the strategy was to provide Council with direction regarding prioritisation of investment in the future of sports fields and facility development. As part of the process to develop the strategy considerable consultation was undertaken with sporting clubs in the district. As well as consultation, population growth, demographic changes and trends in the future of sport and recreation were explored. The strategy identifies that the development of a four-court multi use sports facility is a high priority.

3.7. Options

3.7.1. No facility: Council has the option of not providing any new indoor court facilities in the District. This option would result in a significant lessening of service for the District's residents as both locally and nationally the demand for indoor sports spaces is increasing. The Sports Facilities Strategy has further confirmed the need for increased indoor court facilities for the District. This is not a recommended option.
3.7.2. Reduced number of courts: The need for 4 courts has been identified in the feasibility study, the Sports Strategy and also in a separate study of the provision of sporting facilities in Greater Christchurch. Building a lesser number of courts would not meet the current need without even considering the projected growth in demand from other sports who currently cannot find space in the District. This option would not provide a satisfactory result for any of the current user groups and would not be a good result for the community. This option is not recommended.

3.7.3. Deferring the construction until a later year. Construction costs are continuing to increase and AECOM estimate that the construction price will continue to increase by around 3% per annum. This option is not recommended.

3.7.4. Fund the multi-use sports facility in the current Draft LTP with detailed design to commence in July 2018 and this will mean that the centre will be completed by late 2020. This is the preferred option and this option is currently reflected in the Draft LTP.

3.8. The Management Team/CE has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. The multi-use sports facility will be included in the LTP consultation material but in addition it is planned to hold drop in sessions at both Kaiapoi and Rangiora to provide an opportunity for the community to find out more about what is being proposed and how the facility will be used.

4.2. There will also be a video presentation on the Council’s web page prepared by Warren and Mahoney which will provide further information on the design of the building and the site layout. The community will have opportunity for feedback via a submission or email or through Facebook as well as orally to staff.

4.3. The Council will then have the opportunity of considering the formal feedback from the Draft LTP process as part of its deliberations on the LTP in May 2018.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. The LTP currently has a provision of $22.6 million for the capital cost in 2021.

5.2. In preparing the cost estimates the QS has assessed each of the key areas so the estimate has not been prepared by applying a standard square metre rate across the facility.

5.3. The development of the site does also require some servicing upgrades for water and sewer. Note that this would be required for any sporting use of the site.

5.3.1. Water Supply: a new 150mm main along Coldstream Road will be required. The section under the railway line and up to East Belt will be paid for by the Rangiora water account as this provides an improvement to the existing network. The section east of this point would be solely to serve the sports complex this will be a cost to the development. The estimates for this work are shown below.

5.3.2. The section under the railway line is estimated to cost $75,000 and this will be funded from the Rangiora Water account.

5.3.3. The section east of East Belt is estimated to cost $145,000 and this will be attributable to the site development.
5.4. Development contributions for Rangiora water are currently $6,802 per property. Assuming that DC’s are applied and a household unit equivalent (HUE) of 15 (to be confirmed based on actual expected water usage), this would give a figure of $102,030.

5.5. Wastewater

5.5.1. A dedicated pressure main from the onsite pump station to the existing sewer system in East Belt would be required which would cost around $80,000.

5.5.2. Development contributions for Rangiora and Eastern Districts sewer are currently $12,188 per property. Assuming that DC’s are applied and HUE of 15 (as per water), this would give a total of $182,820.

5.6. The cost estimate does have provision of $500,000 for the provision of infrastructure services as described above which staff believe as these are first order costs and with contingency available will be sufficient funding.

5.7. Roading

5.7.1. It is also likely that when a traffic impact assessment is undertaken that there will be some roading modifications required. The LTP budget for roading includes a provisional sum of $500,000 for future works to accommodate the needs for the multi-use sports centre and the proposed tennis development. This is a first order estimate and once the scope of work is more clearly defined this cost estimate will be revisited.

5.8. The rating impact of the project cost will equate to $91.00 per property and this will be progressively applied in line with borrowing and loan repayments with the full sum occurring in Year 23/24. When the income from the Trust is factored in the amount will reduce by approximately $6.50 which will result in a net cost to each property of $84.50.

5.9. The following table is the estimate from the QS which details the components of the cost as well as addressing the cost escalation likely during construction.
### Building Gross Floor Area = 6,057 m²

#### Site Area (Stage 1) = 12,766 m²

#### External Works Area = 6,709 m² (12,766 - 6,057 m²)

### Building Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Area (m²)</th>
<th>Floor Area (m²)</th>
<th>Cost (m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Courts (4 no.)</td>
<td>3,444</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>9,299,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Fitness Areas</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing Areas</td>
<td>409</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports House</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception, Foyer &amp; Entranceway</td>
<td>252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Management Area</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allied Health</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Use Rooms</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>6,057 m²</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,045 per m²</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **External Wall Thickness**: 536 m² at 2,613 m², 3,500 m², 9,146,000 m², 3,087 per m².
- Extra for Screened Rooftop Plant Areas: 250 m², 18,695,000 m².

### Infrastructure Services & External Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Cost (m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Services</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carparking / Hard &amp; Soft Landscaping</td>
<td>6,709 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,342,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,842,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20,037,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contingency (%)</td>
<td>1,087,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Fees, WDC Internal Costs &amp; Consents (15%)</td>
<td>1,235,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Contingency (5%)</td>
<td>1,240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong>:</td>
<td>25,039,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Exclusions:
- Land Remediation (if required)
- Retractable Spectator Seating to Indoor Courts (500 seats) (circa $250,000)
- Outdoor Plaza / Civic Space Structure (circa $1,250,000)
- Photo Voltaic Panels to Outdoor Plaza Canopy (indicated on Concept drawings - future consideration)
- Tenant Fitout Costs (Health & Fitness, Sports House, Core Management & Allied Health) including Indoor Court Divider Screens (if required)
- Financing Costs
- Development Levies (if any)
- Land Costs
- Escalation Beyond the Date of this Estimate
- GST

### Escalation:
- Escalation in the Christchurch rebuild market has tracked at circa 6% per annum for the past 3-4 years. However, the market has now tightened with the consequential effect of reducing escalation going forward. Accordingly, we calculate future escalation at circa $1,850,000 based on 4.0% for 2018, 3.5% for 2019 and 3.0% for 2020.

### Programmes:
- Commence Design - 1 July 2018
- Complete Design - 31 January 2019 (7 months)
- Procurement Complete - 30 March 2019 (2 months)
- Construction Complete - 30 September 2020 (18 months)

### Cashflow:
- The following financial year cashflow is based on the overall total of circa $27,850,000 including escalation provision:
  - 1 July 2018 - 30 June 2019 Financial Year: $4,350,000
  - 1 July 2019 - 30 June 2020 Financial Year: $20,500,000
  - 1 July 2020 - 30 June 2021 Financial Year: $3,000,000
6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy

This matter is a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance Policy and will require a formal engagement process with the Community.

The provision of an indoor court facility has been the subject of several reports to Council. Key reports considered by Council include:

∑ Contract 17-20: Indoor Court Architectural Services May 2017 (Trim 170519050621)
∑ Indoor Court Design and Location, February 2017 (Trim 170127007516)
∑ Indoor Court Functional Design Brief, September 2016 (Trim 160825086360)
∑ Indoor Court Project Steering Group August 2015 (Trim 150730113868)
∑ LTP Provision for an Indoor Court Facility May 2015 (Trim 150508074259)
∑ Draft LT: Options for Provision of an Indoor Court Facility January 2015 (Trim 150115005057)
∑ Indoor Court Feasibility Study February 2014 (Trim 140205011156)

6.2. Legislation

∑ Reserves Act 1977.
∑ Resource Management Act 1991

6.3. Community Outcomes

∑ Public spaces and facilities will be accessible and of a high standard.
∑ People will involve themselves in a range of recreation activities.
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to inform the Council of the key issues arising from the Stage 2 Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry and their implications to Council’s public drinking water supplies, and how this has fed into the Draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan (LTP).

1.2. The Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry Stage 2 report was released on the 6th of December 2017. The report recommended a number of urgent and early recommendations to prevent recurrence of an outbreak of water borne disease in water supplies throughout New Zealand. The recommendations are currently being considered by Government.

1.3. The key issues raised in the Stage 2 Inquiry report with respect to the Waimakariri District water supplies are considered to be the following:

1.3.1. The abolishment of the secure classification system in the Drinking Water Standards as an immediate recommendation using Section 69P(2) of the Health Act to implement without consultation. The implication is therefore that all water sources require treatment for both bacteria and protozoa. At present the majority of the Council’s schemes that are compliant with the current standards, have achieved compliance through their sources being deemed as secure.

1.3.2. The further recommendation that there be a residual disinfectant in the reticulation (i.e. chlorine). This is expected to take longer to implement (3 – 5 years) as full consultation is likely to be required. Although not recommended in the Stage 2 report, the Government may choose to implement using Section 69P(2) of the Health Act.

1.4. The implications of the key issues noted above are as follows:

1.4.1. The removal of the secure classification system of the current standards means that schemes can no longer rely on this to negate the need for treatment. Therefore all water will need to be treated for bacteria and protozoa. This has resulted in additional capital budgets in the order of $3.0M being proposed from 2018/19 through to 2021/22 to fund the installation of ultra-violet (UV) disinfection treatment systems.
1.4.2. The cost estimates that have fed into the draft budget were based on engineering judgement rather that detailed site specific analysis. There is specific analysis being carried out by an external consultant at present with the final output due in March 2018. This may require that the proposed budgets be modified if the detailed analysis suggests that the current proposed budgets are inadequate.

1.4.3. The need for a residual disinfectant in the reticulation system would mean that chlorination would need to be implemented on all schemes where this is not already in place. It is the intention of staff that this would not be implemented until either Council is legislatively required to do so, or the Council resolves to implement chlorination following consultation with the public.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180118003751.

(b) **Notes** that key recommendations from the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry Stage 2 Report include the abolition of the secure classification system of the current standards meaning that all water will need to be treated, the need for a residual disinfectant (chlorine) within the reticulation system, and for compliance with the standards to be mandatory.

(c) **Notes** that staff have allowed for the implementation of UV treatment on all schemes that currently rely on secure classification of their sources for compliance with the current Drinking Water Standards, based on the recommendations from the Stage 2 Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry.

(d) **Approves** the implementation of UV treatment across the district’s water supply schemes at an estimated additional capital cost of $3.0M, which has been allowed for within the Council’s Draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan over the years 2018/19 through to 2022/23.

(e) **Approves** the approach of allowing for the cost of chlorination on all the currently unchlorinated schemes while not committing to implementation of this without Council being legislatively required to do so or without consultation with the public at the direction of Council.

(f) **Notes** the reasoning set out in Section 6.2 of this report for making financial provision for mandatory chlorination which is not consistent with current Council practice.

(g) **Notes** that due to the timing of the Havelock North Inquiry Stage 2 Report, the cost estimates that fed into the Draft Long Term Plan budget were carried out without detailed site specific analysis.

3. ** ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. The Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry Stage 2 report was released on the 6th of December 2017. The report recommended a number of urgent and early recommendations to prevent recurrence of an outbreak of water borne disease in water supplies throughout New Zealand.

3.2. The key issues raised in the Stage 2 Inquiry report with respect to the Waimakariri District are discussed below. It is noted that at this stage the recommendations from the Stage 2 Report are simply recommendations for central government to consider rather than being immediate changes to legislation or standards. However, it is anticipated that at least some
of the recommendations will be adopted in the near future, hence the need for the immediate response in anticipation of changes to requirements.

Abolishment of the Secure Classification System in the Drinking Water Standards

3.3. The abolishment of the secure classification system in the Drinking Water Standards has been recommended to be implemented using Section 69P(2) of the Health Act to implement without consultation. The removal of the secure classification system of the current standards means that schemes can no longer rely on this to negate the need for treatment. Therefore the implication is that all water will need to be treated for bacteria and protozoa.

3.4. It has been assumed that the current secure sources (Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, Pegasus, Cust, Oxford Urban, Summerhill and West Eyreton, Oxford Rural No.1 for the new source, Ohoka) will therefore require UV treatment to be implemented. The total cost allowed for the implementation of UV treatment as a direct result of the abolishment of the secure classification system is estimated at $3.0M, and implementation has been allowed for from 2018/19 through to 2022/23. Refer to Table 1 in Section 5 for a breakdown.

Residual Disinfectant in Reticulation System

3.5. There is a further recommendation that there be a residual disinfectant in the reticulation (i.e. chlorine). This would mean that chlorination would need to be implemented on all schemes where this is not already in place (Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, Oxford Urban, Cust, Waikuku Beach). It is noted that this is a further recommendation in the Stage 2 Inquiry Report rather than an ‘urgent and early recommendation’. This is expected to take longer to implement (3 – 5 years) as full consultation is likely to be required. Although not recommended in the Stage 2 report, the Government may choose to implement using Section 69P(2) of the Health Act.

3.6. Given the potential for the Health Act and/or the Drinking Water Standards to be modified at short notice under urgency, staff have allowed for the cost to chlorinate water on the unchlorinated schemes from the year 2018/19 onwards. Although this has been allowed for financially as a conservative measure, it is the intention of staff that this would not be implemented until either Council is legislatively required to do so, or the Council instructs staff to undertake consultation with the public.

Health Act Changes

3.7. Changes to the Health Act to remove the need for water suppliers to take ‘all practicable steps’ to achieve compliance, and make compliance mandatory has been recommended as a further recommendation. The removal of ‘all practicable steps’ from the Health Act is not seen as likely to have a significant impact on Council, as Council is fully committed to achieving full compliance with the Drinking Water Standards. This change would be more significant to local authorities that may have previously not had plans in place as to how or when they would achieve compliance with the current standards. This change however would further emphasise the urgency at which upgrades are required to be completed on the schemes where further work is still required to comply with the current standards.

Other Recommendations

3.8. The establishment of a drinking water regulator with the responsibility of the oversight of all aspects of the drinking water sector has been included as an urgent recommendation. It is expected that the key outcome of this change would be the way in which the standards are enforced and staff are confident that they could adapt to any changes in this area.
3.9. The creation of dedicated and aggregated drinking water suppliers has been included as a further recommendation. This is seen as necessary for an effective and affordable means to improve compliance, competence and accountability. This would be a significant change to the way in which drinking water services are currently provided, however due to the significance that would be involved with this change it is thought that the timeframe for this to be adopted (if this is adopted at all) would be significant and therefore this does not require immediate action.

3.10. Greater focus and emphasise on source water protection has been referred to within several recommendations within the Report. Recommended changes include changes to the Resource Management Act (RMA) and the acceleration of NES regulations. It is thought that there would be no significant cost implications to Council associated with these potential changes, and that this would likely provide Council with greater ability to restrict any undesirable activities within drinking water catchments.

3.11. It is noted that the key issues above cover just some of the recommendations from the Stage 2 report that in the opinion of staff may have the most significant impact on Council, if these recommendations are adopted by central government. It is possible that the assumptions made in terms of which recommendations may be adopted and their implications may prove to be incorrect. The accuracy of the assumptions feeding into this report will not be known until central government formally responds to the Stage 2 Inquiry Report. Staff will report back to Council following a central government response to cover this matter and Council’s required response further.

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

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. The community has not been consulted directly on the matter of the Stage 2 Report of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry.

4.2. The community will be consulted through the draft Long Term Plan process regarding the rating implications of the anticipated capital works required.

4.3. In terms of level of service, there will be no distinguishable difference to consumers as a result of the UV treatment systems proposed, other than that the water will carry a lower level of risk of contamination.

4.4. The implementation of chlorination on currently unchlorinated schemes (such as Kaiapoi, Rangiora, Woodend, Cust, Waikuku Beach and Oxford Urban) would have a noticeable change in the level of service provided to the affected communities in terms of the taste and odour of their water as well as the water carrying a lower risk of contamination. Therefore, it is proposed that one of the three courses of action be taken regarding this:

4.4.1. Government may opt to legislatively require Council to chlorinate all water. In this scenario information sessions could be held to inform the communities of the upcoming change and how it will affect them.

4.4.2. Government may not opt to require chlorination by legislation, but there may be a desire from Council to consider this as an option regardless, given the recommendation in the Stage 2 report. If instructed by Council staff could consult with the potentially affected communities regarding the possibility of chlorinating their water and make a decision after feedback is received.

4.4.3. Government may not opt to require chlorination by legislation, and Council may be satisfied with maintaining the status quo with regard to chlorine without
consulting with the potentially affected communities, given the strong opposition that has been expressed previously on this topic when the Rangiora, Oxford Urban and Wooded and Pegasus communities have been consulted.

4.5. Based on the above, it is recommended that no change be made regarding chlorination without either legislation requiring that Council do so, or without consultation with the potentially affected communities.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. The following table summarises new budgets proposed for UV treatment systems and the implementation of chlorine as part of the Draft LTP 2018-28, where these systems are potentially required directly as a result of the Havelock North Drinking Water Inquiry recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>UV Treatment Budget</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Approx. Rating Impact of UV treatment (average $ per property per year)</th>
<th>Chlorine Treatment Annual Cost</th>
<th>Rating Impact of Chlorine Treatment (average $ per property per year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>2018/19 – 2019/20</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$62,000</td>
<td>$9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>2018/19 – 2019/20</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
<td>$9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td>2018/19 – 2019/20</td>
<td>$146</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>2021/22</td>
<td>$191</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Rural No.1 (new well)</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>2021/22 – 2022/23</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Urban – Oxford Rural No.2</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>2018/19 – 2019/20</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
<td>$9#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Eyreton-Summerhill-Poyntzs Rd*</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>2020/21 – 2021/22</td>
<td>$72</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach</td>
<td>NA (already installed)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$3,700</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$3,020,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*assuming Poyntzs Road joins with West Eyreton and Summerhill schemes, subject to community consultation in 2017/18.  
# the rating impact of additional chlorine treatment applies only to Oxford Urban, as chlorination is already implemented on Oxford Rural No.2.

5.2. The cost estimates above were compiled based on engineering judgement rather than detailed site specific analysis. There is specific analysis being carried out by an external consultant at present with the final output due in March 2018. This may require that the proposed budgets be modified if the detailed analysis suggests that the current proposed budgets are inadequate.

5.3. It is noted that the following schemes have not been included in the table above as they already have or are already planned to have UV treatment systems installed, irrespective of the recommendations from the Stage 2 Havelock North Inquiry Report:

\[ \sum \text{ Woodend-Pegasus (planned for 2018/19 as part of treatment upgrade works)} \]
Garrymere (planned for 2018/19 as part of source upgrade works, subject to community consultation).

Mandeville-Fernside (UV treatment is already installed following source losing secure status previously).

6. **CONTEXT**

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

6.2. **Legislation**
The Health (Drinking Water) Amendment Act and the Local Government Act are relevant in this matter.

It is not Council’s current practice to undertake routine ongoing chlorination of community water supplies but it is considered prudent to make financial provision for this to occur given the recommendations of the Havelock North Inquiry and as discussed in section 3.6 of this report. As such this would be a decision inconsistent with Council’s current practice. Section 80 of the Local Government Act provides for such inconsistencies but requires their disclosure and reasoning. As indicated at this time there is reasonable cause to suggest within the LTP period mandatory chlorination is reasonably foreseeable and as such financial provision to comply is appropriate.

6.3. **Community Outcomes**
This project is related to the following community outcomes:

- There is sufficient clean water to meet the needs of communities and ecosystems.
- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable and affordable manner.
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek Council's approval of the funding approach for the Garrymere and Poyntzs Road water supply schemes which have significant rating increases projected in the draft Long Term Plan (LTP).

1.2. It was identified in report 171128128873 that went to the Utilities and Roading Committee on the 12th of December 2017 that the Garrymere and Poyntzs Road schemes have significant rate increases projected as a result of source upgrade projects on those schemes.

1.3. The Utilities and Roading Committee recommended that Council consider funding options for the scheme upgrade as part of the Draft Long Term Plan that could include partial funding from other water supply schemes, or the general rate.

1.4. Three options have been presented for consideration by Council.

1.4.1. That the schemes that require the upgrades cover all their costs. This will result in increases in the order of $1,100 to $2,000 per connection per year to ratepayers on the Garrymere and Poyntzs Road schemes. This is the option currently included in the draft LTP.

1.4.2. That the rates be capped at the current maximum water rate (which is the current Garrymere rate of $1,272 per 2 unit connection and $1,803 per 19 unit connection), with the cap increasing annually in accordance with the Local Government Cost Index (LGCI). This would give a maximum rate for the 2018/19 financial year of $1,306 per 2 unit connection and $1,852 per 19 unit connection. The additional costs be spread across all other water schemes and would result in an approximate increase of $6.20 per water connection across the district.

1.4.3. As with Option 2, but that the additional costs would be spread across the district as part of the general rate. This would result in an approximate increase of $4.80 per property in the district.

1.5. If either of the options involving spreading rates is favoured, it is recommended that this be included in the Consultation Document for the draft Long Term Plan.
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180119004275.

(b) **Notes** that the current figures in the 2018-28 Draft Long Term Plan include rating increase in the order of $1,100 to $2,000 per standard connection (2 unit and 19 unit connections respectively) on both the Garrymere and Poyntzs Road water supply schemes.

(c) **Notes** that the Utilities and Roading Committee recommended that Council consider funding options for the scheme upgrade as part of the Draft Long Term Plan that could include partial funding from other water supply schemes, or the general rate.

**EITHER**

(d) **Approves** the capping of water rates at the current maximum water rate effective from the 2018/19 financial year, which would increase annually in accordance with the LGCI, and that any costs over and above this would be spread across all other properties with a water connection.

(e) **Notes** that the proposed capping of rates is estimated to increase all water rates by $2.10 per connection in 2018/19 and $6.20 per connection in 2019/20.

**OR**

(f) **Approves** funding of the Garrymere and Poyntzs Road scheme upgrades from within each scheme respectively, as per the current practice.

(g) **Notes** that the option to cap and spread water rates should be included for consultation as part of the Draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan Consultation Document.

(h) **Notes** that the 3 Waters rating structure is due to be reviewed in 2022 and that the proposed capping of water rates is considered to be an interim solution for the most significantly affected schemes in the medium term.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. The Council is working its way through a series of water supply source upgrades in order for all its schemes to achieve compliance with the Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand by the end of the 2018/19 financial year.

3.2. The last two schemes to be completed are the Garrymere and Poyntzs Road schemes. These are schemes with small numbers of properties connected, but high costs to bring them into compliance with the current standards.

3.3. Under the Health Act there is a requirement that Council take all practicable steps to achieve compliance with the standards. Physical solutions have been identified that would achieve compliance and are to be consulted on with the affected communities over the coming months.

3.4. Due to the relatively high costs ($500,000 - $800,000) of the upgrades, the small ratepayer bases, and the fact that all schemes are currently rated such that they recover all their own costs, these projects are forecast to increase rates in the order of $1,100 for a 2 unit connection on the Poyntzs Road scheme to $2,000 for a 19 unit connection. This is depicted on Figure 1:
Figure 1: Summary of Impact of Upgrades on Garrymere and Poyntzs Rd rates as per Draft LTP

3.5. This was reported to the Utilities and Roading Committee on the 12th of December 2017 in report 171128128873 with respect to the Garrymere source upgrade project, but also noting the Poyntzs Road scheme.

3.6. The Utilities and Roading Committee recommended that Council consider funding options for the scheme upgrade as part of the Draft Long Term Plan that could include partial funding from other water supply schemes, or the general rate.

3.7. Three options have been considered:

1. That the schemes that require the upgrades cover all their costs. This will result in increases in the order of $1,100 to $2,000 per connection per year to ratepayers on the Garrymere and Poyntzs Road schemes. This is the option currently included in the draft LTP.

2. That the rates be capped at the current maximum water rate (which is the current Garrymere rate of $1,272 per 2 unit connection and $1,803 per 19 unit connection), with the cap increasing annually in accordance with the Local Government Cost Index (LGCI). This would give a maximum rate for the 2018/19 financial year of $1,306 per 2 unit connection and $1,852 per 19 unit connection. The additional costs be spread across all other water schemes and would result in an approximate increase of $6.20 per water connection across the district.

3. As with Option 2, but that the additional costs would be spread across the district as part of the general rate. This would result in an approximate increase of $4.80 per property in the district.

3.8. The cost implications of the options identified are summarised in the table below:
3.1. Option 3 above is not recommended for further consideration. Options 1 and 2 would mean that water rates would be targeted to those that receive a water supply service from Council. Alternatively Option 3 would require that residents who do not receive any water supply service from Council would be required to fund residents who do, which may be seen as inequitable.

3.2. This options above are not a proposal to create a district wide water rate. It is an option solely to help fund the final two water supply upgrades in the district to achieve compliance with the DWSNZ. It is currently not expected that any other schemes would exceed the cap threshold within the LTP period.

3.3. Council resolved at its 1 August 2017 meeting that consultation would commence on an alternative rating structure for 3 Waters services from 2022, with a view to including an alternative rating proposal for consideration as part of the draft 2021/31 Long Term Plan (refer to report 170721076345). The proposed capping of water rates is considered to be an interim solution for the most significantly affected schemes in the medium term, prior to the wider 3 Waters review.

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

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Community consultations are planned for both the Garrymere and Poyntzs Road upgrade projects in the coming months. Consultation material has been prepared on the basis that schemes will cover their own costs at this stage (as per Option 1). The Garrymere consultation will involve just the Garrymere scheme members, while the Poyntzs Road consultation will involve schemes members from Poyntzs Road, Summerhill and West Eyreton as it is proposed that Poyntzs Road join with the West Eyreton / Summerhill sheme.

4.2. If the option involving spreading rates is favoured, it is recommended that this be included in the Consultation Document for the draft Long Term Plan for consultation with the entire district.

4.3. The Council may need to consider the approach of capping and spreading rates for the two highest rated wastewater schemes of Loburn Lea and Fernside in the future.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. The financial issues are covered in the Issues and Options section of this report.
6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Legislation**

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

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

This project is related to the following community outcomes:

- There is sufficient clean water to meet the needs of communities and ecosystems.
- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable and affordable manner.
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1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval for additional budget of $282,500 in the draft Long Term Plan for the 2018/19 financial year for the Oxford Wastewater Treatment Plant (Oxford WWTP) Aeration Upgrades.

1.2. The original total budget to complete construction of the treatment and power upgrades at Oxford WWTP was $486,000. The remaining available budget as of December 2017 is approximately $365,000. The amount spent to date, approximately $121,000, relates to:
   - external consultant fees to generate a conceptual design of the improvements,
   - previous design build tender documentation,
   - WWTP reactor desludging, and
   - procurement of a replacement mixer.

1.3. This project was programmed for completion in the 2017/18 financial year. However as the blowers have a long lead time (12 weeks) it is proposed to be carried over into the 2018/19 financial year to enable the works to be completed over next summer. Additionally the revised cost estimates indicate that additional budget of approximately $282,500 is required to complete the full scope of upgrades at the Oxford WWTP.

1.4. Consideration was given to splitting the Oxford WWTP aeration upgrades into two smaller construction packages; however the cost and risks associated with draining the reactor would be incurred twice, and the effectiveness of treatment provided would be compromised until both packages were complete. Therefore undertaking the identified aeration upgrades as a single construction package is the recommended option.

Attachments:

i. Consultant Business Case Report for Aerator Renewal (TRIM: 160601051351)
ii. Aeration Upgrade Management Team Report (TRIM: 160224015049)
iii. Reactor Cleaning Findings Memorandum (TRIM: 170607058093)
iv. Post Cleaning Recommendations (TRIM: 170608058123)
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 18/01001310.

(b) **Approves** additional budget of $282,500 in the Draft Long Term Plan for the 2018/19 financial year to enable the full scope of required aeration upgrades at Oxford WWTP to be completed as one construction package.

(c) **Notes** that the additional budget will have a rating increase of $27 per property per year over the next 15 years.

(d) **Notes** that staff will carry over the remaining budget of approximately $350,000 from the 2017/18 financial year to the 2018/2019 financial year, to provide a total budget of $632,500 for this work.

(e) **Notes** that this budget provision is included in the Draft Long Term Plan.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

**Background:**

3.1. The Oxford WWTP was originally commissioned in 1997 and had an upgrade in 2004 to incorporate an aerobic zone in addition to the aeration basin. In 2012, an inline UV unit was installed with its own controller to replace the original open channel UV system.

3.2. In 2014 the initial stage of an inflow and infiltration sealing works was undertaken and a plant upgrade was carried out to include a wet weather holding pond and relocation of the inlet screen and channel.

3.3. The existing submersible aerators are the original units installed when the plant was commissioned (1997) and the floating aerator was installed circa 2004. All three aerators are reaching the end of their expected useful lives. The two submersible aerators are also difficult to maintain and require manually entering the aeration basin for maintenance tasks.

3.4. In addition to the aeration upgrade, operators have expressed concerns regarding potential short-circuiting of the treatment process, clarifier performance, mixing within the anoxic zone and solids build-up.

3.5. The Oxford WWTP is also operating at, and at times beyond, the available power provided to the site. This has caused power outages to the plant due to pole mounted transformer fuses blowing. The upgrade will include a new pole mounted transformer and some relatively minor electrical modifications within the existing building.

3.6. To begin addressing Oxford WWTP shortfalls, Council engaged an external consultancy in 2016 to develop aeration upgrade options (refer to Management Team report to engage consultant TRIM: 16C2010015049 and Consultant Business Case report for aeration renewal TRIM: 1000010515311), and subsequently develop a concept design and procure the aeration upgrade using a design and construct contract (NZS3916:2013). The options report recommended that Council:

3.6.1. Assess condition of existing aerators and keep running as long as economical to maintain them, but beyond 2015 they will be about 20 years old and may not provide enough aeration for peak loads.
3.6.2. Replace the existing submersible aerators when they reach the end of their life with a fine bubble aeration system consisting of removable banks of diffusers and an external blower in an acoustic enclosure. As identified in the Consultant Business Case report for aeration renewal (TRIM: 160601051351), fine bubble diffused aeration is a common and proven technology in New Zealand and is most appropriate for this application.

3.6.3. Procurement of the equipment and associated civil services would be best achieved using a design and construct contract, where the "Employer’s Requirements" are specified in the contract allowing a Contractor the opportunity to select equipment and materials that satisfy the specification at a competitive price.

3.6.4. The estimate of cost for the fine bubble diffused aeration upgrade was approximately $400,000.

3.7. On receipt of tenders, it was clear that tenderers did not fully understand the constraints of the site and the residual risk to Council of all of the methodologies proposed was too great. Therefore all tenders were rejected, the price envelopes of tenderers were returned un-opened and detailed design of aeration and associated treatment upgrades was completed by PDU in-house.

3.8. Due to concerns regarding the extent of settled deposits within the reactor and the risk that these posed to construction of the aeration upgrade project, cleaning of the reactor was undertaken. The results of the cleaning and recommended next steps were documented by the Project Delivery Unit. Refer to TRIM 170607058093 and 170608058123.

3.9. The main components of work recommended as part of the scope of aeration upgrades (following cleaning) include:

- Upgrade power supply to Oxford WWTP / pole mounted transformer to 200A supply
- Supply blowers and install in modified existing shed/building
- Supply and install DN150 316L stainless steel header ring main pipework and fittings from the blowers to the diffuser head droppers
- Electrical and control modifications for blowers, relocate existing dissolved oxygen meter and infrastructure controls to be retained and removal of redundant cabling
- Drain down and clean reactor (including clarifier)
- Supply and install removable fine bubble diffused aerators
- Remove/relocate existing walkways and associated supports
- Remove existing submersible and floating aerators and associated plinths
- Remove mixer and support pole
- Remove redundant wall within anoxic zone
- Install new mixer and mounting plate/support
- Alter influent pipework and return activated sludge line discharge pipework to anoxic zone
- Supply and install clarifier energy dissipating inlet
- Salvage, reuse or sell infrastructure removed (where appropriate)

3.10. Consideration was given to staging the work identified in Item 3.9; however this would increase total capital costs by approximately $50,000 and would expose Council to increased operational risk, as the treatment plant would need to be taken off-line twice.

3.11. In addition to the upgrades identified in Section 3.9 it is recommended that an additional work is undertaken at Oxford WWTP to reduce the risk of solids entering the anoxic zone of the reactor. This element of works would include installation of a fine screen to either supplement or replace the 10mm step screen currently installed. This work is placed in a
future year due to the installation of a temporary static screen in the anoxic zone to reduce the risk of pumps blocking; this is a temporary solution and is not an acceptable long term solution as deposits still enter the reactor. Additionally this temporary solution has elevated health and safety risks associated with maintenance.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. All works will be undertaken within the boundary of the existing Oxford WWTP Site. However liaison with nearby residents will be undertaken prior to any physical works on the site.

4.2. The proposed additional budget is to be included in the Draft Long Term Plan. This will provide the community an opportunity to provide feedback on the project to Council.

4.3. The community will also be consulted regarding the financial implications of future works at the plant (potential replacement of existing screen to reduce the volume of rags/solids entering the plant) as part of the Long Term Plan.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. The original budget to complete construction of the treatment and power upgrades at Oxford WWTP was $486,000. The remaining available budget at 01 December 2017 is $365,000. The cost to date predominantly includes external consultant fees (associated with development concept design and tender documentation for the design build contract previously withdrawn), cleaning of the Oxford WWTP reactor and procurement of a new mixer.

5.2. The following table provides high level estimates for the key elements plus 10% project contingency. The high level costs indicate that additional budget (in the order of $205,000) would be required to complete the full scope of upgrades required at Oxford WWTP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Components</th>
<th>High Level Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>$205,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Fees</td>
<td>$35,000 (excluding approx. $15k spent to date on cleaning and detailed design)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (excluding contingency)</td>
<td>$535,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contingency (10%)</td>
<td>$53,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Contingency (10%)</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (including contingency)</td>
<td>$647,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Budget</td>
<td>$486,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend to date (to Dec 2017)</td>
<td>$121,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining budget</td>
<td>$365,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Shortfall</td>
<td>$282,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3. A high level rating impact assessment was undertaken to determine the impact of the request for additional budget to complete the projects (assuming it would be loan funded via rates repayments from the Oxford Community). Initial assessments suggest that the additional $282,500 budget would increase wastewater rates by an average of $27 per property per year over the next 15 years.

5.4. A provision of $200,000 has been placed in the Draft Long Term Plan in Year 8 for an upgrade to the existing step screen.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

Council has the delegated authority to receive this report and approve the additional budget required.

6.2. **Community Outcomes**

This report relates to the following community outcomes:

- There is a safe environment for all.
- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable and affordable manner.
- Providing a safe and more efficient wastewater network
- Communicating sensitively and effectively with affected parties
- Minimising disruption of the community
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1 Introduction

1.1 Scope

This project covers the renewal of the Oxford Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) aeration system. There are three existing aeration systems at the Oxford WWTP, two submersible and one floating aerator. These are at the end of their useful lives, starting to need regular repairs and are difficult to safely maintain.

1.2 Background

The Oxford WWTP was originally commissioned in 1997 and had an upgrade in 2004 to incorporate an aerobic zone and aeration basin. In 2012, an inline UV unit was installed with its own controller. In 2014 a plant upgrade was carried out to include a wet weather holding pond and relocated the inlet screen and channel. The existing submersible aeration systems were the original ones installed when the plant was commissioned (1997) and the floating aerator was installed around 2004. All three aeration systems are reaching the end of their expected useful lives. The two submersible aerators are also difficult to maintain and require manually entering the aeration basin for maintenance tasks.

1.3 Project Aims and Objectives

1.3.1 Aim

The main aim of this project is to renew the aeration system at the Oxford WWTP. The aeration system must be able to provide sufficient oxygen supply for the treatment process to treat the incoming flow and load and be more easily maintained than the current equipment.

The intention is to have the new aeration system controlled from two new Cemtec dissolved oxygen (DO) probes that were installed in April 2015. There should also be communication through SCADA (Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition) to send an alarm out for any faults on the system. The PLC (Programmable Logic Controller) programming will also need to be changed to reflect the operation of the aeration system.

1.3.2 Objectives

The aeration upgrade must provide performance to satisfy:

- An efficient design for the system;
- Ensure sufficient capacity and redundancy to provide aeration for at least 15 years;
- Aeration to be controlled by DO probes at the start and end of the aerobic zone to maintain a DO level of 2 ppm;
- Provide a control philosophy that can be built into the existing PLC.

1.3.3 Technology Upgrade

The budget for replacement of floating aerators of $160,000 is insufficient to install submersible aeration and blowers. The MWH 2005 report estimated $294,000 for aeration upgrade and the 2014 Opus Report had an estimate of $318,000. This report provides a review of the aeration equipment issues and options to select the appropriate equipment with cost estimates. The review will discuss the advantages and disadvantages of changing the aeration system. This report also advises on the procurement model for the process design for the aeration system.

1.3.4 Safety in Design

The Health and Safety Reform Bill came into force in April 2015. This Bill has focused on creating safer work environments and reducing the workplace injury and death toll. As part of this MWH, as designers, are responsible for offering solutions that can reduce or eliminate critical risks for people (such as contractors or operators) involved in the construction and maintenance of works or of any persons that may be affected by the works. Safety forms part of the criteria that is used to describe an option's level of operational risk.
2 Business Case Elements

2.1 Scope and Definition of the Problem

The report covers a review existing issues with aerators, either submerged and or surface mounted, aerators including:

- Long term operations;
- Operator health and safety; and
- Capital & operational costs.

The investigation will include the following items:

- Investigate alternative aeration technologies including fine bubble diffused aeration (FDBA) with removable diffusers;
- Develop a Net Present Value analysis to compare the options, including consideration of against the improvement in plant efficiency improvements and improved process performance;
- Provide recommendations on the selected type of equipment of the preferrad option (including cost estimates).

Figure 1 shows the 11kW floating aspirator aerator in the aeration zone. There are a number of problems associated with the operation of the floating aspirator and submerged aerators, highlighted by the difficulty of maintaining equipment without good access. These will be discussed later in this report.

![Floating Aspirator Aerator: Access for maintenance is difficult as seen in the photo.]

Figure 1: Existing Aeration Equipment
2.2 Alignment with Master Plan

2.2.1 2009 Development Plan Recommendations

The Oxford WWTP Development Programme\(^1\) proposed that the future upgrade of the existing aeration system should be a fine bubble diffused aeration system.

The expected economic life of the floating aspirators has occurred. In summary the recommendations made in 2009 align well with the operation of the equipment and are summarised below:

- Assess condition of existing aerators and keep running as long as economical to maintain them, but beyond 2015 they will be about 20 years old and may not provide enough aeration for peak loads.
- When the existing aerators are going to be replaced decide on upgrade to FBDA or forced air submersibles (plus a submersible mixer to improve mixing in aeration zone).
- Either replace the existing aerators with forced air submersibles one by one, or follow the FBDA upgrade strategy below.

The following staged upgrade and modifications are recommended if Waimakariri District Council choose to upgrade to FBDA:

- Replace the existing submersible aerators with fine bubble aeration system in 2011 (note this assumes that the existing aerators have reached the end of their useful life by 2011) consisting of removable banks of diffusers and an external blower in an acoustic enclosure.

2.2.2 Oxford WWTP Master Plan, 2014

The Oxford WWTP Master Plan\(^2\) assessed that the aeration system redundancy had to be improved as, whenever one of the floating aspirator aerators was out of service for maintenance, the process had insufficient aeration capacity.

The Master Plan allocated $318,000 in 2017, for the upgrade of the aeration system. While the existing aerators were proposed to be replaced in 2011, additional maintenance has extended the life of the equipment. Further investment in the aeration system is required to provide equipment and hence process compliance related redundancy of the aerators. This provides an opportunity to assess the recommended upgrade with that of replacing the existing aerators with the same aerator type.

This business case discusses the advantages and disadvantages of converting the aeration system and provides greater definition to support the project.

2.2.3 Aeration Options

The report assesses aeration equipment upgrade by either replacing the existing aerators with:

1. The existing floating aerators as the base case, or
2. Forced air submersibles sequentially, or
3. Follow the FBDA upgrade strategy.

The 2014 Master Plan provided population, wastewater characteristics and flows and loads for Oxford WWTP, these are provided in Table 1, Table 2 and Table 3 respectively.

Table 1: Forecasted growth for Oxford and flows to the WWTP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Connections</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Flow Rate (ML/d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>1,895</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2059</td>
<td>1143</td>
<td>2,563</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) MWH, November 2009 21007601
\(^2\) Opus, January 2014 CON201331-02
Table 2: Wastewater characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domestic Wastewater Parameter</th>
<th>Typical Load per capita (g/p/day)</th>
<th>Typical Concentration (mg/L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOD</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended Solids</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Nitrogen</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammoniacal Nitrogen</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Phosphorous</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Oxford WWTP Flows and Loads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2064</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td>1,886</td>
<td>2,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Dry Weather Flow</td>
<td>m³/d</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Wet Weather Flow</td>
<td>m³/d</td>
<td>2,032</td>
<td>2,142</td>
<td>2,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOD Load</td>
<td>kg BOD/d</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Suspended Solids</td>
<td>kg TSS/d</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Nitrogen</td>
<td>kg N/d</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammoniacal Nitrogen</td>
<td>kg N/d</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Phosphorus</td>
<td>kg/d</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diurnal Peak Load Factor</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Benefits

3.1 Benefits to be Realised

The benefit to Waimakariri District Council is improved compliance with Environment Canterbury (ECAN) consent conditions by improving the level of service. The level of service improvement is achieved with increased equipment redundancy. The proposed upgrade works will provide ongoing ECAN consent compliance for treated wastewater and discharge whilst providing Waimakariri District Council with the benefit of increased operator safety.

An additional benefit in plant operation will be realised with a reduction in power demand for the same aeration demand as diffused aeration oxygen transfer efficiency is higher than that of surface aeration. This also relates to avoiding an increase in electrical power supply that is currently nearing its full load capacity.

3.2 Evidence of Benefit Delivery

Waimakariri District Council will achieve and maintain the level of service to its customers and demonstrate ongoing compliance to ECAN. Ease of maintenance and operation provides improved Health and Safety for operators and reduces risk to Waimakariri District Council.

---

*Recent sampling data must be used for blower aeration sizing.*
4 Solution

This Business Case focusses on implementing an aeration solution for Oxford WWTP that ensures ongoing compliance with the ECAN consent.

The critical elements for implementing the aeration upgrade are:
- Meet the aeration requirements;
- Time to design, procure and construct the aeration facility; and
- Whole of Life Costs.

4.1 Options: Technology Assessed

Two options for meeting aeration requirements have been identified, adopting proven technologies.

The two options are as follows:
- Option 1 – Existing Aeration Aspirator aeration (existing system) with submersible aerators
- Option 2 – Fine Bubble Diffused Aeration (FBDAA).

A summary of the two options is provided in Table 2 below which form the basis for the assessment of the options.

There are several different types of aeration systems that can be utilised for aeration and mixing of the:
- Jet aerators – installed on the bottom of the basin
- Submersible aerators – installed on the bottom of the basin
- Floating inclined aspirating aerators – floating on the basin surface
- Vertical shaft high-speed aerator – floating on the basin surface
- Blowers with diffused fine bubble aeration – blower installed in blower room, diffusers installed on bottom of basin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Summary of aeration options considered for Oxford WWTP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 1 – Aspirator aeration (existing system);</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary description**

Surface aspirating aerators consist of a motor and a solid motor shaft which spins a propeller. Water moves at a high velocity through and near the propeller, creating a low pressure zone at the hub. The low pressure draws air in through the stationary intake and down a large diameter draft tube. The air exits into the water at the propeller hub. The aerator mounts at an angle in the water with the motor and air intake above the water surface and the propeller submerged below the water. The photos above show the functional principle of the RWL Water TORNADO aerator as an example.

The difficulty of maintaining this type of aerator is well understood by the operators and is not their preferred equipment type.
### Advantages and Disadvantages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Advantages&lt;br&gt;i. Low capital cost&lt;br&gt;ii. Simple operation</td>
<td>b. Disadvantages&lt;br&gt;i. Have to be removed from bioreactor for maintenance; requires heavy lifting equipment&lt;br&gt;ii. Low oxygen transfer rate, implying high operation power cost&lt;br&gt;iii. High bearing maintenance cost&lt;br&gt;iv. Emit noise during night time operation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analysis of floating aspirator type aerators

Long term, operation of the floating aeration system carries operational risk that is higher than alternative aeration equipment. The configuration and size of the bioreactor does not allow a number of floating aerators to be fixed on the surface. The footprint of the pontoon results in selection of larger motor sizes to accommodate sufficient redundancy for repair and maintenance.

Removal of one aerator results in insufficient aeration capacity. A large zone is affected by removal of an aerator, resulting in inefficient use of the power required to aerate the mixed liquor.

Operator health is impacted by operating equipment that is immersed in sludge. Standard operating procedures ensure that operator health is not affected, but a better process is to avoid the risk by selecting alternative types of aerators.

Safe operation of the floating aerators impacts on safe operation of the plant whenever repairs and maintenance is required. Plant has to be removed from the bioreactor to inspect and repair plant. The frequency of this activity increases the risk of operator safety. Avoidance of a condition where equipment has to be regularly inspected ensures safer operation.
**Option 1 – Submersible Aerator Technology**

---

**Summary description**

Submersible aerators are positioned on the bottom of the basin without anchorage. The unit can be lifted in and out of the tank for maintenance and inspection with a mobile crane. The second graphic shown above visualises the operation principal of the ABS XTA/XTAK submersible aerator.

The aerator is fed from a blower much the same as that for diffused aeration, the difference being that diffuser banks are replaced by discrete points of aeration providing the same oxygen transfer, although not evenly spread out as FBDA.

---

**Advantages and Disadvantages**

a. **Advantages**

i. Easy to install and free-standing on the bottom of the basin — no need to empty the basin for installation

ii. Wear-resistant and long lifetime

iii. Very low noise level, no aerosol formation, and no sedimentation on the bottom, thereby minimizing environmental effects

iv. Self-cleaning

v. High Standard Oxygen Transfer Rate (SOTR)

---

b. **Disadvantages**

i. Submerged moving parts of equipment

ii. Requires davit and lifting arrangements to remove equipment and service

iii. Power supplied to submerged equipment

iv. Mixing in an annulus-shaped tank is less effective as mixer locations are limited to three or four positions in the bioreactor depending on motor selection
Analysis of the submerged aerators

Long term, operation of the submerged aeration has a lower operational risk than floating aspirators, but as shown in the photo above, installation requires a platform to install the aerator. This comes at a cost in Oxford’s case. As for aspirators, the configuration and size of the bioreactor impacts on the size and available redundancy for repair and maintenance.

Operator health is less impacted by operating equipment that is immersed in sludge. Standard operating procedures would be the same as that for submersible pumps.

Submerged aerators have to be removed from the bioreactor to inspect moving parts and electrical connections. Increased power demand will require removal and inspection to identify whether raggling is causing the problem. The frequency of this activity increases the risk of operator safety. Avoidance of a condition where equipment has to be regularly inspected ensures safer operation.

Option 2 – Fine bubble diffused aeration technology (FBDA)

Support beam
Wall guide
Drop leg
Manifold
Bottom guide
Counterweight
Purge system

Summary description.

For this aeration option, the generation and the introduction of air into the liquid is separated into two systems. The air blowers will be located outside of the aeration basin in a separate blower room with the diffusers installed in grids on the bottom of the basin. The blower and the diffusers are connected via an air pipe.

There are a lot of different type of diffusers, however, for the application at Oxford, disc diffusers are best suited.

The diffuser grids can be installed as fixed or retractable systems. The retractable system allows maintenance or service to be conducted without shutting down the process or dewatering the tank. The frame for retractable diffuser grids needs to be manufactured of stainless steel to have enough rigidity in the system when lifting it. Using stainless steel for the piping increases costs compared to using uPVC or PP pipes. The photo above shows an example of a retractable diffuser grid by Grundfos.
### Advantages and Disadvantages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Advantages</th>
<th>b. Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Maintenance without isolation of bioreactor</td>
<td>i. Higher capital cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. High oxygen transfer efficiency and implied lower operating costs</td>
<td>ii. Blowers have high noise emissions and require noise attenuation (centrifugal blowers, which are quieter, are too large for this application)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Improved treatment performance</td>
<td>iii. Requires good screenings capture to avoid hair and fibre accumulation on diffuser bank pipework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Achieves redundancy requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analysis of the submerged aerators

The equipment is located in the in the blower room or installed on the main air header feeding the banks of diffusers, while the diffusers based on a removable bank design to facilitate removal from the bioreactor. Apart from the diffused aeration (blowers aeration pipework and diffusers), which requires an annual inspection and replacement in (10) year intervals, there is no equipment maintenance in the bioreactor.

Diffused aeration avoids the ongoing operator health and safety risk. Standard operating procedures for diffuser inspection will need to be developed.

The blower room must be designed to ensure that blower acoustic emissions are contained within the building. Operating procedures ensuring entry using ear protection is required with the appropriate warning signs to protect against exposure to excessive noise emissions.

### 4.2 Options Analysis

The capital cost estimate is listed in Section 4.3. Current and future investment is provided in the estimate, together with expected replacement costs for diffusers at ten year intervals. The scope for the estimate assumed that a new prefabricated shed building would be built to house the blowers and switchboard.
Table 5: Itemised Cost Estimates for Oxford WWTP Aeration Upgrade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Aeration Technology Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Aeration Devices</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$ 40,000.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$ 120,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Aeration Devices</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td>$ 40,000.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$ 120,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Aeration Devices</td>
<td>2045</td>
<td>$ 40,000.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$ 120,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 360,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FBDA Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blower Building</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$ 72,000.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$ 72,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Stage Blowers</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$ 20,000.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$ 60,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inline Silencer</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$ 7,000.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$ 7,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical upgrade</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$ 35,000.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$ 35,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stainless Steel Pipework</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$ 50,000.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$ 50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffused Aeration System</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$ 72,000.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$ 72,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 296,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Blowers</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td>$ 20,000.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$ 20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Inline Silencer</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td>$ 7,000.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$ 7,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Pipework</td>
<td>2036</td>
<td>$ 10,000.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$ 10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Diffusers</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td>$ 72,000.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$ 72,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Diffusers</td>
<td>2045</td>
<td>$ 72,000.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$ 72,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 181,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CAPEX, in Present-Value (2016) dollars, for the total project implementation cost for each option was calculated and is shown in Figure 2 below. This comparison shows the capital costs required to either replace the existing aerators with similar technology or to install the more expensive FBDA blowers and diffusers.

The CAPEX estimates include allowances for the following indirect costs:
- 30% Contingency;
- 10% for Design;
- 5% for Superintending; and
- 3% for Waimakariri District Council’s costs.
- Costs were inflated at 2%, and then discounted at 5%.

![Figure 2: Comparative CAPEX Costs (Present Value)](chart.png)
Figure 3 shows the cumulative OPEX costs comparing overall operation of the two systems through to 2050. FBDA requires less power to deliver similar oxygenation rates and requires less maintenance intervention and this is reflected in the difference in accumulated costs by 2050.

Base (2016) costs were assumed:
- $0.15 per kWh for power (power requirements determined by aeration spreadsheet tool).
- $60 per Operator hour (estimates of 1-hour per week for FBDA and 2-3 hours per week for the existing aeration system).
- Costs were inflated at 2%, and then discounted at 5%.

![Cumulative OPEX Costs (Present Value)](image)

4.3 Total Project Cost

The following works, at a high level, are required for the proposed aeration system upgrade:
- Process building (secured colour-bond cladding on base slab)
- Procurement and installation of new blowers; and
- Fabrication and installation of new air main header feeding the diffused aeration system, and
- Procurement and installation of diffused aeration banks.

Waimakariri District Council's total project cost for the proposed aeration system upgrade is summarised in Figure 4 below. This shows that both options have a similar magnitude of cost when considered through to a 2050 design horizon. Higher capital costs for the FBDA solution are balanced by the higher operational costs for the existing aeration.

![Cumulative TOTEX Present Value](image)

![Cumulative Whole of Life Costs (Present Value)](image)
Chapter 5: Option Selection

The whole of life cost comparison (costs through to 2050) between the existing aeration technology (submerged and surface aerators) with FBDA shows that cost does not need to be the determining criteria for option selection.

Allowances for risks around construction and operability should also be considered. This includes:
- The ability of plant to meet current and future treatment goals;
- Reduction of operational risks associated with each treatment options;
- Provide the best value outcome for the residents and stakeholders.

Section 5.1: Option Analysis

The estimated capital investment for each option is summarised in Table 6 below. Net present value (NPV) values were determined based on the capital and operating estimates. The operating period adopted in the NPV estimates is 20 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>20-year CAPEX (Present Value)</th>
<th>NPV (Present Value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base case: Submerged and surface aeration</td>
<td>$284,000</td>
<td>$696,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1: Fine bubble diffused aerations</td>
<td>$508,000</td>
<td>$665,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Comparative NPV Assessment between the Aeration Options

The analysis of the options considered the advantages and disadvantage against the criteria shown in Table 8 and include criteria weightings. The scoring was done against the base case using the multi-criteria analysis (MCA) scoring methodology outlined in Table 7.

Table 7: MCA Scoring methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much better</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much better</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately better</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little better</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change (same as base case)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little worse</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately worse</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much worse</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much worse</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MCA framework was applied to the options and scored accordingly. The base case was maintaining the current aeration equipment. The diffused aeration option was compared with the base case and as can be seen in Table 8, the option to install diffused aeration, Option 1, scored favourably. Option 1 is therefore the preferred option.
## Table 8: MCA Scoring for Oxford WWTP aeration upgrade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Weightings</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OH&amp;S</td>
<td>Operational Health &amp; Safety is a primary concern for WW and must be considered for all options.</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Future flexibility</td>
<td>Option needs to consider future changes to the layout. Operation of the plant needs to be flexible to fit in with staging requirements over time. Assessment also to consider flexibility for changes to regulation.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>0.00 0.40</td>
<td>The system is flexible as the air demand can be matched easily with the diffused system. Diffuser density can be adapted to demand and deferred until required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Environment, Sustainability &amp; Community</td>
<td>The impact on the sustainability of the site when compared to the base case. Consideration to include, regulatory compliance, environmental impact etc.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>0.00 0.40</td>
<td>Long term reduction in power demand provides compliance to reduce carbon footprint. Blower power maintenance is secured within the blower room and has noise attenuation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Operability/Maintainability</td>
<td>Relative operability and maintainability comparing to the base case.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>0.00 0.40</td>
<td>Operation of diffused aeration is easier and safer than the base case. No working above water is required to operate the aeration system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Net Present Value</td>
<td>Assessment of the relative opportunities for effluent reuse into the future. Does the effluent quality produced by the option provide opportunities to the community for future use (i.e. environmental, agricultural, irrigation etc.)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>0.0 -1.0</td>
<td>0.03 -0.20</td>
<td>Calculated based on relative ratio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Constructability and Staging</td>
<td>Assessment of the constructability of the option in relation to the number of required live cut in, impact on existing operation, risk to plant operation etc. Ability to stage the works to adapt with population growth and reduce initial expenditure.</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0 -1</td>
<td>0.00 0.20</td>
<td>Divers are required to fasten diffuser supports for removable aeration banks. Future diffuser banks can be added to manage lower demand, rather than including all diffusers in 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00 0.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Formula for Tender Price Scoring Calculation = Average [(Base Case NPC - Option NPC) / (Maximum Option NPC - Base Case NPC) x 4, (Base Case NPC / Option NPC) - 1] x 4*
6 Procurement

6.1 Procurement

Procurement of the equipment and associated civil services would be best achieved using a design and construct contract, where the "Employer's Requirements" are specified in the contract allowing a Contractor the opportunity to select equipment and materials that satisfy the specification at a competitive price.

Aeration demand has been determined in previous investigations and once the sizing of the aeration system has been checked, the details of the selected aeration equipment can be confirmed in the Technical Requirements of the contract.

Structuring the contract where Weirnocaan District Council enter into a contract with a single party has a number of advantages, namely:

1. Guarantee of design for the Works is provided by the Main Contractor;
2. Administration of the contract is simplified and reduces costs;
3. Responsibility for delivery of the Works resides with one organisation;
4. By delegating responsibility to one contractor, administration for coordination of sub-contractors resides with the Main Contractor;
5. Completion and hand-over is simplified.

6.2 Timing

After approval of the business case, the project schedule would require the following time to complete:

1. Development of Technical Employer's Requirements; 4 weeks
2. Complete contract documentation and tender conditions; 2 weeks
3. Review documentation; 2 weeks
4. Issue documentation for tender; 2 weeks
5. Tender period; 4 weeks
6. Tender adjudication and approvals to select preferred contractor; 4 weeks
7. Provide insurance, sign contract documentation; 4 weeks
8. Contract period (incl. equipment supply and delivery 16 weeks); 24 weeks

The project period is estimated to be 12 months. The equipment supply may be shorter and that could reduce the project period.
Appendix A  2009 Development Plan

The Oxford WWTP Development Programme proposed that the future upgrade of the existing aeration system should be a fine bubble diffused aeration system. The details of the assessment of the equipment upgrade is provided below as a reference to link to the recommendations made in 2009 about future development requirements.

Section 7.3.2  Aeration System

The existing aeration system will provide sufficient oxygen until around 2015 (based on an oxygen transfer efficiency of 1.0kgO_2/kWh). However the existing aerators will have reached the end of their useful life in about 2011. The existing submersible aerators are very inefficient and it is recommended to replace these units with fine bubble diffused aeration (FBDA) or forced air submersible aerators.

FBDA is the most efficient but has the highest capital cost and the diffusers will need to be replaced every 7 to 10 years (depending on type). It will also improve mixing in the aeration zone. A forced air submersible's efficiency is between the existing submersibles and FBDA. They comprise a submersible aerator (similar to existing) with a small blower feeding air into it.

MWH recommend the following strategy to reduce capital costs:

- Assess condition of existing aerators and keep running as long as economical to maintain them, but beyond 2015 they will be about 20 years old and may not provide enough aeration for peak loads.
- When the existing aerators are going to be replaced decide on upgrade to FBDA or forced air submersibles (plus a submersible mixer to improve mixing in aeration zone)
- Either replace the existing aerators with forced air submersibles one by one, or follow the FBDA upgrade strategy below.

The following staged upgrade and modifications are recommended if Waimakariri District Council choose to upgrade to FBDA:

- Replace the existing submersible aerators with fine bubble aeration system in 2011 (note this assumes that the existing aerators have reached the end of their useful life by 2011) consisting of removable banks of diffusers and an external blower in an acoustic enclosure.
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval from the Management Team to engage MWH as a consultant to undertake an options study and design work for the Oxford WWTP aerator renewal project.

1.2. There are currently three existing aerators at the Oxford WWTP which are all at the end of their useful lives and are starting to require some expensive maintenance.

1.3. We have a budget of $160,000 in this financial year for the renewal of the existing aerators, which will fund a like for like replacement. This renewal method does not offer much resilience or room for growth at the plant.

1.4. MWH have proposed to undertake an issues and options study to provide an optimum renewal strategy for the Oxford aerators and then carry out the design specification for $33,000.

1.5. There is a high potential that the optimum renewal strategy will recommend diffused aeration at the Oxford WWTP as this offers increased operational flexibility, safer maintenance and power savings. However it will cost significantly more than the like for like replacement with the latest cost estimate of $318,000 for diffused aeration.

Attachments:

i. MWH Proposal for Oxford WWTP aerator renewal.
ii. Consultant engagement form

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Management Team:

(a) Receives report No. 160224015049

(b) Accept the price of $33,000 from MWH to undertake an issues and options report and the design scope and specifications for the Oxford WWTP aerator renewal.
(c) Notes: that only one consultant was invited to submit a proposal for this project as MWH has the best recent experience of aerator installation at mechanical wastewater treatment plants such as Oxford.

(d) Notes: that there is an approved capital budget for the aerator renewal of $160,000 in the 2015/16 financial year. The MWH work is proposed to be funded from this budget.

(e) Notes: that the assessment for the cost of installing diffused aeration is higher than the existing budget, therefore a report to Council to request further budget may be required depending on the outcome of the issues and options study.

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

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval from the Management Team to engage MWH as a consultant to undertake an options study and design work for the Oxford WWTP aerator renewal project.

3.2. Background

3.3. There are three existing aerators at the Oxford WWTP; two 9kW submersible aerators and one 11kW floating aspirator aerator. All of these were installed in 1997.

3.4. The useful life of an aerator is assumed to be 20 years for mechanical equipment, meaning all three aerators are due for renewal. On top of this, one of the submersible aerators and the floating aerator both needed to be removed for unplanned repairs last year.

3.5. All three aerators were proposed for renewal in the 2015/16 financial year, with an approved capital budget of $160,000.

3.6. MWH carried out a study in 2009 outlining the development programme for the Oxford WWTP (TRIM 091120035435). As part of this study, the existing aerators were calculated to have sufficient capacity to transfer oxygen to the wastewater until 2016. It was also commented that the existing aerators are very inefficient and replacement by fine bubble diffused aeration should be considered.

3.7. A rough assessment of cost of $294,000 was estimated for replacement by fine bubble diffusion.

3.8. In January 2014, Opus provided an updated Oxford Wastewater Treatment Plant master plan (TRIM 140123006156). The main driver behind this work was determining whether a new clarifier will be required in the next 50 years, however this master plan also covered the replacement of the aerators.

3.9. The main conclusion from this master plan regarding the aerators was that the existing aeration system does not have sufficient redundancy in the event of one of the aerators being taken out of service. In 2015, two of the aerators were out of service for a few weeks at a time for repair work.

3.10. The recommendation from the Opus master plan for the aerators was to develop a replacement strategy whether to replace like for like or to switch to diffused aeration, with replacement work in 2017.

3.11. The Opus estimate for upgrading to diffused aeration in the master plan is $318,000.
3.12. The existing submerged aerators have also been highlighted by the Water Unit as being difficult to safely service. Operators have to work "blind" under the surface of the wastewater to undo bolts to remove the aerators for maintenance and servicing. The Oxford WWTP cannot be easily bypassed to enable "dry" working on these submerged aerators.

3.13. Options

3.14. The current budget only allows for like for like replacement of the submersible and floating aerators, which would leave the treatment plant without sufficient redundancy for any future maintenance.

3.15. It is proposed that MWH undertake an issues and options study to determine the optimum renewal strategy. This has been allowed for in their proposal.

3.16. Three main options are available with regards to the aerator renewal:

1. Defer aerator renewal until failure of the existing aerators.

2. Replace the current aerators like for like with a similar aerator layout.

3. Carry out an assessment of the optimum aerator renewal strategy in 2015/16 and renew the aerators in 2016/17.

3.17. Whilst running to failure is an appropriate renewal method for some infrastructure, option one is not recommended for the Oxford WWTP aerators as this would impact on the treatment efficacy and therefore consent compliance.

3.18. Option two would be easiest to implement and would minimise the current maintenance issues. It does however limit the redundancy in the system and means treatment capacity of the plant will be limited in terms of future growth.

3.19. Option three offers the widest flexibility to the future of the treatment plant. If diffused aeration is recommended then there is potential for power savings, safer maintenance practices and better treatment through more control of aeration. This will however come at a higher cost to what is currently budgeted which will impact on the Oxford wastewater rate.

3.20. Option three is recommended as for as cost of $33,000, the Council will have a strategy that offers the optimum renewal of the aerators for the plant. If following this strategy is found to have too high an impact on the Oxford ratepayers, staff can look at alternative aerator options for renewal in the 2016/17 financial year.

3.21. If option three is adopted, then it is also recommended that the proposal from MWH is accepted. Prices from three consultants have not been sought for this work for two main reasons:

- MWH have the best recent track record of upgrading mechanical treatment plants in the local area with upgrades to The Pines treatment plant in Selwyn District and Greywomth treatment plant both undertaken in the last couple of years. Both of these plants have similarities to Oxford WWTP and aeration options were investigated, with diffused aeration being selected and implemented.

- MWH represent the only Christchurch based team with the knowledge to carry out this work, meaning site visits are more easily undertaken. MWH have also
just won the contract for the Rangiora aeration basin design on a selected tender basis, so there is the potential for some savings between these two projects as a similar study will need to be carried out to assess the optimum aeration for the Rangiora aeration basin.

3.22. Staff are of the opinion that this proposal represents fair value for the work and WWH are the best consultants to undertake this work.

3.23. There is the option to request proposals from other consultants, for example the Opus team in Hamilton that carried out the Oxford WWTP master plan would also be able to undertake this work.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Community views have not been specifically sought in relation to this project. Whilst the $160,000 existing budget was consulted on as part of the Long Term Plan process, there is a high potential that

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. The existing aerator renewal budget of $160,000 has been approved by the Council through 2015-26 Long Term Plan. It is proposed to use part of this budget to fund the proposed $33,000 for the MAH work as per the proposal on attachment 1.

5.2. There is a definite potential that increased budget will be required to follow the recommendations from the strategy. Based on the estimate from the 2014 Oxford WWTP Master Plan for diffused aeration of $318,000, this would equate to an extra $191,000 required which would be a rates increase of $18.86 per ratepayer on the Oxford wastewater scheme.

5.3. This will be

8. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy

This requires Management Team approval in order to comply with the Council's Purchasing Policy.

6.2. Community Outcomes

This report relates to the following community outcomes:

- There is a safe environment for all.
- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable, and affordable manner.

Written by

Ric Barber
Wastewater Asset Manager
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEMO

FILE NO AND TRIM NO: PD001130 / 170607058093
DATE: 07 June 2017
MEMO TO: Kalley Simpson, 3 Waters Manager
FROM: Mark Andrews, Civil Engineer (PDU)
REVIEWED: Rob Frizzell, Utilities Officer / Murray Kerr, Senior Design Engineer (PDU)
SUBJECT: Oxford WWTP Reactor Cleaning Findings

1. Background:
Hydrotech undertook cleaning of the Oxford WWTP Reactor on 26 and 27 April 2017, in accordance with the high level methodology (refer TRIM 170323028506).

This memorandum has been prepared to identify the findings of the cleaning process with a view to assisting in the preparation of future works.

2. Cleaning:
Drain down of the reactor commenced 26 April at 04:45am with two diesel pumps draining the reactor. The suction hoses required occasional repositioning to maintain flow to the SW pond. The pumps were particularly effective to a depth of approximately 2.5m to 3m.

When the level in the reactor and clarifier dropped by approximately 2.5m Hydrotech positioned a vacuum unit with its hose in the Anoxic Zone in the vicinity of the two submersible pumps. This unit is likely to have removed a quantity of solids (as this is likely to be where a large proportion of solids accumulated), however the exact measure is not fully understood. The quantity if solids removed is likely to have been less than 5m³ as only two tankers were used to convey suspended material with the vacuum unit in this location.

Cleaning of the sides of the reactor and clarifier commenced when drain down had reached a depth of 1m from the bottom of the reactor. When the depth of the wastewater in the anoxic and aeration zones reached a depth of 1m from invert, over-pumping to the SW attenuation pond ceased and all wastewater was disposed to Kaliapoi WWTP via tankers.

A thicker layer of suspended sludge was encountered in the anoxic and aeration zones at a depth of approximately 0.7m above invert. Localised areas of settled solids and accumulations of lime were found in bottom of the reactor. Figure 1 broadly identifies the locations and approximate depth of settled deposits encountered.
3. **Survey:**

Following cleaning, a survey was completed to record key features of the anoxic and aeration zones of the reactor. The survey initially used GPS to collect key points, however conventional measurements were taken in areas where GPS signal was poor or lost. This information was recorded and uploaded to TRIM (170607057896 and 170607057897).

Photographs of the empty reactor were taken, compiled into PDF format and uploaded to TRIM (170607058046).
The survey identified a number of key features including:

Aeration Zone:
1. Submersible aerators are installed on hexagonal pads (circa 0.2m high, each hexagonal side circa 0.565m)
2. Steel supports for platform wings (to access submersible aerators) are bolted to the floor.
3. A 0.62m high, 1m wide slot exists at floor level between the anoxic and aeration zones (at the northern partition wall)
4. Sealant tape at concrete joints within the reactor is only partially present or attached.

Anoxic Zone:
1. The mixer support pole is in poor condition and is bolted to the anoxic zone floor.
2. The RAS line and clarifier discharge pipework are strapped to concrete plinths that appear to have been poured in situ on the anoxic zone floor.
3. There is a redundant concrete wall within the anoxic zone that relates to step screen infrastructure that has been removed. A 0.8m deep slot has been cut in the top of the northern wall. Refer TRIM 170607057896.
4. A second RAS line discharges (at 4 l/s) to the inside of the wall in item 3 in an attempt to aid mixing in a potentially dead zone.

Clarifier:
1. The clarifier includes a circa 3m deep 1.5m diameter steel baffle

Although pdf drawings of the reactor are available and generally show the outline of the structure, they do not show detail regarding reinforcement or those items listed above. If future upgrades requiring AutoCAD drawings are progressed the results of the survey should be incorporated.

4. **Post Cleaning and Survey Operation**

Liaison with the Water Unit (Richard Collett, 07/06/17) indicates the following:

1. Prior to cleaning the capacity of the WWTP was significantly reduced (in the order of 6 or 7 l/s prior to breakthrough of the blanket within the clarifier).
2. Following cleaning, the plant is consistently achieving 9 l/s with no detrimental performance (such as breakthrough of the blanket within the clarifier or backing up).
3. The operations team are considering increasing the flow rate of influent to the plant incrementally (at 0.5 or 1 l/s increments over time) to confirm capacity, however DWF influent is currently less than 9 l/s. Testing of the plant will occur during subsequent wet weather events.

5. **Summary**

Cleaning of the Oxford WWTP Reactor has notably improved performance at Oxford WWTP, however upgrades are still required to improve system performance, compliance and to accommodate development.

Although drawings of the Oxford WWTP reactor are available in PDF format they do not show details such as reinforcement or those items identified by the survey. If future upgrades requiring AutoCAD drawings are progressed, the results of this survey should be incorporated.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEMO

FILE NO AND TRIM NO: PD001130 / 170008058123

DATE: 08 June 2017

MEMO TO: Kalley Simpson, 3 Water Manager

FROM: Mark Andrews, Civil Engineer (PDU)

REVIEWED BY: Kelly LaValley, Project Delivery Manager (16/06/17)

SUBJECT: Oxford WWTP Post Cleaning Recommendations

1. Scope:

The purpose of this memorandum is to discuss the findings from cleaning of the Oxford WWTP Reactor and to make high level recommendations regarding future works. The intent of the recommendations is to replace assets at the end of their useful life, improve performance and robustness of wastewater treatment processes at Oxford WWTP.

It is assumed that readers of this memorandum are familiar with the processes and infrastructure at the Oxford WWTP Site. However, a brief background is included in Section 2 and a process schematic is included in Appendix 1.

The findings/results of the cleaning, photographic survey and dimensions of infrastructure are available on TRIM (170607057896, 170607057897, 170608058046 and 170607058093).

This memorandum discusses each zone or segment of the reactor, making observations and recommendations for each zone:
- Anoxic Zone
- Aeration Zone
- Clarifier

2. Background

The Oxford WWTP was originally commissioned in 1997 and had an upgrade in 2004 to incorporate an aerobic zone in addition to the aeration basin. In 2012, an inline UV unit was installed with its own controller to replace the original open channel UV system. In 2014 a plant upgrade was carried out to include a wet weather holding pond and relocated the inlet screen and channel.

The existing submersible aerators are the original ones installed when the plant was commissioned (1997) and the floating aerator was installed in circa 2004. All three aerators are reaching the end of their expected useful lives. The two submersible aerators are also difficult to maintain and require manually entering the aeration basin for maintenance tasks.

A design build contract (NZS3918:2013) was released in early 2017 to replace the existing aerators with a diffused aeration alternative. Due to concerns regarding the quality of components proposed and the residual risk to council associated with all submissions, all tenders were rejected and the contract was withdrawn.

To reduce risks associated with any future contract at Oxford WWTP, Council representatives decided to undertake cleaning of the reactor and gain a better understanding of existing reactor
infrastructure for which very limited as-built information was available. A high level methodology was developed for cleaning of the reactor (refer TRIM 170323C28506).

Assuming that a similar methodology was used to empty the reactor prior to future works during a period of dry weather, all works requiring the existing treatment plant to be off-line would have to be completed within three days of reactor emptying. After three days the wet weather pond is likely to be full.

3. Oxford WWTP Reactor Zones Discussion

3.1. Anoxic Zone

A sketch of the Anoxic zone is shown in Figure 1.

![Figure 1 - Anoxic Zone Sketch](image)

During clearing a large quantity of sludge, grit and rags was found below the anoxic zone to aeration zone transfer pumps. This is consistent with problems experienced with pumps blocking...
due to rag build-up. Since cleaning one of the pumps has blocked due to rags, the current step screen is relatively coarse (approx. 10mm) and is unlikely to screen grit and all rags.

3.1.1 Walls:

Prior to the installation of the baffle walls between the current anoxic and aeration zones, the anoxic zone was considerably smaller and bounded by the old walls within the current anoxic zone. At installation of the baffle walls a 0.8m deep notch was cut in the top of the old anoxic zone northern wall. The top of the southern wall of the existing anoxic zone is circa 0.5m above the floor.

It is understood that the intent of the baffle walls was to provide a larger anoxic zone, improve circulation within it and restrict recirculation of aerated wastewater within the reactor. The modification appears to have addressed racetrack recirculation characteristics within the aeration zone. However, despite notches in the old anoxic zone northern wall, the old walls create a partition that significantly impedes circulation within the anoxic zone and results in a large 'dead zone'.

The northern baffle wall between the aeration and anoxic zones incorporates a 620mm high, 1m wide slot at floor level. The intent of this slot was to facilitate transfer of aerated wastewater into the anoxic zone.

The old anoxic zone walls provide support for sections of the walkway; however, these primarily relate to historic infrastructure and could be removed with sections of the walk-way extension. The main component that would require repositioning is one Dissolved Oxygen Sensor.

3.1.2 Influent Pipework

The current influent pipe discharges into the top of the anoxic zone approximately 1m below the top of the baffle walls. The influent pipe is angled downward at 45 degrees and discharges between the northern baffle wall and old anoxic zone northern wall (refer to Figure 1). The Water Unit expressed concern that the position of the inlet, in relation to the old anoxic zone wall and the baffle wall, is potentially allowing shortcutting of the treatment process. Refer to Figure 2.

![Inlet Pipework from Step Screen Chamber](image)

**Figure 2 – Anoxic zone influent pipework and slot**

To improve circulation the Water Unit have installed a second RAS line discharging to the potential dead zone within the old anoxic zone walls. The RAS line is capable of achieving approximately 4 l/s.
3.1.3. Mixer

The mixer cowling and support pole are in very poor condition. The mixer position is generally constrained by the inlets and by the position of existing walls. Improved mixing might occur if not constrained by walls.

3.2. Aeration Zone

A sketch of the aeration zone is shown in Figure 3.

Figure 3 – Aeration Zone Sketch

An area of lime build-up was identified against the outer wall adjacent to the submersible aerators. This build-up relates to historic treatment activities and following removal is not anticipated to occur in the future (lime is no longer used).

The crescent shape area of silt deposits between the submersible aerator and the baffle wall is indicative of material dropping out of suspension between the submersible aerators and clarifier. The location is consistent with that found during a previous cleaning (in circa 2004) although the
quantity is reduced. This is potentially due to the addition of a floating aerator that was installed at the same time as the baffle walls (circa 2004).

As previously identified, all three aerators are reaching the end of their expected useful lives. The two submersible aerators are also difficult to maintain and require manually entering the aeration basin for maintenance tasks.

Installation of a diffused aeration system should improve system performance, final effluent quality and reduce the risk of settled deposits.

3.3. Clarifier

An extract from drawing number 3811808/A005 Rev A of the Clarifier is shown in Figure 4.

The inlet to the clarifier from the aeration zone includes a high-level submerged bubble up style bellmouth discharge connection within a 1.5m diameter, 3m deep steel baffle. This baffle directs flow in the vertical plane towards the bottom of the clarifier. There are concerns that the current baffle provides limited energy dissipation. During periods of higher flow (such as during wet weather) the limited energy dissipation may contribute to breakthrough of the blanket in the clarifier and consequently reduced quality final effluent.

4. Summary

The existing aerators at Oxford WWTP are nearing the end of their useful lives. Changing the style of aeration at Oxford WWTP to a diffused aeration solution should improve system performance, suspension of solids and the quality of final effluent. The chosen aeration solution should use components recognised as high performance within the industry, with excellent New Zealand based support and spares. The aeration upgrade may require the existing submersible aerator pads to be removed.
Consideration should be given to removal of the walls associated with the old anoxic zone to improve circulation and influent flow paths. Removal of the redundant walls would require removal or re-supporting of an unused section of walkway and relocating one Dissolved Oxygen Sensor.

Although removal of the old anoxic zone wall should improve flow paths, the Influent discharge connection could be modified to improve mixing of the influent with recirculated aerated wastewater and reduce the perceived risk of short circuiting treatment. This might take the form of rotating the existing 45-degree bend one bolt so that it is angled slightly away from the slot at the base of the baffle wall.

The mixer support pole in the anoxic zone is in very poor condition. Consideration should be given to replacement of the mixer and support, potentially in a revised location following removal of the old anoxic zone walls.

Consideration should be given to modification to the existing clarifier baffle to improve energy dissipation and reduce the risk of reduced quality final effluent during periods of high flow.

Assuming that a similar methodology to cleaning was used to empty the reactor prior to future works (during a period of dry weather); all works requiring the existing treatment plant to be off-line would have to be completed within three days of reactor emptying. After this time the wet weather pond is likely to be full.

5. **Recommendations**

- Progress design and installation of diffused aeration using conventional procurement strategy (NZS 3910:2013) to ensure the best outcome for stakeholders and reduced risk.
- Design and incorporate the following activities into the aeration upgrade design and subsequently incorporate within construction contract:
  - removal of the old anoxic zone walls
  - removal of submersible aerator pads
  - replacement of mixer and support (potentially repositioned)
  - minor alteration to influent pipework
  - installation of revised clarifier baffle
- Programme installation of infrastructure requiring the reactor to be off-line for a period of dry weather. This should be written into the contract to minimise risk.
- Due to their excellent track record associated with the cleaning works, consideration could be given to nominating Hydrotech for future works requiring emptying/cleaning of the Oxford WWTP reactor. Similarly, Smiths Cranes could be considered for nomination for the cutting and removal of walls.
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1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is give an update on the Council use of herbicides for weed control operations in the district.

1.2. The use of weed spray is covered in detail for each of the relevant Council functions including costs and the cost of alternative options.

1.3. The advice received to date is that provided glyphosate is used appropriately it can continue to be used.

1.4. If the Council would like to take a precautionary approach there are options presented in this report to limit the use of glyphosate in certain circumstances. Cost estimates for the various options are included so that these can be included in budgets for the draft Long Term Plan (LTP).

Attachments:

i. 160805077062, Interim Update on eth use of Herbicides including Glyphosate, for Council Weed control operations, September 2016.

ii. 171012110892, CAREX report on Glyphosate, report to Council October 2017.

ii. 171011110252, Persistence and ecological consequences of glyphosate to control aquatic weeds in Waimakariri lowland waterways, CAREX, September 2017.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180111001840.

(b) Notes that based on information to date, it is unlikely that the use of glyphosate by the Council would pose a risk to public health and the environment.
(c) Notes that the use of herbicide in Council operations is carried out strictly in accordance with the manufacturer’s instructions.

(d) Notes that herbicides, including glyphosate, for Council operations are only used where deemed necessary by Council staff and contractors, and other weed control options are used where they are deemed more appropriate.

(e) Notes that the budgets in the LTP have been based on continuing to use herbicides, including glyphosate, for weed control where deemed necessary by Council staff and contractors.

(f) Circulates this report to the Community Boards, Drainage Advisory Groups and the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee for their information.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. **Background**

3.1.1. Community concerns regarding the use of glyphosate in Council drains have been brought to the Council’s attention. Specifically a resident of Kaiapoi in 2015 blamed the Council’s use of glyphosate for the dieback of submerged weed in the Kaiapoi River.

3.1.2. This report provides a summary of previous reports to Council, activities where the Council’s contractors use glyphosate and suggested options on actions the Council could take to the 2018 Long Term Plan consultation process.

3.2. **Kaiapoi River Sediment Testing**

3.2.1. The Council had Kaiapoi river sediment sampled and tested for the presence of glyphosate. Water and sediment monitoring undertaken in April 2016 found no detectable concentrations in the water, and concentrations between 0.11 to 0.26 mg/kg in three sediment samples.

3.2.2. The Council engaged Dr Jo Cavanagh Research Priority Area Leader – Soil and Contaminant Management from Landcare Research to provide a professional opinion on the use of glyphosate and the weed dieback in the river. Dr Cavanagh’s opinion is that it is unlikely that glyphosate has contributed to the die-off of aquatic plants observed in the Kaiapoi River over 2012–2016. This was presented to the Kaiapoi Community Board on the 20th of June 2016. The Kaiapoi Community Board at this meeting recommended the Council approves the use of mechanical means rather than spraying to control weeds in the Council stormwater, roadside drains, and waterways (refer TRIM 160608053721).

3.2.2. Ecan have undertaken monitoring in the Kaiapoi River and noted salt water intrusions up the river when there are spring tides coupled with low flows in the Waimakariri River. This phenomenon is likely to cause dieback of freshwater aquatic plants.

3.3. **Advice from Government Ministries and Statutory Authorities**

3.3.1. The Council previously sought advice from the Ministry of Health (MOH), Ministry for the Environment (MfE), Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment (PCE) and the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA), on the impact of use of glyphosate and other sprays on public health and on the environment. Their responses are summarised below.

3.3.2. The EPA response referred Council to a recent report it had commissioned, titled “Review of the Evidence Relating to Glyphosate and Carcinogenicity”, published in August 2016. This report was prepared by toxicologists Dr Wayne Temple with
contributions from Michael Beasley of the New Zealand National Poisons Centre. The report found that, “based on a weight of evidence approach, taking into account the quality and reliability of the available data – glyphosate is unlikely to be genotoxic or carcinogenic to humans and does not require classification under HSNO as a carcinogen or mutagen”.

3.3.3. The letter from the MOH referred the Council to the EPA as the most appropriate authority in New Zealand on assessing and regulating glyphosate use. Therefore the report prepared by Dr Wayne Temple is considered the most comprehensive and recent resource provided by the Government for New Zealand organisations to assess public health impacts of the use of glyphosate.

3.3.4. The MfE also concurred with the findings of the EPA report. It noted that the EPA has approved the use of glyphosate in New Zealand following consideration of the likely effects of glyphosate on both human health and on the environment. It concluded that “both could be safeguarded by placing appropriate controls on the use of products containing glyphosate”. It went on to state that “the level of glyphosate in Kaiapoi, according to your own testing on 4 April 2016, is not at a level that would cause significant adverse effects for either humans or the environment.”

3.3.5. Apart from a letter received to acknowledge the request for information no further correspondence has been received from the PCE.

3.3.6. The Council was presented these reports at its meeting on the 6th of September 2016, refer TRIM 160929100894 (complete report with attachments; TRIM 160805077062[v2]).

3.3.7. Representatives from the Environmental Protection Authority visited Council in September 2016. They had no issues with the use of glyphosate by Council but cautioned against using more toxic alternatives available in New Zealand.

3.4. Other Herbicides

3.4.1. Included in the report to Council on the 6th of September 2016 was a review of the Council’s use of herbicides across all departments and activities. There are a number of products used for the control of weeds, some of which are specialist herbicides usually employed to control such weeds as gorse and broadleaf weeds and these include active ingredients such as triclopyr, clopyralid, metsulfuron-methyl, haloxyfop-P-methyl ester, sodium hypochlorite, picloram and others. These chemicals are very hazardous and require qualified applicators and none of them are approved to be used over water. As they are specialist herbicides, very little is used by Council contractors. This report does not cover these chemicals in any detail.

3.5. CAREX Partnership

3.5.1. In the summer of 2016 – 2017 The Waimakariri District Council partnered with (CAREX) in a trial to understand the persistence of glyphosate in stream water and sediment and its short-term effects on freshwater invertebrates and fish following spraying of waterways. The results of the trial are summarised as follows:
3.5.1.1. Glyphosate was present in the sediment before spraying had even started.

3.5.1.2. Glyphosate was present in the water column for 1-2 days following spraying, but quickly bound to sediment and broke down.

3.5.1.3. Freshwater invertebrates and fish were not affected by the use of glyphosate to control emergent macrophytes although it was concluded that as these drains are highly modified environments, invertebrates and fish that continue to occupy them may be already tolerant of existing water quality in these systems.

3.5.2. The CAREX trial report was presented to the Council on the 24th of October 2017, refer TRIM 171012110892 (complete report; TRIM 171011110252).

3.6. Formulations Containing Glyphosate

3.6.1. Glyphosate formulations are available at the local hardware and farm supply stores. They can be purchased and used with no restrictions. Home gardeners and commercial cropping farmers are using glyphosate. A drive around the district reveals the landowners who are spraying their roadside drains, most likely with glyphosate. It is the most widely used herbicide in the world.

3.6.2. There are many herbicide products on the market containing glyphosate. A common misconception is using the term “Roundup” to describe all formulations, but Roundup is just another formulation produced and marketed by the company Monsanto. The Council’s contractors do not use this particular product.

3.6.3. Each manufacturer adds other ingredients to glyphosate to create herbicide formulations usually to target certain weeds. An example of this is the product Weed Weapon manufactured by Kiwicare for the home gardener market. This also contains saflufenacil, which is effective on broad leaf species. Other added ingredients are surfactants and adjuvants (see below).

3.6.4. The Council’s contractors use two formulations of glyphosate: Greenspace contractors use Glyphosate 360, and Drainage and Roading contractors use Glyphosate 510. The label information for the two formulations are compared in Table 1.

3.6.5. The added ingredients distinguish the main difference between the two formulations; Glyphosate 360 cannot be used in the aquatic environment and is classed as toxic, while Glyphosate 510 is approved to be used in the aquatic environment and not classed as toxic. It is not glyphosate itself that sets the hazard class but the added ingredients. Glyphosate alone does not even rate a class 6 toxic label.

3.6.6. It is also worth noting that the hazard warnings apply to the concentrated product before it is diluted for use. This is for the personal protection of the handlers and care that the concentrated product does not enter the natural environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Comparisons of Glyphosate 360 and Glyphosate 510</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glyphosate 360</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazard Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.1D</strong> Substances that are acutely toxic - Harmful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.4A</strong> Substances that are irritating to the eye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 9.1B Substances that are ecotoxic in the aquatic environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Glyphosate isopropylammonium 360g/L</th>
<th>Tallow amine ethoxylate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glyphosate isopropylammonium 510g/L</td>
<td>Alkyl polyoxyethylene phosphate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toxicological Information</th>
<th>ACUTE ORAL: LD50 (rats) &gt;5000 mg/kg.</th>
<th>ACUTE DERMAL: LC50 (rabbit) inhalation &gt;5000 mg/Kg. ACUTE INHALATION: LC50 (rats) &gt;10 mg/L for 4 hour aerosol exposure.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTHER TOXICITY INFORMATION: Warning - May cause skin irritation, avoid skin contact. Warning - May cause eye irritation, avoid contact with eyes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACUTE ORAL: LD50 (rats) &gt;10000 mg/kg.</td>
<td>ACUTE DERMAL: LC50 (rabbit) inhalation &gt;5000 mg/Kg. ACUTE INHALATION: LC50 (rats) &gt;10 mg/L for 4 hour aerosol exposure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTHER TOXICITY INFORMATION: Warning - May cause skin irritation, avoid skin contact. Warning - May cause eye irritation, avoid contact with eyes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ecological Information</th>
<th>AQUATIC TOXICITY: Toxic to aquatic life. LC50 Fish (Trout) 72hr: 9mg/L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOIL TOXICITY: Not toxic to worms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TERRESTRIAL VERTEBRATES - BIRDS: Not toxic to birds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TERRESTRIAL INVERTEBRATES - BEES: Not toxic to bees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AQUATIC TOXICITY: Slightly toxic to fish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOIL TOXICITY: Not toxic to worms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TERRESTRIAL VERTEBRATES - BIRDS: Not toxic to birds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TERRESTRIAL INVERTEBRATES - BEES: Not toxic to bees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Use</th>
<th>A non-selective herbicide for the control of most annual and perennial grass and broadleaf weed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A non-selective herbicide used before planting for the control of most annual and perennial grass and broadleaf weeds. Will control emerged weeds only, and provides no residual control.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6.7. *What are surfactants?* The term surfactant is a blend of surface active agent. They help to break the barrier between unlike chemicals or surfaces, like the waxy surface of a leaf. Surfactants work because they're able to break the surface tension of the herbicide and leaf surface. This allows the spray to evenly coat leaf surfaces in an even sheen with no beading up or rolling off.

3.6.8. *What are adjuvants?* Adjuvants reduce the surface tension, improve the wetting action, and increase the penetration of the herbicide.

### 3.7. Council's Use of Herbicide

3.7.1. **Greenspace, Roading, Property, Transfer Stations, Closed Landfills, Water, Wastewater & Forestry assets**

3.7.2. **Glyphosate formulations are used around the Council’s Greenspace, Roading, Property, Wastewater & forestry assets.** It is used for:
- Keeping neat tidy edges around gardens and grass areas.
- Keeping footpaths and other traffic areas weed free.
- Keeping the area around marker posts and power poles clear of grass and weeds.
- General control of unwanted problem weeds.

3.7.3. Other sprays and herbicides are used by Council contractors where necessary. These are listed in detail on the table below.

Table 2. Council Use of Herbicide Products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Method/ Product</th>
<th>Undiluted Application Rates (if provided/ per annum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roading</td>
<td>Sicon</td>
<td>Zeal (Metsulfuron – methyl)</td>
<td>6 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pulse</td>
<td>22 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glyphosate 510</td>
<td>220 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Versatile</td>
<td>20 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>Hide Spraying Ltd</td>
<td>Glyphosate 510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pulse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grazon (Triclopyr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supplies</td>
<td>Graeme Ford</td>
<td>Glyphosate 510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grazon (Triclopyr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>Hide Spraying Ltd</td>
<td>Agpro Green (Glyphosate 510)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grazon (Triclopyr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pulse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Escort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Properties</td>
<td>National Decorators</td>
<td>Hypostat (sodium hypochlorite) (roof moss &amp; mould)</td>
<td>0.04 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(roof spraying)</td>
<td>Sicon</td>
<td>Gallant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ground spraying)</td>
<td>Wet &amp; Forget / Surrender</td>
<td>0.3 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pulse</td>
<td>0.6 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Versatile</td>
<td>1.7 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glyphosate</td>
<td>5.3 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>Glyphosate</td>
<td>116 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brushkiller</td>
<td>34 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximiser</td>
<td>30 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lime Sulphur</td>
<td>46 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moss &amp; Mould killer</td>
<td>24 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Forestry</td>
<td></td>
<td>Glyphosate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Terbuthylazine (Gardoprim)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grazon (Triclopyr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Picloram</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aminopyralids (Tordon)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wetting agents (pulse etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Stations</td>
<td>Graeme Ford</td>
<td>Glyphosate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grazon (Triclopyr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Landfills</td>
<td>Hide Spraying Ltd</td>
<td>Grazon (Triclopyr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pulse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanfill Site</td>
<td>Hide Spraying Ltd</td>
<td>Grazon (Triclopyr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pulse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7.4. In recent years staff and contractors have been very aware of the concerns around the use of herbicides and in particular glyphosate. The use of glyphosate and other herbicides is limited to essential areas and is one of the range of options, including the use of mechanical weeding.

3.7.5. In Greenspace areas, the current practice is to reduce the need to spray by carrying out the following:

- Application of mulch on shrub beds to reduce weed growth and therefore reduce the need to spray.
- Tree pits created around trees which are covered in mulch reducing the need to spray around the base of the tree where mowers cannot always get to.
- Vegetation around all bollards, wire, chain and post and rail fencing is manually controlled which is a specification in the parks contract.
- Infill planting is undertaken annually to suppress weed growth and therefore reduce the need to use spray.
- Combi guards or equivalent weed matting and plant protection is used when planting new native regeneration areas in natural reserves. The weed matting supresses weed growth around the plants.

3.7.6. At water supply headworks the use of herbicides has been limited and weed control is undertaken with mowers and weed eaters. The key herbicide used at water headworks sites is glyphosate, however Grazon is also used in specific circumstances. If the Council wanted to minimise the use of chemical sprays at water headworks sites this could be achieved by ceasing use of chemical sprays from water supply well sites, but continuing to use sprays as required at headworks or reservoir sites. Given the limited size and number of the well sites and the sensitivity public have to drinking water quality this is a pragmatic approach that could be managed at a modest cost.

3.7.7. One area that could be of concern to the public is children’s playgrounds. While it would be difficult to manage reserves in general without glyphosate it would be manageable to cease using glyphosate and other herbicides in the immediate area of children’s playgrounds if Council wanted to take a precautionary approach.

3.7.8. Excluding drainage there are no other areas where staff would recommend ceasing the use of glyphosate and herbicides.

3.7.9. Drainage

3.7.10. The initial concerns regarding spraying and the use of glyphosate relates to the maintenance of the drainage network therefore this section will focus on the issues in more detail.

3.7.11. The Council’s contractors spray dry drains to control rank grass. They have strict instructions to spray only the invert of the drain and to leave the banks untouched. Usually one spray per year is enough to keep the drains manageable.

3.7.12. The coastal zone of the Waimakariri district has a network of open drains that have a permanent base flow of spring water. There are a number of introduced aquatic weeds (macrophytes) both emergent (growing above the water) and submergent (growing under the water) that infest these drains. During the summer warm temperatures and longer sunlight hours cause prolific growth of these weeds. The most common emergent macrophytes are:
Watercress (Nasturtium officinale) native to Europe and Asia.

Monkey musk (Erythranthe guttata, formerly Mimulus guttatus) native to North America.

Veronica or water speedwell (Veronica anagallis-aquatica) country of origin unknown.

Floating sweet grass (Glyceria fluitans) native to Europe.

3.7.13. The prolific growth of these macrophytes cause the following problems:

- Water levels increase along some of the drainage networks causing flooding of surrounding land.
- Decrease of drain capacity which can cause flooding issues during heavy rain.
- During heavy rain events clumps of weed, especially watercress, can become unrooted, float downstream and build up to cause blockages at culverts.
- Macrophytes trap sediment that reduces drain capacity, clog stream beds, reduce habitat for aquatic biota and, like a self-perpetuating system, enable more prolific weed growth.
- Excess weed will hinder the migration of both introduced and native fish populations.
- Detract from the aesthetic appeal of a body of water.

3.7.14. The Council have a resource consent from Environment Canterbury to spray emergent aquatic macrophytes. Historically approximately 8 - 10% of spring fed drains are sprayed every year.

3.7.15. The product authorized for use is Glyphosate 510. The contractor uses a vehicle mounted spray unit and the practice is to spray the middle of the drain only and not spray the banks. Glyphosate is only effective on emergent weeds as sprays are diluted beyond effectiveness when mixed with stream water.

3.7.16. Glyphosate gel is used to control willow and other woody weeds along open drains and streams. The plant is either drilled and injected with the gel or the plant is cut and the stump pasted. These methods ensure no product enters the water.

3.7.17. Glyphosate is used for managing riparian areas which have been planted with natives. The practice is to target problem weeds that could compete with the natives. A backpack sprayer is used.

3.7.18. There are no other herbicides that are approved to be sprayed over water. Most of the organic products on the market contain fatty acids, pine and other oils that are toxic to stream fauna and flora and as such are not appropriate or approved to control in-stream macrophytes.

3.7.19. If the Council wished to take a precautionary approach it could opt to cease spraying glyphosate on emergent aquatic macrophytes in water.

3.8. Alternatives to using Herbicide

3.8.1. Excavation. A digger fitted with a rake attachment is employed to mechanically remove excess weed. A good operator can do this with minimal disturbance to the stream banks and stream base. The major impact is removal of a large proportion of in-stream biomass is removed from the stream. Ideally the removed macrophytes are placed along the side of the stream which will allow fauna to migrate back into the stream. In recent years the development of lifestyle property
has introduced land owners wanting a tidy groomed road frontage and garden, they do not want stream cleanings spoiling their lawns and expect the Council's contractor to immediately remove the cleanings. The impact is that any fauna is totally removed from the stream.

3.8.2. Shade. The establishment of native plants to introduce shade along stream banks is proven method to reduce macrophyte growth. In many cases, especially with an east–west aligned stream, the use of glyphosate and excavation is completely eliminated.

3.8.3. Grass Cutting. Weed eating dry drains and other areas is an alternative to using herbicide.

3.8.4. Other alternatives were considered in the previous report to Council in September 2016 (refer TRIM 160805077062).

3.9. Hollistic Management of Waterways

3.9.1. In 2013 the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment issued a warning that our long finned eel population is in dramatic decline and heading for extinction. Where there is sufficient data; nearly 3 quarters of our freshwater fish species and one third of freshwater invertebrates are classified at risk or threatened with extinction. This report focusses on the use of glyphosate however there are other factors to consider when looking at the health of our lowland waterways. Our freshwater ecosystems are impacted by changes in the water cycle, drainage, pollution and sedimentation, nutrient enrichment, deforestation and invasion by pests. The CAREX report highlights the issue that the health of our lowland waterways is not good. The use of glyphosate can be discontinued by the Council but we cannot expect an improvement in the health of our freshwater systems without looking at the broader picture.

3.9.2. There are opportunities here to look at our waterways holistically and focus on enhancing water quality and water ecology by managing catchments, more riparian planting to introduce shade and habitat.

3.10. Christchurch City Council experience

3.10.1. In 2016 the Christchurch City Council stopped using glyphosate products in public places due to concerns that glyphosate might be a carcinogen. Their contractors use “organic” alternatives such as Kiwicare product Weedfree Rapid which contains fatty acids.

3.10.2. Discussions with Christchurch City Council staff and the City’s parks contractors Delta and Recreational Services highlights the following issues when using these organic alternatives.

3.10.2.1. The product is highly acidic which can cause burns to skin and eyes. Extra protective clothing must be worn by applicators.

3.10.2.2. As the product is a contact herbicide (glyphosate is a systemic herbicide) every part of the plant must be treated to be effective however the roots...
of the plant remain alive and the plant can re-sprout after treatment. This means more product is required and must be applied more often.

3.10.2.3. The product has a strong odour which has increased the number of complaints from the public. Especially from dog owners because their dogs like to roll in it.

3.10.2.4. It is more of a challenge to maintain parks with a tidy appearance which also increases complaints from the public. For example the product appears to be totally ineffective on the common weed mallow.

3.11. Other Views

3.11.1. Organisations such as the Soil & Health Association and the Green Party are advocating that glyphosate should be reassessed and eventually phased out of use. Green MP Steffan Browning produced a critique of the EPA’s review of the evidence relating to glyphosate and carcinogenicity.

3.12. Options

3.12.1. It is recommended that the Council take the glyphosate issue to the 2018 Long Term Plan process for consultation. This would involve discussion of the issue in the Consultation Document. Members of the public will have an opportunity to express their opinions as a submission to the LTP:

- **Option 1: No change to current practice and use** (Staff recommendation). This option has been allowed for in the draft LTP budgets. There is no cost impact if this option is chosen by Council for consultation.

- **Option 2: Cease use of glyphosate directly into waterways*, water well headworks and in children’s playground areas.** Continue current use for all other Council activities. This option would have a cost of approximately $130,000 to $150,000 per annum. If Council wanted to take a precautionary approach staff would support this as it would eliminate the highest risk activities from an environmental and human health perspective. Staff and contractors would be able to manage most of the level of service issues associated with this. *Note refers to ceasing spraying glyphosate on emergent aquatic macrophytes in water.

- **Option 3: Cease use of glyphosate across all Drainage and public areas (footpaths, parks, playgrounds etc).** Continue to use glyphosate for rural roads and forestry areas. This option would cost an additional $1.0 million to $1.5 million above the current budgets in the draft LTP. It would also have a significant impact on levels of service. This option is not recommended by staff.

- **Option 4: Cease use of glyphosate across all Council activities.** Not recommended. This would cost in the order of $1.1 million to $2.0 million above the current budgets in the draft LTP. Staff advise against this option as it would have significant level of service impacts and in particular road safety implications.

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

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. The community views on this issue are varied. The drainage advisory groups generally are supportive of the use of herbicides including glyphosate. However there are opinions over the whole spectrum including people who consider that there should be no use of glyphosate.
4.2. The Kaiapoi Community Board at its meeting on the 20th of June 2016 (TRIM 160620057958) recommended the following:

4.2.1. **Recommends** that Council approves the use of mechanical means, rather than spraying, to control weeds in the Council stormwater and roadside drains, and waterways. Notes that mechanical means, rather than spraying Council drains, is estimated to cost an additional $80,000 per year.

4.2.2. **Recommends** that Council declines support for a return to the use of spraying to control weeds in Council drains.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. The costs that have been built into the draft LTP are based on the Council continuing with its current approach of using glyphosate for weed control where deemed appropriate by Council staff and contractors. If the Council chooses another option for consultation, other than the staff recommendation, the draft budgets will need to be amended to align with this decision.

5.2. The following table compares current weed control costs for each Council activity with a rough order estimated cost range for replacing sprays with mechanical weed control methods. This is not based on a site specific assessment as the exact cost of the most suitable alternative weed control method for each site has not been identified. The cost estimates are instead based on extrapolations based on the actual costs reported by the drainage activity during the recent mechanical weed control trials.

5.3. The results of the trials have been interpolated across all Council activities to provide a starting point for cost comparisons between glyphosate and mechanical weed removal options. To complete a more comprehensive options assessment would require an individual assessment at each site, including, for instance, the most appropriate weed removal option for each drain, reserve margin, garden, road verge etc. This level of in-depth investigation would require significant further resourcing.

5.4. Any Council reduction in its use of glyphosate is unlikely to have a significant impact on the concentrations found in the environment, due to the extent of private usage of the product.

**Table 3: Current Average Annual Spray Costs and Estimated Mechanical Weed Control Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Current Average Annual Cost of Weed Control</th>
<th>Estimated Total Cost of Mechanical Weed Control for all Council weed control (range)</th>
<th>Estimated Additional Cost for Mechanical Weed Control (range)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roading</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$210,000 to $350,000</td>
<td>$175,000 to $315,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$630,000 to $1.05 million</td>
<td>$525,000 to $945,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supplies</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$154,000 to $257,000</td>
<td>$128,300 to $231,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Properties (incl. pensioner housing)</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation (excludes natural reserves &amp; Mainpower Oval)</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$210,000 to $350,000</td>
<td>$175,000 to $315,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Forestry</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$120,000 to $200,000</td>
<td>$100,000 to $180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Stations*</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Landfills</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanfill Site</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$236,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.38 million - $2.27 million</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.14 million - $2.02 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Weed control is part of transfer station maintenance and not separately scheduled.

5.5. This report presents a number of options for Council to consider the cost of each option is totalled in the options section of this report. The breakdown of the costs to cease use of glyphosate under Option 2 is approximately $100,000-$120,000 in waterways, $10,000 at water well headworks and $20,000 in children’s playground areas.

5.6. A significant risk of ceasing the use of glyphosate or other herbicides is the reduction in level of service. Despite the increase in cost, due to the limitation of other methods there would be a reduction in the level of service. This reduction in level of service would be activity dependant. Anecdotal evidence from Christchurch gas shown there has been a reduction in the level of service from their approach. We would expect the same for this district.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

6.1.1. This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance Policy. However if there was a significant change, such as an outright council wide cessation in the use of herbicide, then this would trigger the significance policy in terms of cost and level of service.

6.2. **Legislation**

**Resource Management Act 1991**

Section 31

(1) Every territorial authority shall have the following functions for the purpose of giving effect to this Act in its district:

(e) the control of any actual or potential effects of activities in relation to the surface of water in rivers and lakes:

Section 35
i. Every local authority shall gather such information, and undertake or commission such research, as is necessary to carry out effectively its functions under this Act or regulations under this Act.

ii. Every local authority shall monitor (a) the state of the whole or any part of the environment in its region or district;

**Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 (HSNO Act)**

The use of glyphosate in New Zealand is regulated through the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 (HSNO Act). The Environmental Protection Authority administers the HSNO Act and has the role of assessing and approving the use of hazardous substances for use or continued use in New Zealand. The use of glyphosate is currently approved for use in New Zealand under the provisions of this Act.

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

6.3.1. The air and land is healthy

6.3.2. Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable and affordable manner.

6.3.3. There is sufficient clean water to meet the needs of communities and ecosystems
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to review the Council’s use of herbicides for weed control across all of its activities and to assist to develop a policy for the use of weed sprays for Council staff and contractors.

1.2. The report summarises the weed control methods currently used by each Council department manager.

1.3. The Council sought advice from the Ministry of Health, Ministry for the Environment, Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment and the Environmental Protection Authority on 29 July 2016, on the impact of use of glyphosate and other sprays on public health and on the environment.

1.4. This report summarises the responses received to date from the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA), Ministry of Health (MoH) and Ministry for the Environment (MfE). Any further response from the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment will be reported to Council at a later date.

1.5. The EPA response (TRIM 160812081280) notes the results of a recent study it commissioned from leading toxicologists. The report, titled “Review of the Evidence Relating to Glyphosate and Carcinogenicity” found that “based on a weight of evidence approach, taking into account the quality and reliability of the available data – glyphosate is unlikely to be genotoxic or carcinogenic to humans and does not require classification under HSNO as a carcinogen or mutagen”. The report from the EPA is attached for reference (see attachment iv TRIM 160823085099).

1.6. The MoH response (TRIM 160815081517) referred the Council to the EPA as the most appropriate authority in New Zealand on assessing and regulating glyphosate use.

1.7. The MfE response (TRIM 160823085124) also concurred with the findings of the EPA report. It noted that the EPA has approved the use of glyphosate in New Zealand following consideration of the likely effects of glyphosate on both human health and on the environment. It concluded that “both could be safeguarded by placing appropriate controls on the use of products containing glyphosate”. It went on to state that “the level...
of glyphosate in Kaiapoi, according to your own testing on 4 April 2016, is not at a level that would cause significant adverse effects for either humans or the environment.”

1.8. This report provides a rough order estimated cost range to implement mechanical weed removal options, as an alternative to spraying herbicides. The cost of using mechanical and/or hand weed removal is estimated to be in the range of 6 to 10 times the cost of the current chemical spray regime.

1.9 This report also notes a proposed study by CAREX, the University of Canterbury freshwater ecology research group, on the effectiveness of glyphosate to control macrophyte growth and environmental effects of glyphosate in the tributary drains (from Threlkholds Road to Barkers Road) to the Cust Main Drain in the spring/summer of 2016/17. The CAREX study proposes undertaking stream bed sediment samples, water chemistry samples and fish and invertebrate surveys. This will enable the researchers to compare relative levels of glyphosate concentrations in stream bed sediment and water chemistry with population counts of fish and invertebrates in the study reach before and after spraying.

1.10 The advice received to date from the EPA, MoH and MfE suggests that Council can continue to use glyphosate. The use of glyphosate should be reviewed in more detail as more information becomes available on the effects of its use on the environment. It is recommended that Council weed spraying programmes continue until the response from the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment and the results of the CAREX study can be reported back to Council.

Attachments:
   i. Letter from the Environmental Protection Authority regarding use of glyphosate in the Waimakariri District (TRIM 160812081280).
   ii. Letter from the Ministry of Health regarding use of glyphosate in the Waimakariri District (160815081517).
   iii. Letter from the Ministry for the Environment regarding use of glyphosate in the Waimakariri District (TRIM 160823085124).

2 RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

   (a)    Receives report No. 160805077062.

   (b)    Notes the responses to a Council request for information on the effects of use of glyphosate on public health and the environment from the Environmental Protection Authority (TRIM 160812081280), Ministry of Health (see TRIM 160815081517) and Ministry for the Environment (160823085124).

   (c)    Notes the report by Dr Wayne Temple, commissioned by the Environmental Protection Authority on “Review of the Evidence Relating to Glyphosate and Carcinogenicity, published August 2016” concluded that “based on a weight of evidence approach, taking into account the quality and reliability of the available data – glyphosate is unlikely to be genotoxic or carcinogenic to humans and does not require classification under HSNO as a carcinogen or mutagen”.
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Notes that based on the information received to date, it is unlikely that the use of glyphosate by the Council would pose a risk to public health and the environment.

Notes the CAREX study in the Cust Main Drain and tributary drains proposes to collect stream bed sediment and water chemistry samples and undertake fish and invertebrate population counts pre and post glyphosate spraying to assist to identify any effects of glyphosate on the distribution of aquatic species in the study reach.

Notes that Council spraying programmes using glyphosate will continue at locations where this was previously used, and the programme will be reviewed again pending receipt of further advice from the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment and results of the CAREX study.

Requests staff prepare a further report on the following: 1) results of the CAREX trial; 2) any further advice from the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment.

Circulates this report to the Kaiapoi, Rangiora and Woodend-Ashley Community Boards and the Oxford Eyre Ward Advisory Board.

3 ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1 The purpose of this report is to provide the Council with a review of its use of herbicides for weed control across all its activities. The report will also assist to develop a policy for the use of weed sprays for Council staff and contractors. The report summarises the weed control methods currently used for each activity, outlines options for alternative methods of weed control and provides a rough order estimated cost range of using mechanical weed control as an alternative to chemical spraying.

3.2 The Kaiapoi Community Board asked the Waimakariri District Council to cease its use of glyphosate for weed control on Council property during its meeting on 20 June 2016 (see report TRIM 160608053721). This request was made given growing concern from members of the Kaiapoi community that these products are adversely affecting public health and the environment.

3.3 The Council considered this issue at its meeting on 5 July. During that meeting it resolved to seek further information from relevant agencies and government ministries on impacts of the use of glyphosate, before making a decision on whether to continue using the weed sprays.

3.4 This report summarises the responses to this enquiry from the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA), Ministry of Health (MoH) and Ministry for the Environment (MfE). Any additional responses from the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment will be reported to the Council at a later date.

3.5 Response from Government Agencies

3.6 The Council sought advice from the Ministry of Health, Ministry for the Environment, Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment and the Environmental Protection Authority on 29 July 2016 on the impact of use of glyphosate and other sprays on public health and on the environment.

3.7 The EPA response referred Council to a recent report it had commissioned, titled “Review of the Evidence Relating to Glyphosate and Carcinogenicity”, published in August 2016. This report was prepared by toxicologists Dr Wayne Temple with contributions from Michael Beasley of the New Zealand National Poisons Centre.
3.8 The report found that, “based on a weight of evidence approach, taking into account the quality and reliability of the available data – glyphosate is unlikely to be genotoxic or carcinogenic to humans and does not require classification under HSNO as a carcinogen or mutagen”.

3.9 The letter from the Ministry of Health referred the Council to the EPA as the most appropriate authority in New Zealand on assessing and regulating glyphosate use. Therefore the report prepared by Dr Wayne Temple is considered the most comprehensive and recent resource provided by the Government for New Zealand organisations to assess public health impacts of the use of glyphosate.

3.10 The MfE also concurred with the findings of the EPA report. It noted that the EPA has approved the use of glyphosate in New Zealand following consideration of the likely effects of glyphosate on both human health and on the environment. It concluded that “both could be safeguarded by placing appropriate controls on the use of products containing glyphosate”. It went on to state that “the level of glyphosate in Kaiapoi, according to your own testing on 4 April 2016, is not at a level that would cause significant adverse effects for either humans or the environment.”

3.11 Staff met with representatives from the Environmental Protection Authority on Wednesday 31 August to obtain further details of its ongoing investigations into the effects of glyphosate on public health and on the environment. The meeting included a presentation from the EPA to staff outlining results of its investigations to date.

3.12 Councils Use of Glyphosate

3.13 The Council currently uses glyphosate in accordance with all regulatory requirements and manufacturer’s guidelines. The product is approved for use in New Zealand under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms (HSNO) Act 1996. Glyphosate is used in Council operations in accordance with the controls published by the EPA on its website.

3.14 Costs of Mechanical Weed Control

3.15 To further inform the Council decision on its future use of glyphosate, the costs of the option of undertaking mechanical weed control for all Council activities are outlined in this report. Mechanical weed removal options include use of weed eaters, mowing, use of a digger, hand pulling or hoeing to remove weeds. These are based on the results of a trial of mechanical weed removal undertaken by the drainage team during 2015/16.

3.16 The drainage trial found that costs of glyphosate spraying on dry land are estimated at 50c per square metre of land. This cost increases to $5 per square metre of land to undertake mechanical weed control (including hand pulling of weeds) on the same area of land. For weed removal on dry land the cost of undertaking mechanical weed removal is about 10 times the cost of spraying herbicides.

3.17 In comparison, the cost of undertaking mechanical weed removal in flowing drains was found to be around 6 times the cost of herbicide spraying of these drains. These drains are self-cleaning which slows weed regrowth, noting also that if it is possible to leave cleanings on the site this will reduce green-waste transport and disposal costs.

3.18 In addition, at locations where mechanical weed control can be undertaken with a digger over a large area then the cost may be around 6 rather than 10 times the cost of herbicide spraying. Cost estimates of mechanical weed removal options are outlined in Section 5 of this report, based on the cost ranges provided during the drainage trial.
3.19 Taking account of advice from department managers, the additional costs that could be incurred with mechanical weed removal include removal of cleanings (including transport and green-waste charges), additional site set-up requirements, health and safety provisions for operating heavier equipment, and traffic management requirements. These are broken down by individual activity in the following section.

3.20 Considerations for Mechanical Weed Control

3.21 For the roading activity in many locations precise weed removal is required. This includes around marker posts or signs on rural roads which serve a safety purpose, for which visibility must be protected. Precise methods of weed control are also required for footpath edging in each town.

3.22 Any machinery operated on the road reserve would be likely to require use of a “spotter” for traffic safety purposes, requiring employment of an additional person. Health and safety costs and more time for site set up would be required to operate machinery on the road reserve or for weed removal on uneven ground such as around culverts or bridges.

3.23 For the drainage activity the use of mechanical weed control can increase bed disturbance and sedimentation. It may also require more than one operation per season due to rate of regrowth.

3.24 For parks and recreation, the mechanical weed control option would create an increase in plant and labour costs including increased risk of injury associated with mechanical and labour intensive options.

3.25 The forestry activity requires new tree seedlings to be spot sprayed to remove competing vegetation around each new tree. The weed removal required is precise and costs of mechanically undertaking this for thousands of seedlings would be significant.

3.26 The wastewater activity requires spraying at wastewater pump stations, treatment plants, wetlands (ponds), around buildings, structures and fence-lines.

3.27 For Council properties, most of the spraying undertaken is for removal of roof moss or mould once per annum. The mechanical removal of roof moss for this activity is not an option due to access and safety issues. The herbicide currently used on roofs of structures is targeted specifically to moss and mould removal.

3.28 Table: Weed Removal Products Currently Used by Council

The following table identifies the range of herbicide sprays used for weed control for each Council activity. Annual usage quantities have also been provided where the information is available.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Method/ Product</th>
<th>Undiluted Application Rates (if provided/ per annum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roading</td>
<td>Sicon</td>
<td>Zeal (Metsulfuron – methyl)</td>
<td>6 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pulse</td>
<td>22 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roundup (Glyphosate 510)</td>
<td>220 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Versatile</td>
<td>20 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>Hide Spraying Ltd</td>
<td>Roundup (Glyphosate 510)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pulse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grazon (Triclopyr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supplies</td>
<td>Graeme Ford</td>
<td>Hitman (coconut fatty acids)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>Hide Spraying Ltd</td>
<td>Agpro Green (Glyphosate 510)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agpro Organosilicone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zeal (Metsulfuron – methyl)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grazon (Triclopyr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Properties</td>
<td>National Decorators</td>
<td>Hypostat (sodium hypochlorite)</td>
<td>(roof moss &amp; mould)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(roof spraying)</td>
<td>Gallant</td>
<td>0.04 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wet &amp; Forget / Surrender</td>
<td>0.3 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pulse</td>
<td>0.6 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Versatile</td>
<td>1.7 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roundup (Glyphosate)</td>
<td>5.3 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>Roundup (Glyphosate)</td>
<td>116 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brushkiller</td>
<td>34 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximiser</td>
<td>30 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lime Sulphur</td>
<td>46 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moss &amp; Mould killer</td>
<td>24 litres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Forestry</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roundup (Glyphosate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Terbuthylazine (Gardoprim)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grazon (Triclopyr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Picloram</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aminopyralids (Tordon)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wetting agents (pulse etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Stations</td>
<td>Graeme Ford</td>
<td>Hitman (coconut fatty acids)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.29 Use of Hitman Vegetable Based Spray

### 3.30
Currently the water supply and transfer station maintenance contractor uses “Hitman”, which is a biodegradable fatty acid coconut based spray. This alternative product is used because the maintenance contractor for these activities is not certified to apply glyphosate commercially within the maintenance sites.

### 3.31
Although Hitman is biodegradable, its potential usage is limited due to its toxicity to fish and invertebrates. The Hitman product specifications outlined on its Material Safety Data Sheet notes the user needs to “avoid release to the environment”. It also emits an odour and therefore is unsuitable to use in public places.
3.32 Trials of Hitman have been undertaken around the pensioner housing units. The contractor has received complaints about the odour it emits. Also, as it does not kill deeply rooted plants right through to the roots the sprayed plants tend to grow back quickly and regrowth can be more prolific than the original weed growth.

3.33 The contractor has been requested to collate regular records for the frequency and cost of using Hitman.

3.34 Weed Control Using Steam

3.35 A further option available to remove weeds is with steam. Although this option has not been specifically investigated or costed by the Waimakariri District Council, information is available from a Christchurch City Council report on “Glyphosate Herbicide Use”, reference 16/81387, dated 3 March 2016 (report available to view upon request).

3.36 With regard to its trial of steam for weed removal, the City Council report notes “this methodology requires large quantities of water to be heated and burns up to 16L of diesel per hour (with resulting environmental impact), and hoses cannot be placed on turf areas as grass damage will result” (p.87).

3.37 The Christchurch City Council report noted that high pressure steam is effective against small annual weeds, although not very successful on deeply rooted, perennial weeds which grow back quickly. It commented that steam has “been used unsuccessfully and disestablished by some local authorities as a chemical-free alternative methodology”.

3.38 It noted the areas of the city where steam would be able to be used are on the roading network, some parks (hard surfaces, kerbs etc.), and other Council properties. Use of steam is not applicable to waterways.

3.39 CAREX Project Study

3.40 This report notes a pending study by CAREX, the University of Canterbury freshwater ecology research group, on the effectiveness of glyphosate to control macrophyte growth and environmental effects of glyphosate in the tributary drains to the Cust Main Drain in the spring/summer of 2016/17. The CAREX study proposes undertaking stream bed sediment samples, water chemistry samples and fish and invertebrate surveys. This will enable the researchers to compare relative levels of glyphosate concentrations in stream bed sediment and water chemistry with population counts of fish and invertebrates in the study reach before and after spraying.

3.41 Further Actions

3.42 Taking into account the advice received from the government ministries, it is recommended that the Council continue its use of glyphosate for Council weed control activities whilst it awaits further information. The use of glyphosate can be reviewed again at a later date once results of the CAREX study and any further advice from the Parliamentary Commissioner is received.

3.43 The Management Team has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.
4 COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1 There is some concern from members of the Kaiapoi community about the effects of use of glyphosate on public health and on the environment.

4.2 The Kaiapoi Community Board asked the Waimakariri District Council to cease its use of glyphosate (and other chemical sprays) for weed control on Council property during its meeting on 20 June 2016.

5 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1 The following table compares current weed control costs for each Council activity with a rough order estimated cost range for replacing sprays with mechanical weed control methods. This is not based on a site specific assessment as the exact cost of the most suitable alternative weed control method for each site has not been identified. The cost estimates are instead based on extrapolations based on the actual costs reported by the drainage activity during the recent mechanical weed control trials.

5.2 The results of the trials have been interpolated across all Council activities to provide a starting point for cost comparisons between glyphosate and mechanical weed removal options. To complete a more comprehensive options assessment would require an individual assessment at each site, including, for instance, the most appropriate weed removal option for each drain, reserve margin, garden, road verge etc. This level of in-depth investigation would require significant further resourcing.

5.3 For Council properties, the mechanical weed control option is not suitable for removal of roof moss and mould due to access and safety issues for contractors. Therefore costs of mechanical weed removal for this activity are only estimated with regards to ground maintenance works on the Council properties. For instance, of the total $36,000 spraying cost for Council properties, $30,500 is for roof moss and mould control and $5,500 for ground weed control.

5.4 Any Council reduction in its use of glyphosate is unlikely to have a significant impact on the concentrations found in the environment, due to the extent of private usage of the product.
5.5 Table: Current Average Annual Spray Costs and Estimated Mechanical Weed Control Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Current Average Annual Cost of Weed Control</th>
<th>Estimated Total Cost of Mechanical Weed Control for all Council weed control (range)</th>
<th>Estimated Additional Cost for Mechanical Weed Control (range)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roading</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$210,000 to $350,000</td>
<td>$175,000 to $315,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$630,000 to $1.05 million</td>
<td>$525,000 to $945,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supplies*</td>
<td>Not provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>$25,700</td>
<td>$154,000 to $257,000</td>
<td>$128,300 to $231,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Properties (incl. pensioner housing- [see Section 3 &amp; 5.3])</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$33,000 to $55,000</td>
<td>$27,500 to $49,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation (excluding natural reserves and Mainpower Oval)</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$210,000 to $350,000</td>
<td>$175,000 to $315,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Forestry</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$120,000 to $200,000</td>
<td>$100,000 to $180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Stations*</td>
<td>Not provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$256,700</td>
<td>$1.4million to $2.3million</td>
<td>$1.1million to $2.0million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Activity uses “Hitman” coconut fatty acid vegetable based spray rather than glyphosate.

6 CONTEXT

6.1 Policy

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

6.2 Legislation

The use of glyphosate in New Zealand is regulated through the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 (HSNO Act). The Environmental Protection Authority administers the HSNO Act and has the role of assessing and approving the use of hazardous substances for use or continued use in New Zealand. The use of glyphosate is currently approved for use in New Zealand under the provisions of this Act.
6.3 Community Outcomes

This report gives effect to the following community outcome:

- There is a safe environment for all
- There is sufficient clean water to meet the needs of communities and ecosystems
11 August 2016

Mr G Cleary
Manager Utilities and Road
Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440

Dear Gerard

Thank you for your letter to our Chief Executive, Dr Allan Freeth, which he has passed on to me.

The use of glyphosate as a broad-spectrum herbicide by councils and others in New Zealand has been the subject of ongoing public discussion both here and internationally, attracting the attention of communities concerned about its impact on people and the environment.

This has been exacerbated by contradictory reports from different arms of the World Health Organisation. In March last year, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) reported that glyphosate was ‘probably carcinogenic to humans’.

In May this year, a second WHO assessment group – the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR) – determined that glyphosate did not pose a cancer risk to humans. The European Food Safety Authority has agreed with this assessment.

It is easy to see the potential for confusion.

At the EPA, we continue to approve its use in New Zealand. As with any chemical, glyphosate remains subject to our approval process, which considers any likely impacts on human health and the environment. Based on the information currently available, we consider glyphosate is safe to use with controls in place. These include labelling rules and safety data sheets that set out how, when and where it should be used, and by whom.

Extensive information about the regulation, application and safety of glyphosate is available on our website: www.epa.govt.nz/glyphosate and I encourage you to share this information with your staff and interested parties.

Among the information is a new report, commissioned by the EPA and written by toxicologists Dr Wayne Temple with contributions from Michael Beasley of the New Zealand National Poisons Centre. It has been peer reviewed by toxicology staff at the Ministry of Primary Industries.

The report takes into account the IARC report, as well as additional studies that were not reviewed by IARC, but have been assessed by overseas regulators including the European Food Safety Authority US Environmental Protection Agency and the Joint FAO/WHO JMPR.
The overall conclusion of the review is that glyphosate is unlikely to be genotoxic or carcinogenic to humans and does not require classification under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act as a carcinogen or mutagen.

The EPA will continue to actively monitor new scientific findings or developments that become available. We would be happy to visit your council to talk about the ways we do this, and to help outline how the application of controls around all chemicals reduces the risk to your community and New Zealand. Please feel free to contact Asela Atapattu (Asela.atapattu@epa.govt.nz) and arrange a time.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Ray McMillan
General Manager (Acting)
Hazardous Substances and New Organisms
9 August 2016

Mr Gerard Cleary
Manager Utilities and Roading
Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440

Dear Mr Cleary

Use of Glyphosate in the Waimakariri District

Thank you for your letter of 29 July 2016 seeking the Ministry of Health’s advice about the effects of using glyphosate and other sprays for weed control in the Waimakariri District on public health and on the environment.

The Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) is the most appropriate agency to provide this advice. As you know glyphosate is regulated under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 (HSNO Act). The EPA administers the HSNO Act and they assess and approve hazardous substances for use or continued use in New Zealand. This process includes determining the toxicity, assigning the hazard classifications and appropriate HSNO controls including public health risk assessments and effects on the environment of hazardous substances, such as glyphosate.

I suggest you contact the EPA at the following address:

Environmental Protection Authority
Private Bag 63002
Wellington 6140
New Zealand

Phone: +64 4 916 2426
Email: info@epa.govt.nz

Yours sincerely

Dr Stewart Jessamine
Director
Protection, Regulation and Assurance
Dear Mr Cleary

Use of Glyphosate in the Waimakariri District

Thank you for your letter of 29 July 2016 regarding the effects on public health and the environment of using glyphosate for weed control.

Glyphosate has been approved for use in New Zealand by the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms (HSNO) Act 1996. Approximately 60 products containing glyphosate are approved for use. Before giving approval, the EPA considered the likely impacts of glyphosate use on human health and the environment. The EPA concluded that both could be safeguarded by placing appropriate controls on the use of products containing glyphosate. Details of the controls in place can be found on the EPA website.

The EPA actively monitors the status of glyphosate, as well as international developments and research on it. Currently authorities in the United States, Canada, Australia, the European Union and New Zealand agree that glyphosate is appropriate for use as a herbicide.

This week the EPA released a report Review of the Evidence Relating to Glyphosate and Carcinogenicity that I believe you will find relevant in your decision making. The report was commissioned due to ongoing public concern about glyphosate’s impact on people and the environment. It was prepared by former National Poisons Centre Director, Dr Wayne Temple, on behalf of the EPA. The report concludes that glyphosate is unlikely to be carcinogenic and should not be classified as a mutagen or carcinogen under the HSNO Act. A summary as well as the full report can be found on the EPA website: http://www.epa.govt.nz/news/epa-media-releases/Pages/EPA-glyphosate-report-released.aspx

If, in the future, new research emerges that suggests there are risks to human health and/or the environment that are not managed by the controls currently in place, then the EPA can reassess the glyphosate product approvals. However, the controls in place are currently considered sufficiently robust to safeguard human health and the environment. Therefore, a reassessment is not considered necessary at this time.

The level of glyphosate in Kaiapoi, according to your own testing on 4 April 2016, is not at a level that would cause significant adverse effects for either humans or the environment. For specific information on what level of concentrated glyphosate would need to be present before significant detrimental effects would occur, please refer to the EPA’s Chemical Classification and information Database.
If you have any technical queries do not hesitate to contact the EPA directly as they have technical expertise in assessing the benefits, risks and costs to safeguard people and the environment in relation to glyphosate.

They can be contacted on either;
Phone (04) 9162426 or
Email: info@epa.govt.nz

I hope this response is able to provide adequate assistance to the Waimakariri Council in reaching a decision.

Yours sincerely

Glenn Wigley
Director, Environmental Systems
Review of the Evidence Relating to Glyphosate and Carcinogenicity

Prepared for the Environmental Protection Authority by Dr Wayne Temple BSc (Hons), PhD, FNZIC, CChem, FRSC, MAACT

Published August 2016
Introduction

Glyphosate (N-phosphonomethyl glycine; CAS registry #1071-83-6) is the primary active ingredient in many generic herbicides. Glyphosate is formulated primarily as an isopropylamine, ammonium, or sodium salt in water soluble concentrates and water soluble granules. The relevant impurities in glyphosate technical concentrates are formaldehyde, N-nitrosoglyphosate and N-nitroso-N-phosphonomethylglycine. Surfactants and sulfuric and phosphoric acids may be added to formulations of glyphosate, with type and concentration differing by formulation. The United States (US) Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and other regulatory agencies around the world have registered this chemical as a broad-spectrum herbicide for use on multiple food and non-food use crops. Glyphosate-based herbicides, which have been sold in the US since 1974, are now registered in over 130 countries.

Glyphosate is widely considered by regulatory authorities and scientific bodies to have no carcinogenic potential. The US EPA (1993) has classified glyphosate as a Group E carcinogen, which is defined as having “evidence of non-carcinogenicity for humans”. This classification was based on “a lack of convincing evidence of carcinogenicity in adequate studies with two animal species, rat and mouse”. Negative results were observed in genotoxicity studies that were conducted under good laboratory practice conditions and compliant with contemporary regulatory test guidelines.

However since that time, results of further studies have come to light, and the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) Monograph 112 on glyphosate (released on 29 July 2015) came to the conclusion that glyphosate should now be classified as a carcinogenic substance in Group 2A (probably carcinogenic to humans). This classification was based on “limited evidence” from human data (regarding non-Hodgkin lymphoma (NHL)) but “sufficient evidence” in animal-experiments. The rationale identifies that the IARC working group (IWG) also notes mechanistic and other relevant data in support of the conclusion; in particular the IWG cites “strong evidence” that glyphosate can operate by two key characteristics of known human carcinogens, namely genotoxicity and oxidative stress.

This classification was initially published in a short report by Blair et al, (2015) in the “Lancet Oncology” on 20 March 2015.

This report discusses the relevant data on glyphosate, especially the more recent studies, and reviews the basis on which the IWG classified it as a probable human carcinogen (Group 2A). This involves review of the quality of evidence for carcinogenicity in humans and experimental animals and the mechanistic arguments.

Cancer in humans

The IWG found there was limited evidence in humans for the carcinogenicity of glyphosate. Some case-control studies of occupational exposure in the USA, Canada, and Sweden reported increased risks for NHL that persisted after adjustment for other pesticide exposures. However the Agricultural Health Study (AHS) cohort did not show a significantly increased risk of NHL. These studies are discussed below.

Case-control studies in the Midwest USA

Three case-control studies were conducted by the U.S National Cancer Institute in Iowa and Minnesota in the 1980s using the same control series, but each investigating a different lympho-haematopoietic cancer. Brown et al, (1990) found a near null association between
glyphosate exposure and leukaemia among white males residing in the area (OR = 0.9; 95% CI 0.5–1.6). Among Iowa farmers reporting ever handling glyphosate, there was a slight non-statistically significant odds ratio for multiple myeloma (OR = 1.7; 95% CI 0.8–3.6) (Brown et al, 1993). Cantor et al, (1992) found an approximately null association between glyphosate exposure and NHL among males (OR 1.1; 95% CI 0.7–1.9).

The IWG reviewed a later study by De Roos et al, (2003) who used pooled data from three case-control studies of NHL conducted in the 1980s in Nebraska (Zahm et al, 1990), Iowa and Minnesota (Cantor et al, 1992), and Kansas (Hoar et al, 1986). Reported use of glyphosate as well as several other individual pesticides was associated with an increased risk of NHL. A total of 650 cases and 1,933 controls were included for the analysis of 47 pesticides. Reporting glyphosate exposure were 36 cases and 61 controls. After adjusting for other pesticide use, age, and study area, by two regression techniques, odds ratios of 2.1 (1.1–4.0) using logistic regression and 1.6 (0.9–2.8) using hierarchical regression were found.

In that regard, a later study by De Roos et al, (2005) where they reviewed the AHS cohort data is significant. They found no association between glyphosate and NHL. The authors noted that the aforementioned Midwest USA case control studies were retrospective in design and therefore potentially susceptible to recall bias as regards exposure reporting.

The cross-Canada case–control study

The IWG reviewed a report by McDuffie et al, (2001) who studied the association between NHL and exposure to specific pesticides in a multicentre population-based study with 517 cases and 1,506 controls among men of six Canadian provinces. The authors reported a slight, non-statistically significant increased risk for NHL from claimed glyphosate exposure, the OR being 1.26 (95% CI 0.87–1.80) for analysis adjusted for age and province, and 1.20 (95% CI 0.83–1.74) for analysis adjusted for age, province and high-risk exposures. The study also assessed the significance of different exposure durations. When stratified by greater than or less than two days of glyphosate exposure/year (< 2d/year), the values were 2.12 (95% CI 1.20–3.73) for >2d/year relative to those with < 2d/year (assigned OR of 1.0). The authors commented that although there was not a statistically significant finding for exposure to glyphosate per se, there was a dose-response relationship.

Case-control studies in Sweden

The IWG reviewed a study by Eriksson et al, (2008) who reported the results of a population-based case-control study of exposure to pesticides as a risk factor for NHL. Men and women aged 18–74 years living in Sweden were included from 1 December 1999 to 30 April 2002. In total, 910 (91%) cases and 1,016 (92%) controls participated. The authors found NHL associations with exposure to glyphosate. This exposure was reported by 29 cases and 18 controls, giving a reported odds ratio of 2.02 (95% CI 1.10–3.71) in a multivariate analysis. When restricted to a >10 year latency period the OR became 2.26 (95% CI 1.16–4.40). Odds ratios were also reported for lymphoma subtypes. For only two of the eight subtypes were odds ratios statistically significant; likely related to the small numbers. The IWG considered that this was a large study; that there was possible confounding from the use of other pesticides including MCPA, but this was controlled for in the analysis. Given the number of cases studied for glyphosate (29 cases and 18 controls) this study could hardly be considered as large. Twelve subjects were in a less than 10 days exposure group and 17 in a more than 10 days group. Therefore this study had limited power to detect an effect.
Other findings

In 2014 Schinasi and Leon reported their study of the association between NHL and occupational exposure to various agricultural pesticide chemical groups. Some findings on glyphosate were presented; for example the results from the studies by McDuffie et al, (2001), De Roos et al, (2005) and Eriksson et al, (2008) were given. This review included a series of meta-analyses, which they asserted showed consistent evidence of positive associations between NHL and carbamate insecticides, organophosphorus insecticides, lindane, and MCPA. As regards glyphosate (an “organophosphorus herbicide”), “in a handful of papers”, associations between pesticides and NHL subtypes were reported; B cell lymphoma was positively associated with phenoxy herbicides and glyphosate.

The Agricultural Health Study (AHS) cohort studies

These studies in Ohio and North Carolina involve a large cohort of private and commercial pesticide applicators (57,311 as at 2004–5). Several studies have been conducted using this cohort.

Alavanja et al, (2003) evaluated associations between specific pesticides and prostate cancer in the AHS. Glyphosate was listed as one of the pesticides with sufficient exposure data for analysis, but the findings for it were not listed, so that it has been assumed that no significant positive association was found with prostate cancer.

Flower et al, (2004) evaluated associations between pesticide application by parents and cancer among children born to Iowa participants in the AHS. There was no positive association between either maternal or paternal use of glyphosate and risk of childhood cancer.

De Roos et al, (2005) evaluated associations between glyphosate exposure and “all cancers” or any cancer site using the AHS cohort. This study did not show a significantly increased risk of NHL. In the group reportedly exposed to glyphosate, small, non-statistically significant relative risks of 1.2 (95% CI 0.7–1.9) adjusted for age (only) and 1.1 (95% CI 0.7–1.9) adjusted for age, demographic and lifestyle factors and other pesticide exposure were found for NHL, (De Roos 2005). There was no dose (exposure) response relationship.

De Roos et al, (2005) also found a non-statistically significant association between glyphosate exposure and multiple myeloma, with rate ratios (RR values) of 1.1 (95% CI 0.5–2.4) adjusted for age only, and 2.6 (95% CI 0.7–9.4) adjusted for age, demographic and lifestyle factors and other pesticides exposures. Such a finding had not previously been reported.

Comparisons were made between ever-exposed versus never-exposed groups, and between three equal sized groups (tertiles), formed by subdivision either on the basis of total days of exposure or intensity-weighted exposure days. In the intensity-weighted analysis of glyphosate and lung cancer, the relative risk for the highest tertile was only 0.6 (95% CI 0.3–1.0), for pancreatic cancer the RR for the highest tertile was 0.5, while for multiple myeloma the RR was 2.1, but the confidence interval was wide (0.6–7.0). None of these findings reached statistical significance at 95%. Regarding the whole group (ie ever used glyphosate), the RR for multiple myeloma was 1.1 (95% CI 0.5–2.4) adjusted for age only, and 2.6 (95% CI 0.7–9.4) adjusted for age, demographic and lifestyle factors and other pesticide exposures. Unremarkable, non-statistically significant results were found for the other cancer sites assessed.
Thus as regards this study, there was no evidence of a statistically significant positive association for any of the cancers for which data were reported (Mink et al, 2012). Furthermore De Roos et al, (2005) acknowledged in their paper that over 13,000 subjects were excluded from multivariate analyses because of missing data. In analyses of “ever” versus “never” exposed to glyphosate, the age-adjusted relative risk of multiple myeloma was 1.1. Lash (2007) assessed the study design and concluded that adjustment for confounders, which resulted in limiting the data set by 25% because of missing data on the adjustment variables, likely introduced selection bias, which was likely to have been in the direction away from the null (ie exaggerating any possible risk).

It is also known that multiple myeloma is often preceded by monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance (MGUS), a pre-malignant plasma cell disorder (Morgan et al, 2002). It is of interest to note that a decreased risk (albeit not statistically significant) of MGUS was observed in glyphosate applicators in the AHS.

Engel et al, (2005) evaluated breast cancer risk among wives of farmers in the AHS. No statistically significant association was found.

In an analysis of colorectal cancer and pesticide use, Lee et al, (2007) found no statistically significant association between glyphosate use and cancer of the colon or rectum.

Andreotti et al, (2009) reported no significant association of “ever” use (versus “never use”) of glyphosate with pancreatic cancer among the combined group of AHS applicators and spouses (OR 1.1; 95% CI 0.6–1.07), nor was there evidence for a dose-response relationship.

Dennis et al, (2010) evaluated associations of 50 pesticides with cutaneous melanoma in the AHS cohort. Glyphosate was listed as one of the 22 pesticides on the enrolment questionnaire. The authors commented that none of these 22 pesticides was associated with melanoma.

None of the AHS cohort study analyses reported statistically significant positive findings for glyphosate exposure and total cancer or any site-specific cancer, in adults or children. In particular, the prospective AHS studies did not corroborate the positive association with NHL reported by the Swedish case-control studies. Analyses of increasing category of glyphosate exposure days and incidence of NHL produced rate ratios that were below the null value of 1.0 (De Roos et al, 2005 and Mink et al, 2012).

**Discussion of review of epidemiological findings**

In a review of glyphosate in 2006, the WHO observed that: “widely used pesticides, like glyphosate, have recently become a focus of epidemiological research. In the past few years several epidemiological studies have been published that reported weak associations of glyphosate with lymphopoietic cancers, self-reported adverse reproductive outcomes and self-reported attention deficit hyperactivity disorder in children. However, the results of these studies do not meet generally accepted criteria from the epidemiology literature for determining causal relationships. Generally, the associations were rather weak and rarely statistically significant. Controlling for potential confounding factors, including other pesticides exposure, was not possible owing to limited available information and small numbers of subjects”.

Whether or not there was any internal exposure or the extent of such exposure was not measured and, accordingly, a possible dose–response relationship could not be evaluated.
This seems a fair assessment of several of the studies regarding glyphosate and its formulations. De Roos et al, (2005) noted that the Midwest USA case control studies were retrospective in design and therefore potentially susceptible to recall bias as regards exposure reporting. Certainly a large prospective cohort study (such as that by De Roos et al, 2005) is much preferable to smaller case-control studies, the latter of which have much less statistical power to identify causal associations and are subject to more biases, including those regarding exposure assessment. Therefore much more weight should be given to the De Roos et al, (2005) cohort study than the much smaller De Roos et al, (2003) case-control study. In that regard, it is important to note that the cohort study found no association between glyphosate and NHL. There was, however, a small (non-statistically significant) increased risk of multiple myeloma in the 2005 study, but the point estimates of this risk may have been exaggerated. (Lash 2007.)

A re-analysis of some data from the De Roos et al, (2005) study has recently been undertaken, with a focus on multiple myeloma (Sorahan, 2015). Assessing the same data, Sorahan found no significant trends of multiple myeloma risk with reported cumulative days of glyphosate use, and unexceptional point estimates of risk for ever-use of glyphosate. This was irrespective of whether the analysis had made adjustment for a few basic variables (age and gender) or made adjustment for many other lifestyle factors or pesticide exposures; as long as data on all available pesticide applicators was used.

Sorahan (2015) argued that the elevated rate ratios (or relative risks) for multiple myeloma reported previously by Roos et al, (2005) arose from use of restricted data sets that, probably by chance, turned out to be unrepresentative. These restrictions were considered to be unnecessary and undesirable, as potentially informative data on the exposure or outcome under investigation were discarded. For example, it was asserted that there were a number of lost cases of multiple myeloma in the group of applicators who had never used glyphosate, because they were excluded by Roos et al, (2005) due to their not having data on for example use of alcohol, or smoking. These lost cases in the baseline category gave a false impression of elevated rates in ever-users. As a result Sorahan gave more weight to the point estimate of 1.1 as the RR (adjusted for age only) as opposed to the estimate of 2.6 as the RR for ever-use of glyphosate (adjusted for age, demographic and lifestyle factors, and other pesticides).

Mink et al, (2012) reviewed the epidemiological literature (and relevant methodological and biomonitoring studies) to evaluate whether exposure to glyphosate is associated causally with cancer risk in humans. Seven cohort studies and fourteen case-control studies examining a potential association between glyphosate and one or more cancer outcomes were subjected to a qualitative analysis.

The cohort studies were all based on analyses of participants or family members of the AHS cohort. Mink et al (2012), observed that none of the AHS cohort study analyses reported statistically significant positive findings for glyphosate exposure and total cancer or any site-specific cancer in adults or children. They found no consistent pattern of positive associations to suggest a causal relationship between human exposure to glyphosate and any cancer.

Overall, this 2012 review found no consistent pattern of positive associations between total cancer (in adults or children) or any site-specific cancer, and exposure to glyphosate. They suggested a cautious interpretation of the few positive associations reported, and concluded that the epidemiological data, when considered together, did not support a causal association between glyphosate exposure and cancer.
Similarly, the latest report of BfR (2015) to the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA)\(^1\) based on the evaluation of over 30 epidemiological studies came to the overall assessment that there is no validated or significant relationship between exposure to glyphosate and an increased risk of NHL or other types of cancer.

A recent peer review by EFSA\(^2\) (2015) essentially confirmed the conclusions in their re-evaluation of glyphosate. They noted that 10 cohort studies (which included the AHS, the largest series of prospective studies to date), found that glyphosate did not cause different types of cancer and did not increase risk of all cancers combined. (As noted earlier, the findings for NHL were negative in the AHS cohort.) Similarly nine case-control studies did not indicate an increased risk of carcinogenicity, or did not have sufficient power to assess this. With regard to NHL, the case-control studies exhibited poor consistency in their results and small numbers of cases limiting the statistical significance of findings in some studies. As noted above, case-control studies have less power, are more subject to various biases, and are less effective at assessing actual exposure levels than are cohort studies. EFSA concluded that there is very limited evidence for an association between glyphosate exposure and the occurrence of NHL.

### Cancer in experimental animals

#### Mice studies

Glyphosate was tested in female and male mice by dietary administration in two studies. A skin application in one initiation-promotion study was conducted with male mice.

The IWG found that in male CD-1 mice, glyphosate induced a positive trend in the incidence of a rare tumour, renal tubule carcinoma. A second study reported a positive trend for hemangiosarcoma in male mice. A glyphosate formulation promoted skin tumours in an initiation-promotion study in mice.

The IWG noted there was a positive trend in the incidence of renal tubule carcinoma and of renal tubule adenoma or carcinoma (combined) in male CD-1 mice in a glyphosate feeding study (0, 1,000, 5,000, or 30,000 ppm glyphosate \textit{ad libitum} for 24 months). (This study was conducted prior to the institution of GLP.) The study was submitted to the US EPA which requested that a pathology working group (PWG) be convened to evaluate the renal tumours. In this second evaluation, the PWG found that the incidence of adenoma was not statistically significant but the incidence of carcinoma and the incidence of adenoma and carcinoma (combined) were significant. The IWG considered that this second evaluation indicated a significant increase in the incidence of rare tumours, with a dose-related trend, which could be attributed to glyphosate.

However, this finding is at variance with the US EPA (1993) which reported in their glyphosate review that the occurrence of these adenomas was spontaneous rather than compound-induced because the incidence of renal tubular adenomas in males was not statistically significantly different when compared with the concurrent controls. An independent group of pathologists and biometricians also conducted extensive evaluations of these adenomas and reached the same conclusion. The US EPA concluded glyphosate was not considered to be carcinogenic in this study.

\(^1\) The BfR (2015) report addressing the carcinogenicity of glyphosate is a report of Germany specifically, as Germany was the lead member state for the EFSA review of glyphosate.

\(^2\) EFSA accepted the conclusion relating to glyphosate and cancer (including NHL), with one dissenting member state.
The IWG reviewed a second feeding study reported to the FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR), and found there was a significant positive trend in the incidence of hemangiosarcoma in male CD-1 mice. Groups of 50 female and male mice were fed diets containing glyphosate at a concentration that was adjusted weekly for the first 13 weeks and every four weeks thereafter to give doses of 0, 100, 300, or 1,000 mg/kg body weight, ad libitum for 104 weeks.

In contrast JMPR (WHO 2006) found that owing to the lack of a dose-response relationship, the lack of statistical significance and the fact that the incidences recorded in this study fell within the historical ranges for controls, these changes were not considered to be caused by administration of glyphosate. They concluded administration of glyphosate to CD-1 mice for 104 weeks produced no signs of carcinogenic potential at any dose.

Initiation-promotion

The IWG found that in a study involving 20 male Swiss mice which had a glyphosate based formulation applied to their skin, it appeared to be a tumour promoter, but they concluded that this was an inadequate study because its design was poor, with short duration of treatment, no solvent controls, small numbers of animals, and a lack of histopathological examination.

However the BfR (2015) considered that generally testing of formulations should not be used for the toxicological evaluation of active substances because co-formulants may extensively alter the outcome. The BfR deemed that this IWG finding was not considered by the institutions in the EU to be evidence for the carcinogenic properties of glyphosate per se.

Review articles – mice studies

The IWG noted that Griem et al, (2015) had published a review article which included discussion of five long-term glyphosate feeding studies in mice. Two of the studies were discussed in the IARC monograph. The working group summarised the other three studies but claimed that it was unable to fully evaluate the other three studies because of the limited experimental data provided in the review article and supplemental information.

Griem et al, (2015) noted that the five mouse studies that they reviewed were submitted to support glyphosate renewal in the EU. They considered that all but the oldest study were reliable without restriction and were performed under conditions of GLP and OECD protocols.

During the EFSA peer-review process for the renewal of the approval of glyphosate, EFSA also received a complementary mandate from the EU to consider the findings by IARC regarding the potential carcinogenicity of glyphosate (EFSA 2015).

The EFSA peer review (2015) also evaluated the five mice studies. Only one of these suggested a potential carcinogenic effect, as evidenced by a statistically significant increased evidence of malignant lymphomas at the top dose level of 1,460 mg/kg/day. However the validity of the study was questioned, due to the occurrence of viral infection which could have influenced survival rates and the incidence of lymphomas. No carcinogenic effects were observed at the highest dose levels in any of the other studies. The IWG evaluated two of these studies and asserted positive trends in males for renal tubular carcinomas in one study and for hemangiosarcoma in the other. However EFSA took a weight-of-evidence approach; with considerations including the statistical significance being only found in trend analysis but not in pairwise comparison, lack of consistency in multiple
animal studies, the fact that the slightly increased incidences only occurred at doses higher than those recommended for the oral route in carcinogenicity studies, incidences in test animals generally being within the historical range for control groups, and the lack of pre-neoplastic lesions.

**Rat studies**

Five feeding studies in rats and two drinking water studies with glyphosate were reviewed by the IWG.

**Drinking water**

One study in Sprague-Dawley rats was considered by the IWG to be inadequate for evaluation because of its short exposure duration.

A glyphosate containing drinking water study with Wistar rats did not show any significant increase in tumour incidence.

**Dietary administration**

Two studies in Sprague-Dawley rats showed a significant increase in the incidence of pancreatic islet cell adenoma in male rats. One of these studies also showed a significant positive trend in the incidence of hepatocellular adenoma in males and of the thyroid C-cell adenoma in females. However two studies (one in Sprague-Dawley and one in Wistar rats) found no significant increase in tumour incidence at any site.

The IWG reviewed a chronic feeding study (provided by the US EPA) in which groups of 60 female and male Sprague Dawley rats were given diets containing glyphosate at a concentration of 0, 2,000, 8,000 or 20,000 ppm *ad libitum* for 24 months. In males at the lowest dose, there was a statistically significant increase in the incidence of pancreatic islet cell adenoma compared with controls. Additional analyses by the US EPA revealed a statistically significant higher incidence of pancreatic islet cell carcinoma in males at the lowest and highest doses compared with controls: lowest dose, 8/45 (18%); intermediate dose, 5/49 (10%); highest dose, 7/48 (15%) versus controls, 1/43 (2%). The range for historical controls for pancreatic cancer islet cell carcinoma reported in males at this laboratory was 1.8–8.5%. The IWG concluded that this study demonstrated a significant increase in the incidence of pancreatic islet cell adenoma in male rats.

However the US EPA (1993) had concluded that:

*these adenomas were not treatment-related and glyphosate was not considered to be carcinogenic in this study. With respect to pancreatic islet cells adenomas, there was no statistically significant positive dose-related trend in their occurrence; there was no progression to carcinomas; and the incidence of pancreatic hyperplasia (non-neoplastic lesion) was not dose-related. With respect to hepatocellular adenomas, the increased incidence of these neoplasms was not statistically significant in comparison with the controls; the incidence was within the historical control range; there was no progression to carcinomas; and the incidence of hyperplasia was not compound-related. With respect to thyroid C-cell adenomas, there was no statistically significant dose-related trend in their occurrence; the increased incidence was not statistically significant; there was no progression to carcinomas; and there was no significant dose-related increase in severity or incidence of hyperplasia in either sex*.
Also, in the JMPR (WHO 2006) review of this study they reported:

“The historical-control range for this tumour at the testing laboratory was 1.8–8.5%, but a partial review of studies reported recently in the literature revealed a prevalence of 0–17% in control males with several values being ≥8%. More importantly, the incidences of islet cell adenomas clearly did not follow a dose-related trend in the treated groups of males. There was no evidence of dose-related pancreatic damage or pre-neoplastic lesions. The only pancreatic islet cell carcinoma found in this study occurred in a male in the control group, thus indicating a lack of treatment-induced neoplastic progression. Taken together, the data support the conclusion that the occurrence of pancreatic islet cell adenomas in male rats was spontaneous in origin and unrelated to administration of glyphosate”.

**Review articles – rat studies**

The IWG noted that Griem et al, (2015) had published a review article containing assessments of nine long-term glyphosate feeding studies in rats. Five of these studies were reviewed by the IWG. The remaining four studies were not evaluated by the IWG which stated that there was limited experimental data provided in the review article. These four studies had been submitted to various organisations for registration purposes. There was no evidence of a carcinogenic effect related to glyphosate treatment.

Its long-term toxicity and carcinogenicity was assessed in nine rat studies. The EFSA peer review concluded that no significant increase in tumour incidence was apparent. Three of these studies were not evaluated by the IARC panel. In two studies, increased incidences of pancreatic islet cell adenomas were found but were not dose-related. EFSA also noted that the significance of these findings depended on the statistical analysis: using a pairwise comparison (as planned for in the study protocol) no significant effect is observed, whereas a trend analysis performed by the IWG identified significant changes. EFSA noted that deviations from the statistical analysis used by the study authors should be limited and properly justified.

**Other relevant data**

The IWG group noted that soil microbes degrade glyphosate to aminomethylphosphonic acid (AMPA). Blood AMPA detection after glyphosate poisoning incidents suggests intestinal microbial metabolism in humans.

Glyphosate has been detected in the blood and urine of agricultural workers, indicating absorption. Neimann et al, (2015) published a critical review and comparison of data obtained in a total of seven studies from Europe and the US. They concluded that no health concern was revealed because the resulting exposure estimates were several magnitudes lower than the acceptable daily intake (ADI) or the acceptable operator exposure level (AOEL).

The measured internal exposure was clearly below the worst-case predictions made in the evaluation of glyphosate as performed for the renewal of its approval within the European Union.

This is consistent with the risk-based approach that regulatory agencies use when considering realistic dosages and real-life conditions. Those studies show that farmers and farm families are exposed to significantly lower doses of the herbicide than some model estimates would suggest.

It is also in keeping with an earlier review (Williams et al, 2000) of the animal data, in which dose levels from animal toxicity tests were compared to conservative, upper-limit estimates
of human exposure to glyphosate, to give a margin of exposure (MOE) value. MOE analyses compare the lowest NOAELs determined from animal studies to worst-case levels of human exposure; with MOEs of greater than 100 indicating confidence that no adverse health effects would occur. These authors found in their review that the MOEs for worst-case chronic exposure to glyphosate ranged from 3,370 to 5,420, and concluded that “under present and expected conditions of use, Roundup herbicide does not pose a health risk to humans”.

Genotoxicity

The IWG claimed that there is strong evidence that glyphosate is genotoxic. They tabulated numerous reports of tests relating to the genotoxicity of glyphosate and its formulations, with some showing a positive association, and some a negative association.

The evaluation of the large volume of genotoxicity data available requires consideration of assay system validation, test system species used, relevance of the endpoint to heritable mutation, reproducibility and consistency of effects and dose-response, and relationship of effects to toxicity. The guidelines for genetic toxicology tests developed for the OECD are a pre-eminent source of internationally agreed guidelines.

There were often inconsistent results reported (both positive and negative) from the same test systems in different laboratories. The relevance of many of the assays in test system species (fish, oysters, insects, snails, worms and caimans) which have never been validated for the assessment of genotoxicity in humans for regulatory purposes, is questionable. Additionally the intraperitoneal route of exposure for many of the mammalian in vivo studies is not appropriate since it does not reflect normal human exposure, with doses exceeding occupational exposure by orders of magnitude.

Kier and Kirkland (2013) published a review of the genotoxicity of glyphosate and glyphosate-based formulations. This review concluded that there was a strong weight of evidence that glyphosate and its formulations are predominantly negative in well-conducted, core bacterial reversion and in vivo mammalian micronucleus and chromosomal aberration assays. Although some positive results for glyphosate and glyphosate-based formulations were reported in DNA damage assays, and for the micronucleus endpoint for formulations in non-mammalian studies, the positive results were associated with high dose levels and/or overt toxic effects. The preponderance of negative results in core assays supports the conclusion that reports of DNA damage or non-mammalian micronucleus effects are likely to be secondary to cytotoxicity rather than indicative of DNA-reactive mechanisms.

The IWG found that glyphosate and glyphosate formulations induced DNA and chromosomal damage in mammals, and in human and animal cells in vitro. They referred to one study (Bolognesi, 2009) reporting increases in blood markers of chromosomal damage (micronuclei) in residents of several communities after spraying of glyphosate formulations, to support this contention of genotoxicity.

However, the authors of the Bolognesi (2009) study concluded that overall, data suggesting that genotoxic damage (as evidenced by the micronuclei test) associated with glyphosate spraying for control of illicit crops is slim, and any such effect appears to be transient. Evidence indicates that the genotoxic risk potentially associated with exposure to glyphosate in the areas where the herbicide is applied for coca and poppy eradication is low. The attribution of a genotoxic effect due to glyphosate exposure rather than a multitude of other demographic and environmental causes seems rather tenuous given the uncertainty of actual exposure.
In a recent communication, EFSA summarised their appraisal of the genotoxicity studies. *In vitro* tests of mutagenicity gave consistently negative results. *In vitro* tests of mammalian chromosome aberration (all of those which had been performed under GLP conditions) were also negative. Positive results were found in some published *in vitro* studies of chromosomal aberrations, but these were not confirmed by *in vivo* studies addressing the appropriate endpoints, such as the micronucleus test.

As regards *in vivo* tests, all studies conducted according to internationally validated guidelines for good laboratory practice (GLP) and some non-GLP published studies gave negative results. Two non-GLP studies were positive in mice treated intraperitoneally, but at levels close to or above the LD$_{50}$ (possibly suggestive that this is a secondary effect), and one study had major flaws. No genotoxic effects on germ cells have been detected in rats or mice treated orally at dose levels up to 2,000 mg/kg/day (the maximum dose level recommended for such studies). EFSA concluded that, considering the weight of evidence, glyphosate is unlikely to be genotoxic *in vivo*.

As regards glyphosate-based commercial formulations, a number of formulations with unknown composition have given positive results when tested *in vitro* and *in vivo*. However, some of the test systems are not validated and/or interpretation is difficult due to possible confounding, such as cytotoxicity, specific organ toxicity or unclear relevance to humans (such as tests in fish, amphibians, or invertebrates). Some of the co-formulants (such as polyethoxylated tallow amine (often abbreviated to POEA)) may be more systemically toxic than glyphosate. However EFSA concluded that the genotoxic potential of such complete formulations should be further assessed.

Kier (2015) reviewed genotoxicity biomonitoring studies of glyphosate-based formulations. He found that most of the human biomonitoring studies were not informative because there was either a very low frequency of exposure to glyphosate formulations or exposure to a large number of pesticides in addition to glyphosate without analysis of specific pesticide effects. One pesticide sprayer biomonitoring study indicated there was no statistically significant relationship between frequency of exposure to glyphosate formulations reported for the last spraying season and oxidative DNA damage. There were three studies of human populations in regions of glyphosate formulation aerial spraying. One study found increases for the cytokinesis-block micronucleus endpoint but these increases did not show statistically significant associations with self-reported spray exposure and were not consistent with application rates. A second study found increases for the blood cell comet endpoint at high exposures causing toxicity. However, a follow-up to this study two years after spraying did not indicate chromosomal effects.

**Oxidative stress**

The IWG found that glyphosate, glyphosate formulations, and AMPA induced oxidative stress in rodents and *in vitro*.

Oxidative stress was only found in one study in rats administered intraperitoneal glyphosate active ingredient (Astiz et al, 2009), and in numerous studies using *intraperitoneal* administration or *in vitro* methods with glyphosate-based formulations. However, these studies used doses that exceeded normal occupational exposures by orders of magnitude and the *intraperitoneal* route of exposure is not appropriate for evaluating human exposure. Glyphosate has low gastrointestinal absorption and poor dermal absorption. It therefore

---

3 LD$_{50}$ is the dose of the substance required (usually expressed in relation to body weight) that is estimated to kill 50% of the test population.
seems unlikely that human exposure would produce the sort of tissue levels used in the oxidative stress tests. There was also some inconsistency in results.

Most effects were seen when whole glyphosate formulations were tested. EFSA considered that generally testing of formulations should not be used for the toxicological evaluation of active substances because co-formulants may extensively alter the outcome. Thus any effects found cannot then be attributed to the glyphosate active ingredient present.

**Discussion**

The IARC WG (IWG) classified glyphosate as “probably carcinogenic to humans (Group 2A)” as the overall evaluation.

As set out in their evaluation section, this was based on:

- “limited evidence” in humans for the carcinogenicity of glyphosate, and
- “sufficient evidence” in experimental animals for carcinogenicity of glyphosate.

The rationale identifies that the IWG also notes mechanistic and other relevant data in support of the conclusion; in particular the IWG cites “strong evidence” that glyphosate can operate by two key characteristics of known human carcinogens, namely genotoxicity and oxidative stress.

This discussion section of the report will consider each of these sources of evidence in turn as contributing factors to the IWG’s overall evaluation.

**Human epidemiological evidence**

The key cited studies in support of the “limited evidence” in humans for carcinogenicity of glyphosate consisted of three case-control investigations. The odds ratios (OR) for cases of NHL and glyphosate exposures are summarised in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study area</th>
<th>OR¹ and 95% CI²</th>
<th>Study reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midwest, USA</td>
<td>2.1 (1.1–4.0) [logistic regression]</td>
<td>De Roos et al, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6 (0.9–2.8) [hierarchical regression]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1.26 (0.87–1.8)</td>
<td>McDuffie et al, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.20 (0.83–1.74) [adjusted for medical variables]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>2.02 (1.1–3.71) [univariate]</td>
<td>Erikson et al, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.51 (0.77–2.94) [multivariate]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. OR is the odds ratio of outcome of interest between the relevant case group and the reference or control group.
2. The 95% CI are the confidence intervals round the OR representing the limits within which there is 95% confidence that the true value fails.
The first important observation is that depending on the statistical tests used only two studies (Midwest USA and Sweden) show OR values indicating statistical significance at the 95% level. In the Midwest USA, however, this is only true using logistic regression, while in the Swedish study only the univariate analysis showed statistical significance.

Some case control studies assessed data using dose (exposure)/response or intensity/response to determine whether or not there is a trend to a higher incidence of tumours in persons categorised as having higher exposures to glyphosate. While these approaches are desirable, the criteria of exposure seem low. For one case-control study, the criterion for high or lower glyphosate use was greater than or less than two days of glyphosate use/year (McDuffie et al, 2001), whereas in another the criterion was greater than or less than 10 days of glyphosate use/year (Eriksson et al, 2008). While the distribution of use category was not given in either study, 2–10 days of use per year seems a low benchmark for exposure comparisons. The direct glyphosate exposure findings with respect to NHL was not significant in the McDuffie et al, 2001 study, but they reported a dose response based on this dose comparison and quoted the OR for exposure >2 day/year as 2.12 (95% CI 1.20–3.73).

The direct glyphosate exposure findings with respect to NHL were significant in the Swedish study using univariate evaluation, and the effect of dose-response in the Swedish study appears to only be statistically significant using this approach (considering the data presented in the IARC Monograph in Table 2.2, p23) which reported a higher OR for “heavy” users (>10 days/year) of 2.36 (95% CI 1.04–5.37). It is noteworthy that the paper reports the highest OR, 2.81 (95% CI 1.27–6.22), for the association between exposure to MCPA and NHL. This may be the explanation for the difference between the results using univariate and multivariate evaluation. When considering the latency period, >10 years exposure to glyphosate had an OR of 2.26 (95% CI 1.16–4.4) in comparison to ≤ 10 years with an OR of 1.11 (95% CI 0.24–5.08), but these findings may be confounded by exposure to MCPA or other phenoxy herbicide exposures. There could be residual confounding from MCPA exposure if the participants under-reported earlier MCPA exposure. The apparent increased risk with latency for glyphosate exposure could be because participants who had sprayed pesticides for longer were more likely to have used the phenoxy herbicides (including MCPA) earlier in their working lives.

The AHS cohort study (De Roos, et al, 2005) had a more detailed assessment at different exposure intensities as they used cumulative lifetime days of use and an intensity measure (years of use x days/year x estimated exposure level). The data (presented in Table 2.1 of the IARC Monograph on p12) for this cohort study showed no statistically significant difference for the trend to increased exposure with exposure bands at 0–20, 21–56 and 57–2,678 cumulative days of exposure, despite the higher exposure levels in comparison to the case-control studies.

It is important in these circumstances to consider the overall data set. Rather than only highlighting the three case-control studies which identified a marginally statistically significant association between reported glyphosate use and NHL, the overall assessment needs to take into account other studies which did not demonstrate such an association. Also, it is particularly important to note the lack of significant finding in a large cohort study (the AHS) where the potential for recall bias is greatly reduced and should therefore be given greater weight than the case control studies. Cohort studies are generally considered more reliable than case-control studies, because the population is defined and the exposure parameters and the potential confounding exposures and lifestyle factors are established prior to the adverse outcome of interest so that the potential for recall bias is less likely.
Given the lack of confirmation of the small number of positive findings from case-control studies in the more powerful cohort study, the epidemiological support for the conclusion “limited evidence” in humans is not convincing.

**Experimental animal studies**
The key cited studies in support of the “sufficient evidence” in experimental animals for carcinogenicity of glyphosate consisted of three studies in mice. These comprised one oral study demonstrating a positive trend for increased incidence of renal tubule carcinoma, one oral study in mice demonstrating a positive trend for increased incidence of hemangiosarcoma; and a supporting skin study demonstrating tumour promotion using a glyphosate formulation. In addition, one rat study demonstrated an increased incidence of pancreatic islet cell adenomas.

In assessing these data, the IWG used different statistical tests to those in the original analysis (trend analysis rather than a pairwise comparison against controls). The original studies were designed with the intention to assess statistical significance by means of a pairwise comparison between the test and control groups, so use of the trend assessment by IARC to assess these data requires justification. IARC’s use of the trend assessment gave a positive response, but in none of the studies are the positive effects statistically significant using the original statistical approaches. Also, the IWG did not take into account the generally accepted assessment of the same data by international panels of experts, which took into account additional historical incidence data for hepatocellular adenomas in the rats and the presence of a viral infection in the mouse study which could have influence survival rates and the incidence of lymphomas.

The promotion study using a glyphosate-based formulation should not be used as support for the carcinogenicity of glyphosate per se, since the test substance contains other components which might influence the outcome.

The IWG did not evaluate some other studies which have been used by other regulators. These did not support the view that exposure to glyphosate in long-term feeding studies was associated with an increase in tumours at any sites. While the IWG approach is consistent with the IARC pre-amble and policy on the selection of study data, in the current circumstances this attributes inappropriate weight to the three studies which IWG considered and for which their analysis found an increase in tumours. Firstly because other studies which other reputable bodies found to be negative were not considered, and secondly because the reasons why the above findings were not relied upon by other assessments were not taken into account by the IWG. In particular a lack of consistency (dose-response) in multiple studies, slight increases in incidence at the maximum tested dose only, or incidences within the historical control range.

Taking into account that the positive findings cited by the IWG were not assessed as evidence of a carcinogenic effect in the view of other reputable bodies, and that the total data set of long-term carcinogenicity bioassays were consistently negative, it is concluded that the overall weight of evidence does not indicate that glyphosate is carcinogenic.

**Mechanism of action**
The IWG cites what is described as “strong evidence” that glyphosate can operate by two key characteristics of known human carcinogens – genotoxicity and oxidative stress. The studies used in support of this conclusion were primarily in vitro mammalian cell studies. In such studies the mammalian cells are directly exposed to the test substance (glyphosate or a glyphosate-based formulation) at high concentrations which would not be reasonably achieved in an in vivo exposure whether in animals or humans. All studies done according to internationally validated guidelines gave negative results, while studies using unvalidated
test method/species, or with glyphosate-containing formulations or using high intraperitoneal doses are inappropriate for assessment of genotoxicity to humans.

Other supporting evidence for this conclusion included DNA damage and micronuclei in various populations allegedly exposed to glyphosate from sprays. Attributing the effects found to the exposure to glyphosate is questionable when the exposure, if any, was to glyphosate-based formulations and unidentified demographic, geographical or lifestyle factors that could be responsible for the DNA damage.

In relation to oxidative stress this was only found in one study in rats administered intraperitoneal glyphosate active ingredient (Astiz et al, 2009), and in numerous studies using intraperitoneal administration or in vitro methods with glyphosate-based formulations. The intraperitoneal route of administration is not considered relevant to human exposures. Glyphosate has low gastrointestinal absorption and poor dermal absorption. There was also some inconsistency in results. So the evidence for glyphosate causing oxidative stress is considered weak.

**Conclusion**
The overall conclusion is that – based on a weight of evidence approach, taking into account the quality and reliability of the available data – glyphosate is unlikely to be genotoxic or carcinogenic to humans and does not require classification under HSNO as a carcinogen or mutagen.
References


http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/43624/1/9241665203_eng.pdf


**Acknowledgement**

Dr Michael Beasley MBChB, DComH, MSc, DIH, FFOM (I) for valuable assistance with the preparation of this review.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: DRA-21 / 171012110892

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 24 October 2017

FROM: Greg Bennett, Land Drainage Engineer

SUBJECT: CAREX report on glyphosate

SIGNED BY:

Department Manager  
Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to present the CAREX report entitled “Persistence and ecological consequences of glyphosate to control aquatic weeds in Waimakariri lowland waterways”.

1.2. The aims of this study were to investigate the persistence of glyphosate in the stream water and sediment following spraying and the effect of glyphosate on the freshwater invertebrates and fish in sprayed waterways.

1.3. The work found that glyphosate was present in the water column for 1-2 days following spraying, but quickly bound to sediment and broke down. It also found that Freshwater invertebrates and fish were not affected by the use of glyphosate to control emergent macrophytes.

Attachments:

i. Persistence and ecological consequences of glyphosate to control aquatic weeds in Waimakariri lowland waterways. TRIM 171011110252

ii. Environmental Protection Authority About Glyphosate Information Sheet TRIM 171012110889

iii. Glyphosate 510 Label TRIM 171012110888

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 171012110892.

(b) Notes that CAREX study did not detect any short term effect of glyphosate on freshwater invertebrates and fish following spraying of waterways.

(c) Notes that a follow up report on the wider use of glyphosate by Council and future maintenance provisions will be presented to Council as part of the LTP process.
3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. The Council at its meeting on the 6th of September 2016 (TRIM 160929100894) made the following resolutions:

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 160805077062.

CARRIED

(b) Notes the responses to a Council request for information on the effects of use of glyphosate on public health and the environment from the Environmental Protection Authority (TRIM 160812081280), Ministry of Health (see TRIM 160815081517) and Ministry for the Environment (160823085124).

CARRIED

Against Councillor Atkinson

(c) Notes the report by Dr Wayne Temple, commissioned by the Environmental Protection Authority on “Review of the Evidence Relating to Glyphosate and Carcinogenicity, published August 2016” concluded that “based on a weight of evidence approach, taking into account the quality and reliability of the available data – glyphosate is unlikely to be genotoxic or carcinogenic to humans and does not require classification under HSNO as a carcinogen or mutagen”.

CARRIED

Against Councillor Atkinson

(d) Notes that based on the information received to date, it is unlikely that the use of glyphosate by the Council would pose a risk to public health and the environment.

LOST

(e) Notes the CAREX study in the Cust Main Drain and tributary drains proposes to collect stream bed sediment and water chemistry samples and undertake fish and invertebrate population counts pre and post glyphosate spraying to assist to identify any effects of glyphosate on the distribution of aquatic species in the study reach.

CARRIED

(f) Notes that Council spraying programmes using glyphosate will continue at locations where this was previously used and the programme will be reviewed again pending receipt of further advice from the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment and results of the CAREX study.

CARRIED

Against Councillors Atkinson, Faass, Meyer

(g) Requests staff prepare a further report on the following: 1) results of the CAREX trial; 2) any further advice from the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment.

CARRIED

(h) Circulates this report to the Kaiapoi, Rangiora and Woodend-Ashley Community Boards and the Oxford Eyre Ward Advisory Board and the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee.

CARRIED

3.2. The CAREX report and this cover report is in response to the request (g) above.
3.3. The Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment acknowledged the request for information regarding glyphosate but no other correspondence has been received.

3.4. In response to the Council’s request on the 6th of September 2016 the Waimakariri District Council partnered the Canterbury Rehabilitation Waterway Experiment (CAREX) in a trial to understand the persistence of glyphosate in stream water and sediment and its short-term effects on freshwater invertebrates and fish following spraying of waterways.

3.5. The trial was conducted over the summer of 2016 – 2017 along five different waterways within the Waimakariri District. In each waterway an upstream reach was left as an unsprayed control and a downstream reach was sprayed. Water quality, macroinvertebrate and fish samples were collected in each reach before and after spraying. The CAREX Report presents the findings of this trial.

3.6. The work found that:

3.6.1. Glyphosate was present in the sediment before spraying had even started.

3.6.2. Glyphosate was present in the water column for 1-2 days following spraying, but quickly bound to sediment and broke down.

3.6.3. Freshwater invertebrates and fish were not affected by the use of glyphosate to control emergent macrophytes.

3.7. It was concluded that as these drains are highly modified environments, invertebrates and fish that continue to occupy them are tolerant of water quality in these systems.

3.8. A previous report titled; Professional Opinion on the Impact of Glyphosate on the Kaiapoi River was presented to Kaiapoi Community Board 20 June 2016 (TRIM 160608053721). This work concluded that it is unlikely that glyphosate has contributed to the die-off of aquatic plants observed in the Kaiapoi River over 2012-2016.

3.9. There have been other concerns regarding the risk of exposure to glyphosate on human health. These concerns are not specifically covered in this report.

3.10. Additional background information on glyphosate is provided as attachments ii and iii.

3.11. A follow up report on the wider use of glyphosate by Council and future maintenance provisions will be presented to Council as part of the LTP process.

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

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. The Kaiapoi Community Board at its meeting on the 20th of June 2016 (TRIM 160620057958) recommended the following:

4.1.1. Recommends that Council approves the use of mechanical means, rather than spraying, to control weeds in the Council stormwater and roadside drains, and waterways. Notes that mechanical means, rather than spraying Council drains, is estimated to cost an additional $80,000 per year.

4.1.2. Recommends that Council declines support for a return to the use of spraying to control weeds in Council drains.

4.2. Kaiapoi resident Michael Bate has been vocal in his opposition to the use of glyphosate making several submissions to the Council and Water Zone Committee. He has distributed flyers and erected billboards.
5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. The chemical testing of water samples was funded using existing drainage budgets and cost $13,200.00

5.2. The spraying of the 5 reaches was funded using existing drainage maintenance budgets and cost $1356.60

5.3. The sampling and reporting carried out by CAREX did not incur any cost to the Council.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Legislation**

*Resource Management Act 1991*

Section 31

(1) Every territorial authority shall have the following functions for the purpose of giving effect to this Act in its district:

(e) the control of any actual or potential effects of activities in relation to the surface of water in rivers and lakes:

Section 35

i. Every local authority shall gather such information, and undertake or commission such research, as is necessary to carry out effectively its functions under this Act or regulations under this Act.

ii. Every local authority shall monitor (a) the state of the whole or any part of the environment in its region or district;

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

6.3.1. The air and land is healthy

6.3.2. Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable and affordable manner.

6.3.3. There is sufficient clean water to meet the needs of communities and ecosystems
Executive Summary

This study and report was undertaken by researchers from CAREX and no payment was received for this work. Waimakariri District Council paid for commercial analysis of glyphosate and AMPA. The purpose of this study was to understand the persistence of glyphosate in stream water and sediment and its short-term effects on freshwater invertebrates and fish following spraying of waterways.

From December 2016 – March 2017 five waterways near Rangiora were investigated to test the effect of glyphosate on aquatic weeds, stream invertebrates and fish. In each waterway an upstream reach was left as an unsprayed control and a downstream reach was sprayed. Samples were collected in each reach before and after spraying. Glyphosate and AMPA (the product of glyphosate) were already present in the sediment at both the control and spray reaches before spraying even started. This implies that parties other the Council are spraying waterways or nearby areas, and this makes determining the effects of spraying on animal life in these waterways difficult.

Glyphosate and AMPA were present in the water column for 1-2 days following spraying, but glyphosate quickly bound to sediment and broke down to AMPA. Glyphosate and AMPA were still present in the sediment at both the control and spray reaches 14 weeks after spraying. Weeds in the spray reaches were greatly reduced by glyphosate, being reduced from 90% cover to 20%, however 14 weeks after spraying weed cover in these reaches had returned to about 50%. We could not detect any effect of glyphosate on stream invertebrate species richness, metrics such as the MCI and SQMCI or fish. These waterways are highly modified environments, and invertebrates and fish that occupy them are tolerant of water quality in these systems. Given the small sample size (five waterways), the findings of the study are limited and add to our understanding of drain maintenance on aquatic systems.
1. Introduction

Excessive growth of aquatic macrophytes (weeds) is a significant problem in lowland agricultural waterways, including in the Waimakariri District. Management is undertaken by Councils to ensure drainage is maintained, most commonly using mechanical clearance, herbicide spray and hand weeding.

Glyphosate is one of the world’s most effective and most frequently used herbicides. It is a non-selective, broad-spectrum herbicide commonly used on emergent (surface dwelling) and marginal (bankside) macrophytes, but following manufacturers instructions, spraying directly on the waterway should be minimised.

Concerns have been raised about the toxic effect of glyphosate on aquatic life. There are also concerns of secondary effects including depleted dissolved oxygen levels and release of nutrients from decomposing plants, and sudden changes in habitat influencing refugia and food sources for aquatic invertebrates and fish.

To respond to public concerns, an investigation was carried out by the University of Canterbury on behalf of the Waimakariri District Council on the use of glyphosate spray to control aquatic macrophytes. This investigation was undertaken between December 2016 and March 2017.

The aims of this study were to investigate:
- the persistence of glyphosate in the stream water and sediment following spraying
- the effect of glyphosate on the freshwater invertebrates and fish in sprayed waterways
2. Methods

2.1. Experimental design

The impact of glyphosate was tested in five waterways. In each waterway an upstream 200m reach was selected which was not sprayed (control reach) and a 200m reach downstream was sprayed (treatment reach). The five waterways were scheduled to be sprayed by the Waimakariri District Council as part of their annual weed control program. They were:

- Ashworths: Ashworths Road Drain, between Mill Road & Main Drain Road
- Ohoka: Ohoka Stream North Branch, between Mill Road & the first gate along the walkway
- Threlkelds: Threlkelds Road, upstream of Main Drain Road
- Easterbrook: Easterbrook Road, upstream of Hicklands Road
- Ashby’s: No. 4 Drain, upstream of Hicklands Road

![Figure 1: Location of the five waterways used in the spray trial.](image)

A 200m stretch at the top of each reach was left unsprayed as a control reach. Macrophytes were sprayed from the 200m point downstream. Sampling of the control reach was undertaken 100m into the reach, and the spray reach was sampled at 400m (Fig 2).
Spraying was carried out by the Waimakariri District Council’s contractor on 21 December 2016.

2.2. Weed monitoring
At each of the control (100m) and spray (400m) reaches, three macrophyte assessment cross-sections were set up. These cross-sections were measured before the spray trial (pre-spray), and 3, 6 and 14 weeks after spraying (post-spray). On each cross-section, aquatic weed species and the height above the water surface were recorded every 10cm across the wetted width of waterway.

2.3. Glyphosate and AMPA sampling of water and sediment
When glyphosate contacts water, there are two major pathways of dissipation: binding to sediments, and microbiological breakdown. When sediments are present glyphosate rapidly binds to soil particles, bacteria and fungi in the water and sediment also breakdown glyphosate into aminomethylphosphonic acid (AMPA). AMPA can remain stable in sediments for some time. We measured both glyphosate and AMPA to better understand the persistence and breakdown time in these streams and sediments.

Glyphosate and AMPA samples of both stream water and stream bed sediment were collected and sent for analysis by AsureQuality (Wellington).
Water samples were collected pre-spray, the day of spraying (both control and spray reaches) and 1 and 5 days post spray (spray reaches only).

Samples of sediment were collected pre-spray (control and spray reaches) and 5 days, 3 weeks (spray reaches only) and 6 weeks post spray (control and spray reaches).

2.4. Aquatic invertebrates
Aquatic invertebrates were collected at both control and spray reaches pre spray, 5 days and 6 weeks after spraying. In each reach a single invertebrate kick-net sample (500 μm mesh) was collected from five representative micro-habitats within the reach using the standard New Zealand protocols (Stark et al 2001). Samples were labelled and stored in 70 % ethanol.

In the laboratory the samples were sieved (500 μm Endecott sieve), and all invertebrates identified to the lowest practicable level (usually genus) using identification guides (such as Winterbourn 2006). Coded abundances of taxa were recorded as described by Stark (1998).

We then calculated several stream health metrics to determine the impact of the spray trial on aquatic invertebrates. The Macroinvertebrate Community Index (MCI) uses the presence or absence of taxa and their tolerance to pollution to indicate stream health. The MCI ranges from 0 – 200, scores of less than 80 indicate a severely polluted system while scores over 120 are considered healthy (Table 1). A second metric called the Semi-Quantitative Macroinvertebrate Community Index (SQMCI) was calculated using the pollution tolerances of taxa present and the coded abundance data. SQMCI's range from 0 – 10. Values less than 4 indicate a severely polluted system while values more than 6 indicate health systems.

Table 1: Interpretation of MCI and SQMCI values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water quality</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>MCI</th>
<th>SQMCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Clean water</td>
<td>&gt; 119</td>
<td>&gt; 5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Doubtful quality or possible mild pollution</td>
<td>100 – 119</td>
<td>5.00 – 5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Probable moderate pollution</td>
<td>80 – 99</td>
<td>4.00 – 4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Probable severe pollution</td>
<td>&lt; 80</td>
<td>&lt; 4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5. Fish sampling
Freshwater fish were sampled with a portable (KAINGA EFM300) electric fishing machine by spot fishing in areas where aquatic weed cover was less than 40%. Electric fishing was undertaken at both control and spray reaches pre spraying and 3, 6 and 14 weeks post spray. However, this was problematic especially prior to spraying as weed cover was extensive and the high weed cover potentially confounded any results. Captured fish were identified to species level where
possible in the field. Very small fry (> 4 cm) were identified to family. Glass eels and elvers (Anguillidae) (>10 cm) were recorded as elvers.

Table 2: Timing of different sample collection over the experimental period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days since spraying</th>
<th>Water samples</th>
<th>Sediment samples</th>
<th>Macrophyte transects</th>
<th>Aquatic Invertebrates</th>
<th>Fish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Spray</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Spray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre spray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day of spray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spray 1 day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spray 5 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spray 3 weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spray 6 weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spray 14 weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Results

3.1. Glyphosate and AMPA in water
Prior to spraying no glyphosate was detected in the water but AMPA was found in water in the control sites. No glyphosate or AMPA were present in the water on the day of spraying at any control (non-sprayed) reaches (Fig 3A & B) whereas both glyphosate and AMPA were present in the water on the day of spraying at all spray (treated) reaches. On the day after spraying, glyphosate was detected in the water at all spray reaches at low concentrations. AMPA was only detectable in the water at the Easterbrook spray reach (Fig 3A & B). Five days after spraying, glyphosate and AMPA were both virtually undetectable in the water at all spray reaches (Fig 3A & B).

A. 

Figure 3: A. Mean glyphosate and B. Mean AMPA concentrations in water pre spraying, on the day of spraying, the day after spraying and 5 days after spraying. Control reaches are shown in white, treated (spray) treated reaches are shown in grey. Time of spraying is indicated by the dotted line. nr = sample not run, bd = sample result below detectable limit. Mean values are shown with ± 1 Standard error.

3.2. Glyphosate and AMPA in sediment
Pre spraying, glyphosate and AMPA were detected in the sediment in both control and spray reaches (Fig 4A & B). Six weeks after spraying, glyphosate and AMPA were still detectable in the sediment in both control and spray reaches (Fig 4A & B).
3.3. Aquatic weed cover

Macrophyte cover was between 80 – 100 % pre spraying. Three weeks post spraying, macrophyte cover was greatly reduced in the spray reaches (Fig 5, Photos 1-3). Fourteen weeks post spraying, macrophytes were starting to grow back in sprayed reaches (Fig 5).
Photo 1: Threlkelds Road site pre spraying

Photo 2: Threlkelds Road control site 3 weeks after spraying

Photo 3: Threlkelds Road spray site 3 weeks after spraying
3.4. Invertebrate species richness, MCI and SQMCI
We compared mean values for invertebrate species richness, MCI and SQMCI and found no difference, suggesting these communities are not affected by the presence of glyphosate in the water or sediment (Fig 6A, B & C). MCI and SQMCI scores at all sites indicated probable moderate levels of pollution.

![Figure 6: A. Mean invertebrate species richness, B. MCI and C. SQMCI](image)

3.5. Fish species richness
Five fish species were observed in the five waterways, including: upland bullies (*Gobimorphus breviceps*), common bullies (*Gobimorphus cotidianus*), shortfin eels
(Anguilla australis), one longfin eel (Anguilla dieffenbachii) and juvenile brown trout (Salmo trutta).
Post spraying no differences were observed in fish species richness despite a declining trend. It seems unlikely individual fish species were directly impacted (Fig 7). Unfortunately, the high weed cover made accurate fish data difficult to collect.

![Figure 7](image)

Figure 7: Mean fish species richness pre spraying, 3 weeks, 6 weeks and 14 weeks post spraying. Control reaches are shown in white, treated (spray) treated reaches are shown in grey. Time of spraying is indicated by the dotted line. Mean values are shown with ± 1 Standard error.
4. Final comments

- The purpose of this study was to understand the persistence of glyphosate in stream water and sediment and its short-term effects on freshwater invertebrates and fish following spraying of waterways.
- Glyphosate and AMPA were present in the water column for 1-2 days following spraying, but glyphosate quickly bound to sediment and broke down to AMPA.
- Glyphosate and AMPA were already present in the sediment at both the control and spray reaches before spraying even started.
- Glyphosate and AMPA were still present in the sediment at both the control and spray reaches 14 weeks after spraying.
- Spraying with glyphosate is an effective way to control aquatic weeds, however effectiveness is short lived and grow back is evident within three months.
- Species richness of invertebrates and fish, MCI and SQMCI are not affected by the use of glyphosate to control emergent macrophytes. These drains are highly modified environments, and invertebrates and fish that continue to occupy them are tolerant of water quality in these systems.
- Glyphosate is commonly used for domestic purposes on lawns and gardens, and in agricultural landscapes. There are several ways it can enter waterways, including spray drift and direct runoff from sprayed land.
- This study was not designed to detect the sources of glyphosate in these stream systems. Our results show that either: glyphosate can persist in these systems between periods of drain maintenance, or the glyphosate in the system prior to commencement of this study was from other nearby sources.
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About glyphosate

Glyphosate is a chemical used to control weeds. It is a broad-spectrum herbicide that works by inhibiting an enzyme found in plants. Glyphosate-containing substances are perhaps the most common herbicides in New Zealand and world-wide, and are used commercially and around the home. The Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) has approved glyphosate for use in New Zealand.

The use of glyphosate in New Zealand

Glyphosate substances are used in a wide variety of settings, including orchards, vineyards, pastures, vegetable patches, roadways, parks, sports grounds and home gardens. Glyphosate has been used in New Zealand since 1976 and is currently sold under a large number of different brand names.

Under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms (HSNO) Act 1996, all hazardous substances, such as glyphosate, require approval by the EPA before they can be used in New Zealand. The EPA has approved approximately 60 substances containing glyphosate under this Act.

The Ministry for Primary Industries’ Agricultural Compounds and Veterinary Medicines (ACVM) Group had active registrations for 89 glyphosate products under the ACVM Act as of 1 June 2015. (Note: a single HSNO approval can cover more than one ACVM registered product.)

The safety of glyphosate

Based on the EPA’s current assessment, people are advised that following the label instructions on all glyphosate products provides adequate protection for users. People should follow the use and safety instructions on all chemical product labels, as these are designed to reduce human exposure to the product and to protect the environment. If the label has been removed or damaged, you can search the manufacturer’s website to find the relevant safety information.

How the EPA balances the risks and benefits of glyphosate

The EPA monitors international developments and the latest research available through a wide range of scientific media. In addition to deciding on applications under the HSNO Act to import and manufacture hazardous substances, the EPA also reassesses existing substances to take into account new information.

Reassessments may be initiated by the EPA or by external parties and anyone can apply to have a substance reassessed or reviewed. You can find further details about this on our website.
All glyphosate substances used in New Zealand have been through an approval process, which considers likely impacts on human health and the environment. To reduce the risks posed by glyphosate, we recommend you follow the advice below.

**Protect yourself, others, and the environment**

Many chemicals we use every day in New Zealand can pose a risk to people or the environment. You can protect yourself, others, and the environment by following the recommendations for using and storing glyphosate.

**Using glyphosate safely**

When using any chemical, you should start by reading the label. This will tell you the specific risks for the product, and how you can reduce these risks. There are some practices that you should follow any time you use glyphosate:

* **Before you spray**
  - Read all instructions on the label and follow them.
  - Make sure you are using the right product for the job you are doing.
  - Confirm your spray area is not close to water, such as streams, rivers, lakes or ponds.
  - Check the weather forecast. Make sure no rain is predicted for at least 24 hours. Avoid spraying when it is windy.
  - Clear children and pets from the area, and keep them well away.
  - Follow the label advice on the need for protective clothing.

* **After spraying**
  - Wash your hands, face and clothing.
  - Keep children and pets away until the spray has dried, or for the amount of time indicated on the label.
  - Read the instructions on the label to help you safely dispose of any unused product.

**Storing glyphosate safely**

You should follow these simple recommendations to protect yourself, others, and the environment:

- Keep it locked up and out of reach of children and pets.
- Store the product in its original container.
- Make sure it is kept far away from food, including pet food.
- Dispose of empty herbicide containers and unused herbicides properly.
- Check the label instructions and use-by date before each re-use.

**Where can I find out more about glyphosate?**

If you need more information, please call 0800 HAZSUBS (0800 429 7827) or email: hazardous.substances@epa.govt.nz.
WARNING
KEEP OUT OF REACH OF CHILDREN
ECOTOXIC

AGPRO
GREEN GLYPHOSATE 510
NON-RESIDUAL HERBICIDE

Active Ingredient:  510g/litre glyphosate as the isopropylamine salt in the form of a soluble concentrate.

Registered to and distributed by:
AGPRO NZ LTD
PO BOX 58-963, GREENMOUNT
10 POLARIS PLACE, EAST TAMAKI
PH 0-9-273 3456
FAX 0-9-273 3457
Web: www.agpro.co.nz

PRECAUTIONS:
• Store in the original unopened container in a cool dry place, avoiding sunlight and away from foodstuffs and drink containers.
• Do not eat, drink or smoke while using.
• Remove protective clothing and wash hands and face thoroughly before meals and after work.
• Wash protective clothing after work.
• Avoid contamination of any water supply with chemical or empty container.
• Avoid contact with eyes and skin.
• Avoid inhalation of spray mist.
• Toxic to aquatic organisms.

FIRST AID:
• If swallowed do NOT induce vomiting.
• For advice contact National Poisons Centre (0800 POISON 764-766) or a doctor immediately
• If skin or hair contact occurs, remove contaminated clothing and flush skin and hair with running water.
• If splashed in eyes, wash out immediately with water.

READ PRECAUTIONS BEFORE OPENING
READ THE DIRECTIONS FOR USE BEFORE USING THIS PRODUCT.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS
AGPRO GREEN GLYPHOSATE 510 is a non-selective herbicide. It is absorbed by plant foliage and greenstems and is translocated through the plant from point of contact into the root system. The effects of AGPRO GREEN GLYPHOSATE 510 may not be apparent for 4-7 days depending on weather conditions, weed species and the herbicide use rate. Some perennial weeds may not show effects for 10-20 days. There is no withholding period for AGPRO GREEN GLYPHOSATE 510. Avoid grazing weeds after spraying for 3 days if treating annual weeds or 7-10 days if treating...
perennial weeds, to allow translocation of this product through the weeds. 

SPRAY DRIFT WARNING:
Beware: Apply this product carefully. Spray drift may cause serious damage to other 

desirable plants. Do not apply under weather or spraying conditions which would be 

expected to cause spray drift onto nearby crops and susceptible plants. 

RECOMMENDED USES

Agricultural Areas: Used to control a wide range of annual and perennial weeds prior to 
sowing crops or pastures. See Weed Control Chart. 

Asparagus: May be used to control weeds prior to planting or crop emergence and in 
established plantings provided herbicide contact with any part of the asparagus plant is 

avoided through the use of shielding or weed wiping equipment. See Weed Control 

Chart. 

Aquatic Areas: May be used in drains and waterways. See Weed Control Chart. 

Broad-acre Crops: Used to control a wide range of weeds prior to cultivation of barley, 
oats, peas, and wheat. For best results do not disturb sprayed weeds by cultivation for 3 
days after spraying for annual weeds and 7 days after cultivation for perennial weeds. 

See Weed Control Chart. 

Brushweeds: A wide range of brushweeds are controlled by this product. Always use 

AGPRO 

Organosilicone when treating brushweeds. See Weed Control Chart. 

Forestry: May be used to control a wide range of brushweeds and grasses. See Weed 

Control Chart. 

General Weed Control: Used in a wide range of situations to control weeds. Use 1 litre 
in 100 litres of clean water and ensure the foliage is well covered. See Weed Control 

Chart. 

Market Gardens: May be applied to control weeds before or after seeding, but prior to 
crop emergence. See Weed Control Chart. 

Non-agricultural Areas: Used to control weeds. See Weed Control Chart. 

Orchards: May be used for weed control in apple, pear, citrus, grape, stone and 
berryfruit growing provided any herbicide contact with the trees is avoided. See Weed 

Control Chart. 

Pasture: Used as a spot application to control a wide range of weeds. See Weed 

Control Chart. Existing pasture may be treated with this product prior to the sowing of 

new pasture or crops. 

Other Uses: May be used as a spot application to control weeds in lawns, parks, 
reserves and ornamentals. 

MIXING PROCEDURES

Spray tanks should be free of any previous spray chemicals. A suitable tank cleaning 
agent is recommended. Half fill spray tank with clean water, add the required amount of 
AGPRO GREEN GLYPHOSATE 510 then fill with clean water. Add surfactant last. 
Agitate well before spraying. When tank mixing with other compatible chemicals add 
AGPRO GREEN GLYPHOSATE 510 after other water soluble products, but before 
flowables. 

IMPORTANT 

AGPRO GREEN GLYPHOSATE 510 should only be stored and applied in plastic or 
plastic lined containers, aluminium, brass, copper, stainless steel or fibreglass 
containers. The contact of AGPRO GREEN GLYPHOSATE 510 with unlined or 
galvanised steel may cause a highly flammable gas to form causing an explosion if 
ignited by an open flame etc.
SURFACTANT ADDITION
The addition of a surfactant is not generally needed with this product, except when water volumes exceed 50 litres/ha. In this case add a 100% non-ironic surfactant, such as AGPRO Wetter/Penetrant at label rates.

TANK MIXTURES
AGPRO GREEN GLYPHOSATE 510 can be tank mixed with DICAMBA 20% ai for improved control of clover. For knockdown and residual control AGPRO GREEN GLYPHOSATE 510 can be tank mixed with AGPRO SIMAZINE 500. Observe the Directions of Use Table and crops suitable on the respective label. Do not apply tank mix by air.

APPLICATION
A. BOOM SPRAY EQUIPMENT: A spray volume of 25-120 litres/ha is recommended. Ensure a double overlap of nozzle patterns at the top of the weed canopy.
NOTE: Fan nozzle equipment should be used at pressures in the range 240-280kPA.
B. AERIAL APPLICATION: AGPRO GREEN GLYPHOSATE 510 may be aerially applied in pasture or fallow situations prior to establishment of field crops or new pasture. Apply in spray volumes of 15-80 litres/ha. Increased spray volumes should be used in difficult situations such as mountainous areas and hilly terrains. This will ensure adequate crop coverage. DO NOT use in intensive horticultural areas.

APPLICATION PROCEDURE IN HOT CONDITIONS
It is recommended that when the temperature reaches 24-26 degrees C, increase water volume to at least 30-35 litres/ha and increase droplet size to at least 300 micron VMD. Aerial application is not recommended at temperatures above 32 degrees C.

WASHING AND CLEANING OF EQUIPMENT
Take careful precautions with regard to the washing of all spray equipment after each day of spraying. Spray tanks, pumps, lines and nozzles should be thoroughly rinsed with clean water following application to prevent corrosion. Aircraft should be thoroughly washed, especially landing gear, after each day of spraying.

CONTAINER DISPOSAL:
Triple rinse container and add residue to spray tank. Burn in an appropriate incinerator, if circumstances such as wind direction permit. Otherwise crush or puncture and bury in a suitable landfill, or if appropriate, recycle.

SHELF LIFE:
When stored appropriately, this product should show no significant degradation for two years from the date of manufacture. Contact your supplier for further information about the use of any product that is older than this.

COMPATIBILITY: Compatible with most commonly used herbicides.

CONDITIONS OF SALE:
The use of AGPRO GREEN GLYPHOSATE 510 being beyond the control of the manufacturer, no warranty expressed or implied is given by AGPRO NZ LTD regarding its suitability, fitness or efficiency for any purpose for which it is used by the buyer, whether in accordance with the directions or not and AGPRO NZ LTD accepts no responsibility for any consequence whatsoever resulting from the use of this product.
# WEED CONTROL CHART - Application Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEDS</th>
<th>BOOMSPRAY Per HA</th>
<th>HANDGUN Per 100L</th>
<th>WATER KNAPSACK Per 15L WATER</th>
<th>CRITICAL COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Weeds</td>
<td>700ml - 1.4L</td>
<td>140ml</td>
<td>20ml</td>
<td>Apply at the higher rate for larger weeds. May be tank mixed with AGPRO Simazine 500 for longer term control. Do not spray plants stressed due to low moisture levels, frost, waterlogged or covered with dust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Sedge</td>
<td>4.2L</td>
<td>700ml</td>
<td>110ml</td>
<td>Apply to actively growing weeds only, usually November to March. For aerial application increase the rate to 6.3L/ha. Density growth should be burnt 12-18 months prior to treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barberry</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>700ml</td>
<td>110ml</td>
<td>Apply from flowering to late fruit stage, usually January to April. If bushes have been cut, regrowth should reach 1.5 before spraying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley Grass</td>
<td>700ml</td>
<td>140ml</td>
<td>20ml</td>
<td>Apply to actively growing weeds only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackberry</td>
<td>6.3 - 14L</td>
<td>700ml - 1.1L</td>
<td>110 - 140ml</td>
<td>Should be applied between January-May ie from flowering to leaf fall. See that the plants are not under stress. Use of CDA equipment is not recommended. Complete spraying of foliage cover is essential for total control. Use the higher rate on old, dense infestations over 1.75m high.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxthorn</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>700ml</td>
<td>110ml</td>
<td>Do not spray in dry conditions. Complete spraying of the foliage cover is essential for total control. The use of CDA equipment is not recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracken</td>
<td>6.3L</td>
<td>700ml</td>
<td>160ml</td>
<td>Bracken should be slashed in the winter or early spring. Then prior to frosts, apply in March-May to actively growing fronds. It may be necessary to repeat treatment in conjunction with pasture improvement for permanent control. Add AGPRO Organosilicone at 250ml per 100L of spray to achieve good control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broom</td>
<td>6.3L</td>
<td>700ml</td>
<td>110ml</td>
<td>Best results are obtained when plant is in full leaf. (Late spring to early summer). Add AGPRO Organosilicone at 250ml/100L (aerial application), 200ml/100L (Handgun), 20ml/15L (Knapsack) to achieve good control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browntop</td>
<td>2.1L</td>
<td>500ml</td>
<td>70ml</td>
<td>Apply at early head stage to actively growing plants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddleia</td>
<td>6.3L</td>
<td>700ml</td>
<td>110ml</td>
<td>Apply to actively growing plants. Spray before the seedheads have formed (late spring to early summer) for best results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Californian thistle</td>
<td>2.8L</td>
<td>700ml</td>
<td>110ml</td>
<td>Apply to actively growing plants after development of flower buds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couch</td>
<td>4.2L</td>
<td>700ml</td>
<td>110ml</td>
<td>Apply to actively growing plants at early head stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dock</td>
<td>2.8—6.3L</td>
<td>700ml</td>
<td>110ml</td>
<td>Use the higher rate for larger plants. Apply to actively growing plants in full leaf. Dicamba 20% ai can be added at label rates to improve control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floating sweet grass &amp; Reed sweet grass</td>
<td>6.3L</td>
<td>700ml</td>
<td>140ml</td>
<td>Apply to actively growing plants in late summer (Feb-March) and before the onset of frosts. Not more than one quarter of the plant should be submerged at the time of treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorse</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>700ml</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Handgun application only. Use AGPRO Organosilicone at 200ml/100L or poor results will occur. Spray plant to ensure complete coverage. Apply at any time of the year. Re-treat as required as regrowth may occur after 12 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian doab</td>
<td>6.3L</td>
<td>700ml</td>
<td>110ml</td>
<td>Apply to actively growing plants at early seedhead stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson grass</td>
<td>4.2L</td>
<td>700ml</td>
<td>110ml</td>
<td>Apply at early head stage to actively growing plants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikuyu</td>
<td>4.2L</td>
<td>700ml</td>
<td>110ml</td>
<td>Apply to actively growing plants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer grass-aquatic</td>
<td>6.3L</td>
<td>1.1L</td>
<td>110ml</td>
<td>Apply to actively growing plants in late summer (Feb - March)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer grass-non-aquatic</td>
<td>4.2L</td>
<td>700ml</td>
<td>75ml</td>
<td>No more than one quarter of the plant should be submerged at the time of treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Man's Beard</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>700ml - 1.4L</td>
<td>200ml</td>
<td>Use the higher rate on plants with stem diameters greater than 1cm. If it is not possible to obtain complete coverage, cut the plant in winter and spray when the plant is over 0.5 m long, using the higher rate. Apply November to March.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pampas grass/Toetoefl</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>700ml</td>
<td>110ml</td>
<td>Apply Spring to Autumn. Ensure complete coverage of the foliage. Do not spray while the plant is flowering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paspalum</td>
<td>4.2L</td>
<td>700ml</td>
<td>110ml</td>
<td>Apply to Paspalum at early head stage. Apply to actively growing plants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie grass</td>
<td>700ml - 1.4L</td>
<td>140ml</td>
<td>20ml</td>
<td>Apply to actively growing plants at seedhead stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ragwort</td>
<td>4.2L</td>
<td>700ml</td>
<td>110ml</td>
<td>Apply to actively growing plants with sufficient leaf area for herbicide uptake. Keep stock out until the treated plants brown-out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring Fern</td>
<td>700ml - 2.1L</td>
<td>210ml</td>
<td>35ml</td>
<td>The higher rate should normally be used for control. Use 700ml-1.4L/ha only for Pasture Manipulation, increasing the rate to 2.1L/ha for dense infestations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakataf</td>
<td>3.5L</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Apply to actively growing plants, usually January to March.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rautahi (Cutty grass) &amp; Rushes</td>
<td>4.2L</td>
<td>700ml</td>
<td>110ml</td>
<td>Apply to actively growing plants at seedhead stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryegrass</td>
<td>1.1 - 2.1L</td>
<td>350ml</td>
<td>50ml</td>
<td>Use AGPRO Organosilicone at 100ml/100L or poor results will occur. Apply when plants are actively growing. Use the lower rate from January to July before cultivation and the higher rate from August to December.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tall fescue</td>
<td>4.2L</td>
<td>700ml</td>
<td>110ml</td>
<td>Apply to actively growing plants usually January to March.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow</td>
<td>6.3L</td>
<td>700ml</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Apply to actively growing plants and spray to ensure the foliage is well covered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to obtain Council approval of the Draft 2018/19 Development Contributions Schedules for consultation as part of the 2018-28 Long Term Plan (LTP).

1.2. The draft 2018/19 Development Contributions Schedules are based on the LTP budgets and growth projections.

1.3. As a result of changes to budgets and growth projections, many of the development contributions have changed from the 2017/18 Annual Plan schedule.

1.4. The Development Contributions Schedules will be included with the supporting information to the Draft 2018-28 Long Term Plan Consultation Document.

Attachments:
   i. Draft 2018/19 Development Contributions Schedule

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180111002046.

(b) Approves the Draft 2018/19 Development Contributions Schedule for consultation with the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

(c) Notes that the methodology for the neighbourhood reserves land purchase has been reviewed and updated.

(d) Notes that staff will be assessing the options for development contributions when existing properties connect to reticulation. A report will be brought to Council with a recommendation based on this assessment.

(e) Notes that proposed updates to the Development Contribution Policy are presented in a separate report (TRIM 180111001799).
3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. The Development Contributions Policy has a series of schedules that set out the basis for the various development contributions. Development contributions include those that relate to District-wide growth, scheme growth, and specific Development Contribution Areas (DCA). The location of any particular development will determine which development contributions apply.

3.2. Development Contributions (DCs) have two primary components, the growth rate anticipated for the scheme or development contribution area and the capital cost of the works required for servicing the new growth. The DCs are determined based on the projects and costs which are required to facilitate growth in the area divided by the expected number of properties to be developed in that area. These project costs include both past expenditures and anticipated future expenditures that need to be recovered by growth in the area that is serviced by the growth related projects.

3.3. Solely growth related projects (those required only to service new development) have capital costs spread as a development contribution over the anticipated number of new lots in the scheme/District.

3.4. Partially growth related projects (level of service improvements that also provide additional capacity for growth) typically have the growth component as the percentage of new lots in the scheme/District anticipated in the 10-year planning period.

3.5. DCA servicing requirements are identified through structure plans and investigations into the requirements to service specific growth areas. Through the structure plan process, infrastructure projects are subject to a cost benefit analysis. DCAs are typically solely growth related and therefore all of the costs are divided among the number of properties anticipated to develop in the area.

3.6. A summary of the draft 2018/19 DCs based on the budgets and growth projections in the draft LTP are shown below. Commentary is provided when the DC has changed by more than 10% from the 2017/18 DC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adopted Annual Plan 2017-18</th>
<th>Draft 18-19 Long Term Plan</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WATER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust</td>
<td>2,822</td>
<td>5,731</td>
<td>50.76%</td>
<td>Increase due to new partially growth related projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernside</td>
<td>1,862</td>
<td>1,862</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrymere</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>-25.39%</td>
<td>Budget for new source reduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>2,564</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>-506.15%</td>
<td>Damley Square reservoir project removed from budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Kaiapoi</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>-7.66%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kaiapoi DCA</td>
<td>2,421</td>
<td>3,008</td>
<td>19.51%</td>
<td>Increase due to additional budget for extra-over link main plus additional interest on past expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>45.10%</td>
<td>Increase due to additional growth related projects including a 3rd bore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka</td>
<td>3,876</td>
<td>3,903</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>4,929</td>
<td>7,325</td>
<td>32.71%</td>
<td>Addition of growth related projects for headworks upgrades and Oxford Rd trunk main project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Adopted Annual Plan 2017-18</td>
<td>Draft 18-19 Long Term Plan</td>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford 1</td>
<td>9,711</td>
<td>4,930</td>
<td>-96.98%</td>
<td>Increase in growth projection numbers, and spreading new source growth costs over 35 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford 2</td>
<td>4,356</td>
<td>6,654</td>
<td>34.54%</td>
<td>Addition of new growth related projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poyntz Road</td>
<td>1,724</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>6,802</td>
<td>5,092</td>
<td>-33.58%</td>
<td>South Belt reservoir project pushed out beyond LTP period, growth numbers have also reduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rangiora DCA</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>-560.77%</td>
<td>Bulk of Northbrook Rd project dropped off as in year 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rangiora DCA - Kippenberger Ave</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Rangiora Outline Development Plan Area</td>
<td>2,271</td>
<td>4,524</td>
<td>49.80%</td>
<td>Added North Rangiora ring main project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rangiora</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>21.53%</td>
<td>Increase in budget for the Lehmans Rd link main project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook (m2)</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-478.57%</td>
<td>Southbrook Ring Main Stage 3 project has been pushed out beyond the 10-year LTP period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerhill</td>
<td>7,185</td>
<td>6,171</td>
<td>-16.43%</td>
<td>New source costs spread over 35-year period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi</td>
<td>6,097</td>
<td>8,058</td>
<td>24.34%</td>
<td>Interest on past expenditure plus decrease in growth numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend - Tuahiwi water</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>1,712</td>
<td>63.84%</td>
<td>Inclusion of the Bradleys Road well and Chinnerys Road main to the DC plus a decrease in the growth projection numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach</td>
<td>2,579</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>-101.33%</td>
<td>All source project costs as partially growth related and an increase in growth projection numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Eyreton</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>3,209</td>
<td>71.89%</td>
<td>New solely growth related projects added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>1,993</td>
<td>3,565</td>
<td>44.10%</td>
<td>Increase in budget for the Rangiora Woodend Booster main and Chinnerys Road main and a decrease in the growth projection numbers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEWER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Adopted Annual Plan 2017-18</th>
<th>Draft 18-19 Long Term Plan</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Districts - Ocean Outfall</td>
<td>9,240</td>
<td>5,434</td>
<td>-70.04%</td>
<td>Increase in growth projection numbers and income received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>2,030</td>
<td>2,079</td>
<td>2.36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Kaiapoi</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>44.83%</td>
<td>Cost of funding was added to calculation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kaiapoi</td>
<td>1,978</td>
<td>2,148</td>
<td>7.91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East North East Kaiapoi Reticulation</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>-13.30%</td>
<td>Work completed by developer did not have the cost share that was anticipated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>2,948</td>
<td>3,161</td>
<td>6.72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todds Rd Business Zone (per hectare)</td>
<td>166,095</td>
<td>166,095</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook Stage 2 (m2)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rangiora DCA Other Properties</td>
<td>7,786</td>
<td>8,685</td>
<td>10.35%</td>
<td>Addition of extra-over sewer costs as a future budget item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rangiora DCA (Gilberthorpes)</td>
<td>2,062</td>
<td>2,217</td>
<td>6.99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner West Rangiora DCA</td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>1,796</td>
<td>6.68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rangiora DCA</td>
<td>3,436</td>
<td>3,497</td>
<td>1.74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Rangiora DCA</td>
<td>5,919</td>
<td>6,320</td>
<td>6.34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernside</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,325</td>
<td>New DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,667</td>
<td>New DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annual Plan 2017-18 vs Draft 18-19 Long Term Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Adopted Annual Plan 2017-18</th>
<th>Draft 18-19 Long Term Plan</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville, Ohoka, Swannanoa - new properties</td>
<td>13,134</td>
<td>12,661</td>
<td>-3.74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville, Ohoka, Swannanoa - existing properties wishing to connect</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td>2.75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach</td>
<td>1,893</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No longer need project completed so DC not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Past expenditure dropped off so no longer have a DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Woodend DCA</td>
<td>6,407</td>
<td>7,159</td>
<td>10.50%</td>
<td>Addition of extra-over sewer costs as a future budget item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Sewer</td>
<td>3,323</td>
<td>2,054</td>
<td>-61.78%</td>
<td>Increase in growth numbers and a past expenditure dropped off as completed more than 10 years ago</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DRAINAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Adopted Annual Plan 2017-18</th>
<th>Draft 18-19 Long Term Plan</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville, Ohoka, Swannanoa - new properties</td>
<td>13,134</td>
<td>12,661</td>
<td>-3.74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville, Ohoka, Swannanoa - existing properties wishing to connect</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td>2.75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach</td>
<td>1,893</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No longer need project completed so DC not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Past expenditure dropped off so no longer have a DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Woodend DCA</td>
<td>6,407</td>
<td>7,159</td>
<td>10.50%</td>
<td>Addition of extra-over sewer costs as a future budget item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Sewer</td>
<td>3,323</td>
<td>2,054</td>
<td>-61.78%</td>
<td>Increase in growth numbers and a past expenditure dropped off as completed more than 10 years ago</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ROADING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Adopted Annual Plan 2017-18</th>
<th>Draft 18-19 Long Term Plan</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>6,302</td>
<td>5,782</td>
<td>-8.99%</td>
<td>Increase in growth numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook (m2)</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Woodend</td>
<td>6,964</td>
<td>6,964</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rangiora DCA</td>
<td>3,474</td>
<td>3,501</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
<td>Now includes full budgeted amount and total anticipated number of lots in DCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kaiapoi DCA</td>
<td>5,931</td>
<td>5,931</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kaiapoi DCA - new collector Rd</td>
<td>5,756</td>
<td>5,756</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi North</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Rangiora (West Belt Extension to Townsend Road)</td>
<td>8,577</td>
<td>8,577</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7. **Reserves Land Purchase Methodology**

3.8. The methodology for determining the cost of purchasing additional neighbourhood reserves land (included in the Residential Zones Reserve DC) has been reviewed.

3.9. A ratio of 1 Hectare per 1000 residents has been determined as an acceptable quantity of reserves land to meet current Council Levels of Service for neighbourhood reserves. With the population over the Long Term Plan period expected to increase by 11,500 residents, an additional 11.5 hectares of neighbourhood land would be required over the next 10 years.

3.10. In some instances Council will enter into an agreement with a developer of a large scale comprehensive development, whereby the land and improvements required for neighbourhood reserves is provided in lieu of the reserve development contributions being paid. Over the next 10 years, approximately 2.6 hectares of land will be acquired in this manner, reducing the amount of neighbourhood reserve land that requires Council purchase to 8.9 hectares. For the DC calculation, the projected growth number has also been correspondingly reduced by the population within developments with agreements in place.

3.11. Over the past 5 years, the average cost of land purchased for neighbourhood reserves was $190 per square metre. Using this cost a per annum figure was determined to be required to fund the neighbourhood land purchase.

3.12. Further an additional cost of $70 per square metre has been allowed for in budget for Recreational and Ecological Linkages. This is based on average cost over the past 5 years.

3.13. **Future Work**

3.14. Over the next year, staff will be considering the options for development contributions applicable for existing properties connecting to Council reticulation. The outcomes of the options evaluation will be presented to Council for consideration.

3.15. The Management Team have reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. Community views have not yet been sought on the draft development contributions, however the recommended option is to consult this as part of the 2018/19 Long Term Plan.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. The current funding policy, excluding ring fenced outline development areas, is to fund capital works until growth occurs. The development contribution amount is amended each year to reflect the cost of funds and any changes to the programme.
5.2. The ability of the Council to require development contributions from growth to pay for the infrastructure required to accommodate growth is critical to ensuring growth is self-funding. This means that the cost of the increased capacity in Council’s infrastructure is the responsibility of those requiring the increased capacity and not carried by the people who occupy existing dwellings.

5.3. The legislation allows the Council to recover growth related expenditure for projects undertaken during the previous 10 years as well as future expenditure providing that future expenditure is scheduled in Council’s Long Term Plan.

5.4. The recommended changes to the proposed 2017/18 DCs will have an impact on developments and that impact will vary depending on where growth occurs.

5.5. To provide an indication of the impact of the development contributions on various development areas within the District, the following examples have been prepared. The 2017/18 development contribution rate has also been included for comparison.

Table 2 – Summary of Draft 2018/19 Development Contributions for Example Development Areas
(All figures are inclusive of GST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Sewer</th>
<th>Drainage</th>
<th>Roading</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Draft 2018/19 Total</th>
<th>2017/18 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>7,513</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5,782</td>
<td>12,750</td>
<td>26,562</td>
<td>32,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCAs pay the costs above PLUS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Kaiapoi</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>782</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28,584</td>
<td>34,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kaiapoi</td>
<td>3,008</td>
<td>2,148</td>
<td>6,325</td>
<td>11,687</td>
<td></td>
<td>49,730</td>
<td>49,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>7,325</td>
<td>2,054</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,782</td>
<td>12,750</td>
<td>27,649</td>
<td>27,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>5,092</td>
<td>8,595</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>5,782</td>
<td>12,750</td>
<td>32,489</td>
<td>38,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCAs pay the costs above PLUS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rangiora</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>8,685</td>
<td>7,708</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49,012</td>
<td>56,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Rangiora</td>
<td>4,524</td>
<td>6,320</td>
<td>5,383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48,716</td>
<td>52,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rangiora SPA</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>3,497</td>
<td>5,739</td>
<td>8,577</td>
<td></td>
<td>51,477</td>
<td>55,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>3,565</td>
<td>5,434</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,782</td>
<td>12,750</td>
<td>27,531</td>
<td>30,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCAs pay the costs above PLUS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Woodend</td>
<td>7,159</td>
<td>9,895</td>
<td>6,964</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51,549</td>
<td>56,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend DCA</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,315</td>
<td>33,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka</td>
<td>7,806</td>
<td>18,095</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,782</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>32,786</td>
<td>38,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>2,612</td>
<td>18,095</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,782</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>27,592</td>
<td>32,199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6. The overall financial implication of these changes is dependent on the number of lots that are created and the areas that these lots are created in.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

The Local Government Act 2002 Subpart 5 relates to Development Contributions.

6.3. Community Outcomes

This report relates to the following community outcomes:

- There is a safe environment for all.
- Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable, affordable and sustainable.
- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable, and affordable manner.

Kelly LaValley
Project Delivery Manager
Attachment i
Draft Development Contributions Schedule
Development Contributions:

All contribution charges are shown inclusive of GST. Council’s full Development Contribution Policy should be consulted when determining an assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Adopted Annual Plan 2017-18</th>
<th>Draft 18-19 Long Term Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WATER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust</td>
<td>2,822</td>
<td>5,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernside</td>
<td>1,862</td>
<td>1,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrymere</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>2,564</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Kaiapoi DCA</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kaiapoi DCA</td>
<td>2,421</td>
<td>3,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>1,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka</td>
<td>3,876</td>
<td>3,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>4,929</td>
<td>7,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford 1</td>
<td>9,711</td>
<td>4,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford 2</td>
<td>4,356</td>
<td>6,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poyntzs Road</td>
<td>1,724</td>
<td>1,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>6,802</td>
<td>5,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rangiora DCA</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rangiora DCA - Kippenberger Ave</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Rangiora Outline Development Plan Area</td>
<td>2,271</td>
<td>4,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rangiora</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>1,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook (m2)</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerhill</td>
<td>7,185</td>
<td>6,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi</td>
<td>6,097</td>
<td>8,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend - Tuahiwi water</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>1,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach</td>
<td>2,579</td>
<td>1,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Eyreton</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>3,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>Drainage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>1,993</td>
<td>3,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEWER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Districts - Ocean Outfall</td>
<td>9,240</td>
<td>5,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>2,030</td>
<td>2,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Kaiapoi</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kaiapoi</td>
<td>1,978</td>
<td>2,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East North East Kaiapoi Reticulation</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rangiora</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todds Rd Business Zone (per hectare)</td>
<td>166,095</td>
<td>166,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook Stage 2 (m2)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rangiora DCA Other Properties</td>
<td>7,786</td>
<td>8,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rangiora DCA (Gilberthorpes)</td>
<td>2,062</td>
<td>2,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner West Rangiora DCA</td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>1,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rangiora DCA</td>
<td>3,436</td>
<td>3,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Rangiora DCA</td>
<td>5,919</td>
<td>6,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernside</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville, Ohoka, Swannanoa - new properties</td>
<td>13,134</td>
<td>12,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville, Ohoka, Swannanoa - existing properties wishing to connect</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td>1,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach</td>
<td>1,893</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Woodend DCA</td>
<td>6,407</td>
<td>7,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Sewer</td>
<td>3,323</td>
<td>2,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DRAINAGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rangiora</td>
<td>9,182</td>
<td>7,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rangiora DCA</td>
<td>4,363</td>
<td>5,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Area 1</td>
<td>Area 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Rangiora - Enverton Drive East</td>
<td>5,383</td>
<td>5,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Rangiora - Enverton Drive / Ballarat Rd</td>
<td>4,276</td>
<td>2,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook (m2)</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>9.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todds Rd Business Zone (per hectare)</td>
<td>57,500.00</td>
<td>57,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Urban</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Woodend DCA</td>
<td>12,642</td>
<td>9,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend DCA</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>2,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend DCA (Commercial) (m2)</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>8.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Kaiapoi</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Kaiapoi Commercial (m2)</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kaiapoi</td>
<td>6,325</td>
<td>6,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Road ODP</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROADING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>6,302</td>
<td>5,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook (m2)</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Woodend</td>
<td>6,864</td>
<td>6,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rangiora DCA</td>
<td>3,474</td>
<td>3,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kaiapoi DCA</td>
<td>5,931</td>
<td>5,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kaiapoi DCA - new collector Rd</td>
<td>5,756</td>
<td>5,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi North</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Rangiora (West Belt Extension to Townsend Road)</td>
<td>8,577</td>
<td>8,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESERVES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Zones</td>
<td>2,089</td>
<td>1,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Zones</td>
<td>12,750</td>
<td>12,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. SUMMARY

1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval for the changes to the Draft Development Contribution Policy 2018/19 for consultation as part of the 2018-2028 Long-Term Plan.

1.2 The existing Development Contribution Policy was adopted for the 2015/16 financial year, with minor amendments made in 2017/18. The policy is required to be reviewed in full every three years.

1.3 Legal advice has been sought to clarify matters relating to: vehicle crossing permits, payment of development contributions (DC) invoice, section 208 LGA powers, Council’s liability.

1.4 As part of the 2018-28 Long-Term Plan consultation, there is an opportunity to address some inconsistencies within the policy.

1.5 Changes were made to the following main areas:

- Amending section 4.6.3 (Timing of payment of contributions) to allow Council to collect payment in full of DCs at the time of granting consent (resource or building) or providing service connection.

- Flagging changes will be needed to be made by Council regarding future collection of financial contributions as part of Government’s reform of resource-related legislation in 2017.

- Population forecasting: recalculation of household unit equivalents (HUE) by adjusting estimated (2017) and projected (2018) resident populations.

- Schedule 3: updating formula definitions of development contribution area (DCA for water (3.1), sewer (3.2) and roading (3.4))

- Schedule 3: updating drainage section (3.3) by insertion of new section (3.3.5) and associated formula accounting for DCA areas.
Schedule 3: updating drainage section (3.3) by simplification of formula for DC rates within Subdivision of Southbrook Industrial Area.

Schedule 3: updating roading section (3.4) by insertion of new section (3.4.2.4) to account for the Southbrook DCA roading scheme DC.

Southbrook (Map: RGA 1) Water: this map was updated to include the Todds Road area as the water works for both the Southbrook and Todds Road areas were combined into a single area with the works benefiting both areas.

Southbrook (Map: RGA 1a) Roading: there has been no change to this area, only the title block has changed as this same map was previously used for water as well.

West Rangiora (Map: RGA 9) Water and Sewer: this map is updated to correct an error in which the southwest portion of this development contribution area was left off of the map.

South West Rangiora (Map: RGA 11) Stormwater and Roading: stormwater has been added to this development contribution area. Stormwater was previously shown for the larger West Rangiora development contribution area (Map: RGA 9A) and the development contribution had included additional work that serves the development area to the west and northwest (to Oxford Road) of that shown in this map. However, as the works for the area beyond what is shown in this proposed map are out beyond the 10-year period, the development contribution area was reduced to reflect the service area for the projects in the budget in the LTP period.

Todd's Rd Business Zone (Map: RGA 13): the title for this map has been updated to remove water from the area as water is now included in Map: RGA 1 (noted above).

Definition of allotment and dwellinghouse.

1.1. There were some areas that were deliberately not addressed in this policy revision as they were considered to be major changes, therefore will be looked at next financial year.

Collection of DCs at the first available opportunity (e.g. collecting the water DC for the whole of a subdivision when a new main is connected to the existing reticulation).

- Included with consideration of the above would be DC deferment of invoice and/or payment if collecting at the first opportunity and there is a logical point for invoicing and payment (e.g. deferring payment for the whole of the subdivision from the time of the new main connection to the existing reticulation until Section 224C Certificate is issued for the subdivision). Criteria as to how deferral discretion would be exercised would need to be developed.

Minimising Council liability of carrying risk and cost of development: incorporation of mechanisms such as being able to recover DCs as debt.
Clarification of Council’s powers set out in LGA section 208.

1.2. A full (every three year) review of the DC Policy will be undertaken in the 2018/19 financial year.

Attachments:
   a. Draft 2018/19 Development Contribution Policy (with track changes)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:
   a. Receives report No 180111001799.
   b. Approves the Draft Development Contribution Policy 2018/19 for consultation as a Special Consultative Procedure as part of the 2018-2028 Long-Term Plan.
   c. Notes that this update has been undertaken through the Development Contribution Internal Review Group.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval for the changes to the Draft Development Contribution Policy 2018/19 for consultation as part of the 2018-2028 Long-Term Plan.

3.2. The existing Development Contribution Policy was adopted for the 2015/16 financial year. No update was made in 2016/17, however, minor amendments were made in 2017/18. The Policy is required to be reviewed in full every three years.

3.3. The Development Contribution Internal Review Group met on 6th December 2017 to discuss the main points to be reviewed and to delegate the policy updating process to a DC internal review group consisting of:

   • Kelly LaValley (Project Delivery Manager); Geoff Meadows (Policy Manager); Mike O’Connell (Senior Policy Analyst); Joanne McBride (Development Manager); Chris Brown (Community Greenspace Manager).

3.4. As part of the 2018-2028 Long-Term Plan consultation there is an opportunity to address some inconsistencies within the policy.

3.5. A couple of issues have been identified whilst implementing this policy over the last financial year, particularly in regards to the following areas:

   • Timing of payment of contributions: this section (4.6.3) has been amended to allow Council to invoice and collect payment in full of DCs at the time of granting consent (resource or building) or providing service connection.
   • Maps: some of these needed to be updated to reflect growth pattern changes and service areas for proposed growth projects, particularly in wider Rangiora.
3.6. Some further clarification regarding for standard planning terms were also considered to be a worthwhile addition to this policy:

∑ Definitions of allotment and dwellinghouse.

3.7. There were also some issues that were highlighted in 2017 that were thought to be too broad to be covered in this update and will be covered next financial year. These were:

∑ Legal advice provided to Council allows for a customer to be invoiced at the first trigger of a resource consent, building consent or service connection. This is different than the current approach of invoicing at application for a s224c certificate or a code compliance certificate. Changing the point at which DCs are invoiced would require an amendment, by way of special consultative procedure.

   o Requiring DCs at an early stage minimises the risk of challenge to the requirement for DCs.

   o This approach would also require that deferment of the DC invoice and/or payment be considered. Council would need to develop criteria in the Policy so as to how such a deferral decision would be exercised.

3.8. Further issues were discussed but were thought to not require any change to the existing DC policy and can await a full legal review in the 2018/19 FY. These were:

∑ The ability to issue a vehicle crossing permit as the basis for collecting development contributions. Council staff had legal advice confirming that this permit cannot be used to require a DC as it is not provided for under the Local Government Act. They cannot, therefore, provide a trigger for delaying development pending payment of DCs.

3.9. Table 1 shows the main changes that have been incorporated into the draft 2018/19 Development Contribution Policy. A full copy of the policy with tracked changes has also been appended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section Number</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Page Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>Financial contributions</td>
<td>A paragraph added to flag changes to Council's current cost recovery processes</td>
<td>The Resource Legislation Amendment Act 2017 will require financial contributions to be phased out by April 2022</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td>Population forecasting</td>
<td>Updated to latest population statistics to recalculate number of HUEs</td>
<td>Latest Stats NZ data used for most relevance</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Definitions</td>
<td>Definition of 'allotment and dwellinghouse'</td>
<td>Key words in policy not previously defined</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.3</td>
<td>Timing of Payment of Contributions</td>
<td>Change to invoicing for DCs at time of granting a consent or providing service connection</td>
<td>To achieve consistency of when to invoice and ensure payment is made on all BC’s.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Schedule 3.3.5

**Outline Development Plan**

New section added including new and updated formulas

- Improved derivation of drainage scheme costs of development unique to a particular development

Page Number: 43

### Schedule 3.3.5.1

**DCA Drainage Scheme Development Contribution**

New formula included

- A new calculation for a drainage DCA DC and the Southbrook Roading DC is required

Page Number: 43

### Schedule 3.3.5.2

**Rangiora / Southbrook stormwater**

Updated formula (and section – previously 3.3.4.2)

- The calculation was revised to reflect calculation of the DC by the area developed whether this be by subdivision or development.

Page Number: 43

### Schedule 3.4.2.3

**Outline Development Plan Area (excl. Southbrook)**

Updated formula for the calculation of DCs in ODPs.

- For ODPs, the estimated number of additional lots is taken as the total over the area, rather than the number at the end of the LTP period. This is to reflect that growth projects and costs in an ODP area often cover a period greater than the LTP period

### Schedule 3.4.2.4

**Southbrook DCA Roading Scheme DC**

New formula included

- The calculation for the Southbrook Roading DC has been separated out from the ODP calculation as it is based on area rather than number of additional lots

Page Number: 46

### Map RGA1

**Southbrook water**

Alteration to map boundary

- Adjustment needed to accommodate commercial growth in Todds Road ODP area

Page Number: n/a

### Map RGA1A

**Southbrook roading**

Alteration to title block

- The roading area has not changed, however, the title block needed to be updated to reflect water being shown on a separate map

Page Number: n/a

### Map RGA9

**West Rangiora water and sewer**

Alteration to title block

- Adjustment needed to account for growth area that was inadvertently omitted from previous map

Page Number: n/a

### Map RGA11

**South West Rangiora stormwater**

Inclusion of ‘stormwater’ service to map title

- Adjustment needed to ring fence the area serviced by the planned stormwater management area in the South West Rangiora ODP. This has been separated from the remaining West Rangiora stormwater projects, which are budgeted for beyond the 10-year LTP period.

Page Number: n/a

### Map RGA13

**Todds Rd Business Zone sewer and stormwater**

Alteration to title block

- The sewer and stormwater areas have not changed, rather water was removed from this map as it has been included in Map RGA1 as noted above

Page Number: n/a

---

**Table 1: Main changes between 2017/18 DC Policy and Draft 2018/19 DC Policy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section Number</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Page Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 3.3.5</td>
<td>Outline Development Plan</td>
<td>New section added including new and updated formulas</td>
<td>Improved derivation of drainage scheme costs of development unique to a particular development</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 3.3.5.1</td>
<td>DCA Drainage Scheme Development Contribution</td>
<td>New formula included</td>
<td>A new calculation for a drainage DCA DC and the Southbrook Roading DC is required</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 3.3.5.2</td>
<td>Rangiora / Southbrook stormwater</td>
<td>Updated formula (and section – previously 3.3.4.2)</td>
<td>The calculation was revised to reflect calculation of the DC by the area developed whether this be by subdivision or development.</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 3.4.2.3</td>
<td>Outline Development Plan Area (excl. Southbrook)</td>
<td>Updated formula for the calculation of DCs in ODPs.</td>
<td>For ODPs, the estimated number of additional lots is taken as the total over the area, rather than the number at the end of the LTP period. This is to reflect that growth projects and costs in an ODP area often cover a period greater than the LTP period</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 3.4.2.4</td>
<td>Southbrook DCA Roading Scheme DC</td>
<td>New formula included</td>
<td>The calculation for the Southbrook Roading DC has been separated out from the ODP calculation as it is based on area rather than number of additional lots</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map RGA1</td>
<td>Southbrook water</td>
<td>Alteration to map boundary</td>
<td>Adjustment needed to accommodate commercial growth in Todds Road ODP area</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map RGA1A</td>
<td>Southbrook roading</td>
<td>Alteration to title block</td>
<td>The roading area has not changed, however, the title block needed to be updated to reflect water being shown on a separate map</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map RGA9</td>
<td>West Rangiora water and sewer</td>
<td>Alteration to title block</td>
<td>Adjustment needed to account for growth area that was inadvertently omitted from previous map</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map RGA11</td>
<td>South West Rangiora stormwater</td>
<td>Inclusion of ‘stormwater’ service to map title</td>
<td>Adjustment needed to ring fence the area serviced by the planned stormwater management area in the South West Rangiora ODP. This has been separated from the remaining West Rangiora stormwater projects, which are budgeted for beyond the 10-year LTP period.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map RGA13</td>
<td>Todds Rd Business Zone sewer and stormwater</td>
<td>Alteration to title block</td>
<td>The sewer and stormwater areas have not changed, rather water was removed from this map as it has been included in Map RGA1 as noted above</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3.10. The Development Contribution Internal Review Group met again on 14th December to agree to amendments required to the draft policy.
3.11. **Options**

3.12. The Council has two main options:

1. The Council could approve the Draft 2018/19 Development Contribution Policy to be consulted on as part of the 2018-2028 Long-Term Plan. This is the recommended option.

2. The Council could decide not to consult on the changes in the Draft 2018/19 Development Contribution Policy as they could be considered potentially minor in nature.

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

Community views have not yet been sought on this project, however the recommended option is to consult on the DC Policy to formalise a change to allow collection of DCs when consents are granted, as part of a Special Consultative Procedure within the 2018-2028 Long-Term Plan.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. The changes in the Draft 2018/19 Development Contribution Policy aim to provide clarification and ensure the growth component of any capital projects are correctly levied against new developments.

5.2. There is little risk involved with adopting this Draft 2018/19 Development Contribution Policy that staff can foresee.

5.3. The development contributions schedules that are referred to within the policy are provided in another report to be presented to the Council on 30 January 2018 (Trim reference 180111002046)

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Legislation**

6.3. The Local Government Act 2002 (LGA2002) introduced powers to levy development contributions. The power to require contributions is set out in Section 198 of LGA2002:

6.4. A territorial authority may require a development contribution to be made to the territorial authority when:

   (a) a resource consent is granted under the Resource Management Act 1991 for a development within its district:

   (b) a building consent is granted under the Building Act 2004 for building work situated in its district (whether by the territorial authority or a building consent authority):

   (c) an authorisation for a service connection is granted.

6.5. LGA2002 Section 198 (4A) also provides for the levying of development contributions when granting a certificate of acceptance (under the Building Act 2004 Section 98), if a development contribution or contributions would have been payable on the building consent had one been obtained for the work that is the subject of the certificate of acceptance.
6.6. The principles which underpin decision-making with respect to development contributions are set out in LGA2002 Section 197AB.

6.7. **Community Outcomes**

All of the community outcomes are considered to be relevant to ensure that growth is catered for and funded appropriately within the District.

Written by

Mike O’Connell
**Senior Policy Analyst**

and

Kelly LaValley
**Project Delivery Manager**
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1 INTRODUCTION

Development contributions are the contributions that the Council levies on the developers of new properties, and new development that place additional demand on infrastructure in the District. These funds are used to provide the additional reserves, roads and/or water, sewer and stormwater services needed to meet the demands generated by the residents who move into these new developments. Contributions are, therefore, used to cater for the growth in demand for infrastructure that comes from new properties or activities.

This Development Contributions Policy sets out the basis on which development contributions will be charged. The aim of the Policy is to share the cost of infrastructure fairly between the owners of existing properties, and the owners and developers of new properties or developments.

This document provides the Council’s policy base which states what it will do in relation to levying development contributions. Accompanying it are the Schedules and related maps. The Schedules provide the basis on which various development contributions are calculated, the amounts budgeted and the amounts payable for each contribution for each scheme area and development contribution area across the District.

2 POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 Statutory context

2.1.1 Development contributions

The Local Government Act 2002 (LGA2002) introduced powers to levy development contributions. The power to require contributions is set out in Section 198 of LGA2002:

\[
\text{A territorial authority may require a development contribution to be made to the territorial authority when—}
\]

\[
\text{(a) a resource consent is granted under the Resource Management Act 1991 for a development within its district;}
\]

\[
\text{(b) a building consent is granted under the Building Act 2004 for building work situated in its district (whether by the territorial authority or a building consent authority);}
\]

\[
\text{(c) an authorisation for a service connection is granted.}
\]

LGA2002 Section 198 (4A) also provides for the levying of development contributions when granting a certificate of acceptance (under the Building Act 2004 Section 98), if a development contribution or contributions would have been payable on the building consent had one been obtained for the work that is the subject of the certificate of acceptance.

The principles which underpin decision-making with respect to development contributions are set out in LGA2002 Section 197AB.

2.1.2 Financial contributions

Financial contributions are contributions levied under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). Section 108–(10) of the RMA provides the conditions under which financial contributions can be imposed on resource consents.

Financial contributions, imposed under the District Plan, can be taken to address environmental effects of activities irrespective of whether they result from growth, for example, to pay the costs of services such as roads, water supplies, sewerage and drainage systems which must be developed to address adverse
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effects on the environment. Financial contributions can also be taken to offset adverse effects that may result from developments, as environmental compensation. Financial contributions will be used when the effect of development directly contributes to the need for physical works on Council services and when the effect of the development has not been foreseen in the Long Term Plan (LTP).

Financial contributions are based on actual expenditure. Council’s ability to levy financial contributions is drawn from section 108(2)(a) and section 111 of the Resource Management Act 1991. These sections were repealed by the Resource Legislation Amendment Act 2017 and financial contributions will be phased out by coming into effect on 18 April 2022 by which time a single regime for recovery of all contribution costs will need to be in place.

2.2 Assumptions

2.2.1 Introduction

This Policy uses a range of assumptions and forecasts about population growth, and the demand that will be placed on infrastructure by different types of development. These assumptions assist with planning for growth, and help determine how the cost of growth will be recovered for different types of development.

2.2.2 Population forecasting

The key assumption underpinning this Policy is that the District’s population will continue to grow. The household unit equivalents (HUEs) are the basis upon which development contributions will be assessed. For the purposes of calculating the additional residential HUEs for a given period, the estimated number of households that is anticipated at the end of the LTP period is determined by dividing the projected population by the anticipated average number of people per household across the District. The additional households required to accommodate the projected population is then determined by subtracting the number of households at the beginning of the period from the estimated number at the end of the period.

The 2018/19 Policy is based on the District having a projected population of 71,500 by 30 June 2028, and that an estimated 28,600 HUEs based on the assumption of 2.5 people per household will be required to accommodate this projected population. This projection is consistent with Statistics New Zealand’s medium to high variant projection for the District for 2028.

The following table sets out the anticipated population across the District based on the population projections for 30 June 2028.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Resident Population</th>
<th>Projected Resident Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 June 2018</td>
<td>30 June 2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57,800</td>
<td>74,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,900</td>
<td>74,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.3 Business Zone subdivision

New allotments in Business Zones will be treated for development contributions purposes as for any other new allotment created in any other Zone within the District. Contributions equivalent to 1 HUE will be charged for any new allotment created by subdivision in a Business Zone, and prior to the release of the Section 224C Certificate. Further contributions may be levied on land-use or building consents if the proposed activity will place additional demand on infrastructure.
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2.2.4 District Wide Reserves assumption

A smaller contribution is required for Rural Zones which is made on the assumption that people living in these areas will provide their own local open spaces, but still generate demand for District-wide reserves of various categories.

2.2.5 Network infrastructure assumptions

∑ **General**

It is assumed that all Residential Zone allotments consume the same unit of demand, except as provided for under multi-unit developments and as provided for drainage.

The District will continue to grow in line with population forecasts and new infrastructure assets designed to cater for additional growth-related capacity will be required.

∑ **Water**

As for the general network infrastructure above.

A standard water connection is a 15mm pipe, and that a higher contribution will be levied if a larger connection is requested

∑ **Sewer**

The costs of reticulating, treating and disposing of sewage for lots connected to sewer systems are in proportion to the volume of sewage produced.

No adjustment is made for geographical, sewage strength or seasonal flow variations.

Sewerage disposal assessment is in relative proportion to the inflow of water to the lot, assuming the standard water connection is a 15mm pipe.

Adjustments to contributions payable will be made for connections where the pipe size exceeds the standard connection size.

∑ **Drainage**

The drainage from Residential 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 6A Zone allotments will have the same volume of runoff. Exceptions may occur when developments are undertaken which provide for a significantly higher run-off co-efficient than is anticipated for residential development.

∑ **Roading**

The District’s roading network is a single integrated network, and the components of upgrades and additions represent improvements to strategic and arterial roads on network designed to cater for growth are separate from projects that cater solely for growth and relate to development contributions areas.

Additional growth of allotments in the District will result in additional volumes of vehicle movements, and developers, therefore, should contribute to the cost of providing an appropriate roading network. For planning purposes, the number of vehicle movements per day will be the same regardless of lot size, for a single household unit.

The growth-related component of projected expenditure of strategic and arterial roads as set out in the Council’s Long-Term Plan will provide the basis for calculating the general roading contribution.
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Development contributions will only be sought for roads for the growth component of expenditure on strategic and arterial roads and Development Contribution Areas. The funds required for upgrading local roads will be obtained from other sources.

New allotments created in Business Zones will be charged the same development contributions as for a new allotment created in any other zone. Additional development contributions may be charged on building consents depending on the demand on infrastructure to be generated by the associated activity.
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3 POLICY OBJECTIVE

The Council is levying development contributions to ensure that the growth-related capital expenditure identified in the LTP (future and past expenditure) is appropriately recovered from those who are directly benefiting, rather than having existing ratepayers bear all of the costs. Development contributions will be levied when the effect of the development, or the cumulative effects of developments, contributes to the need for the development of physical works or Council services and when these works or services have been allowed for in the LTP.

4 POLICY STATEMENT

4.1 Definitions

**Allotment** - has the meaning given to it in section 218(2) and (3), Resource Management Act 1991.

**Development Contribution Area (DCA)** – means a mapped area within the District which defines an area for which specific development contributions will be payable. Development Contribution Area maps are included with the Schedules that accompany this Policy.

**Dwellinghouse** – means any lot, or habitable structure on that lot, occupied or intended to be occupied in part or in whole as a residence and may include one additional physically separated dwellinghouse that is no more than 75 square metres in gross floor area and is located within 30 metres of the primary dwellinghouse.

**Eastern District Sewer Scheme (EDSS)** – means the Ocean Outfall and all four wastewater treatment plants (Kaiapoi, Rangiora, Woodend and Waikuku Beach) that discharge directly or indirectly into the Ocean Outfall under one discharge consent. The sewer development contribution has an additional component if the development is connected to the Eastern Districts Sewer Scheme. Developments connecting to the EDSS are assessed as an EDSS DC as well as a reticulation DC based on the geographical location within the EDSS. The EDSS DC includes expenditures for both the ocean outfall, the four wastewater treatment plants and associated connecting trunk pipelines.

**Household unit equivalent (HUE)** – means a “unit of demand” that equates to the typical demand for infrastructure by an average household unit assessed at 2.5 persons per household.

**Household unit** - means a building or part of a building intended to be used as an independent residence, including, but not limited to, apartments, semi-detached or detached houses, units, and town houses. For the purposes of calculating development contributions, a dwellinghouse with two separate self-contained areas consented for family use only will be treated as one household unit. In addition, a secondary independent dwellinghouse as defined in the District Plan shall not be treated as a household unit for the purposes of calculating Development Contributions. To avoid any doubt, visitor accommodation units that are separately unit-titled shall be considered as separate household units.

*Note: If a subdivision results in the principal dwellinghouse on one lot and a secondary dwellinghouse on a separate lot, development contributions will apply to the secondary dwellinghouse as if it were a new principal dwellinghouse.*

**Multi-unit residential development** – means any development involving more than one household unit (as defined above) per allotment including flats, townhouses, retirement villages and traveller’s accommodation. Contributions will be levied on the increase in the number of dwellinghouses over those already existing at the commencement of the development.

**Multi-unit non-residential development** – means a development involving more than one self-contained structure, either attached or separate from other structures on the same allotment, designed to be used for non-residential activity.
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Note: Multi-unit non-residential developments will be treated for development contribution purposes as if subdivision had occurred, i.e. that each unit will attract the contributions equivalent to those to be paid for 1 HUE for the district-wide, District Plan Zone and DCA specific contributions, as well as relevant network infrastructure connections at the time building consents are lodged irrespective of location within the District.

Notional lot – means an area of land within a site that meets the minimum lot area and dimensions for the Zone, and is shown by defined boundaries, legal or otherwise, which encompasses a proposed building platform for a dwellinghouse or an existing or second or subsequent dwellinghouse.

Reserve – means land that is vested in and managed by the Waimakariri District Council, under the Reserves Act 1977.

Residential activity – means a building or part of a building that is intended to be lived in that does not meet the definition of a household unit or visitor accommodation. This includes but is not limited to the portion of a retirement village or residential health care facility where 24-hour on-site medical support to residents is provided.

Note: To assess the HUEs for residential activity, the number of people to be accommodated in the facility that meets this definition should be divided by the number of people per household that is used to determine the number of HUEs for development contributions purposes for the 10 years under consideration.

Run-off coefficient – the anticipated proportion run-off from impervious surfaces from an allotment and is the basis for assessing the impact that a development will have on the stormwater infrastructure. The average run-off coefficient for a 600m² Greenfields development is 55 percent and this is the basis for establishing the stormwater HUE.

Section 224C Certificate – means the certificate that is issued under section 224(c) of the RMA to formalise the establishment of a new allotment. New allotments may also be created by way of RMA section 226, and Local Government Act 1974 s306.

Vehicle crossing – means an area of land from the carriageway up to and including the road frontage of any site or allotment that is used by vehicles to access a site or allotment from the carriageway.

Zoned – means the various areas identified as zones shown on the Waimakariri District Plan: District Plan Maps.
4.2 Types of development contributions charged

4.2.1 Contributions levied on new allotments anywhere in the District

The District-wide development contributions are based on assumptions about the increase in population anticipated over the period covered by the policy and the number of additional “units of demand” that will be needed to accommodate the increased population. District-wide contributions are collected for roading and reserves.

When determining the amount to be paid in development contributions for roading to cater for growth, the Council also takes into account the amount of the total expenditure needed to meet any existing deficiency or shortcomings in the infrastructure. This means that not all the cost of a particular project is necessarily collected from development contributions.

This Policy provides the Council with the ability to take contributions for past growth-related expenditure incurred during the previous 10 years, and growth-related spending over the next 10 years.

4.2.2 Development Contribution Areas

This Policy includes maps and details concerning the specific contributions that are payable for each of the DCAs. These contributions relate to infrastructure such as water, sewer, roading, and drainage that is provided specifically for a particular area, and are spread over the estimated number of new lots in each area. Development contributions for DCAs are levied in addition to other contributions.

Schedules and DCA maps accompany this Policy.

Works schedules identifying the projects to be funded or part funded by development contributions are posted on the Council’s website.
4.3 Reserves contributions

4.3.1 Introduction

The Council aims to develop a reserves network within the District to enable recreation activities to be undertaken, to retain areas with conservation value and to develop sports surfaces for the purpose of encouraging physical as well as passive activity.

4.3.2 Provision for reserves contributions

The use of reserves development contributions is for the land purchase and development of for reserves. The two main types of reserves are those that are used by the community as a whole, and those that are used more often by people living in the immediate vicinity of the reserve. For this reason the reserves schedule is divided into neighbourhood reserves and District-wide reserves. While residents in urban areas will likely make the most use of neighbourhood reserves, people living in rural areas will be likely to make use of District-wide reserves. Accordingly the formula for calculating contributions recognises the zone the residential development is in.

Development contributions payable for reserves are also subject to the statutory maxima set out in LGA2002 Section 203, namely that:

"(1) Development contributions for reserves must not exceed the greater of –

(a) 7.5% of the value of the additional allotments created by a subdivision; and

(b) the value equivalent of 20 square metres of land for each additional household unit or accommodation unit created by the development.

For the purpose of Section 203(1)(a), the Council will assess the value of additional allotments created by a subdivision by reference to the land value recorded for similar allotments in the vicinity of the subdivision in the District valuation roll. The council will assess the value equivalent of 20 square metres of land for the purposes of Section 203(1)(b) by reference to the value of reserve land (including all improvements thereon) in the vicinity of the subdivision. In each case the assessment of value shall be the Council’s discretion.

LGA2002 Section 198 (3) also specifies that “…reserves does not include land that forms or is to form part of any road or is used or is to be used for stormwater management purposes.”

Open space within subdivisions which provide walkways/cycleways are regarded as road reserves and are excluded from calculations with respect to the development contributions payable for reserves.

4.3.3 Land in lieu of cash for reserve development contributions

The Council will generally take development contributions towards providing reserves for open space and recreation in cash. In some circumstances the Council may, at its sole discretion consider taking land in lieu of, or in addition to, cash. Where it does so, any land taken will be valued in accordance with the Council’s land valuation policy.

4.3.4 Reserve land valuation policy

Land valuation for the purpose of assessing the value for land to be vested as reserves in lieu of cash development contributions will be determined by the Council on the basis of the market value of the land.
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at the time the application for subdivision consent is lodged. A request for a reserve land valuation will be made by the Council to an independent valuer within 20 working days from the date the resource consent application is lodged with the Council. The cost of the initial valuation will be met by the developer. The Council is not required to provide an updated valuation before the issue of a section 224 (c) certificate.

The valuation of reserve land for vesting must be carried out according to the following valuation principles:

∑ the value of any improvements to the land will be excluded;
∑ an appropriate adjustment will be made on account of any easements or other rights to which the land is subject;
∑ where there are different density zonings within a subdivision or outline development plan, the value will be based on the lowest density zoning;
∑ the value will include any rights and configuration given by the consents already granted; and
∑ the value will be based on the highest and best use for the particular parcel of land valued (based on the lowest density zoning).

Unless otherwise agreed in writing between the Council and developer, the valuation of reserve land will occur in a manner consistent with the Public Works Act 1981 and relevant case law.

If the developer and the Council cannot agree on the valuation of the land to be vested, either party may, by written notice to the other party, refer the matter to independent valuation. If the parties do not agree on the valuer within 5 business days of either party giving a notice of valuation, either party may request that the Arbitrators' and Mediators' Institute of New Zealand appoint the valuer as soon as is reasonably practicable. The onus on the independent valuer will be to seek the correct valuation rather than to mediate a mid-point answer. The findings of the independent valuation as to the value of the land will be the final determination of value for the purposes of this policy.

The cost of this further valuation will be met equally by the developer and the Council.

If having received the final determination of the value of the land proposed to be vested, the Council determines that, at that price the land does not represent a prudent acquisition for the wider community and the Council's broader portfolio of open spaces, it may, at its discretion, notify the developer that it chooses to take the development contribution for reserves in money rather than in land.

If having received the final determination of the value of the land proposed to be vested, the developer determines that it does not wish to sell the land at that price, the developer may, at its discretion, notify the Council that it chooses to pay the development contribution for reserves in cash rather than in land.

Notices given by the Council or the developer, as referred to in the previous two paragraphs, must be given to the other party no later than 20 working days after the final determination of the value of land proposed to be vested is issued.

4.3.5 Circumstances for refunds or reductions for reserves contributions

In the event that planned reserve developments or alternative upgrades are not undertaken, then development contributions will be refunded, after allowing for the associated administrative costs.

Development contributions are being applied to general reserve purposes as specified under Section 205 of the LGA2002 not for specific reserves under Section 210 of the LGA2002.
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If the Council does not use the land for reserve purposes within 10 years of acquiring the land that has been vested to Council, it will be returned to the developer.
4.4 Network infrastructure development contributions

4.4.1 Introduction

There are separate schedules for the assessment of development contributions for water, sewerage, drainage and roading but each policy has been developed on the broad principle that costs associated with the development of assets, to meet the demands associated with growth of the population, should be spread as equitably as practicable among the beneficiaries of those developments.

The growth of the District and the resulting additional connections to the system will increase the demand on existing services. The Council considers it should be developing long term sustainable solutions to cater for users of today and tomorrow, therefore any scheme it develops or extends will have a planned growth component within it.

4.4.2 Water

4.4.2.1 Introduction

The Council provides potable water to avoid the risk of water-borne diseases affecting public health.

The Council operates several different water supply schemes and while the policies are methodology for calculating development contributions are the same for each scheme, the actual level of contribution varies because of different growth and planned expenditure.

The policy differentiates between residential, non-residential and DCA developments and there is a different basis for assessing the development contribution payable for each type of development.

The policy also provides for the levying of additional contributions where the size of the pipe required to service a development is larger than the standard 15mm water pipe. Provision is nevertheless made for the applicant to negotiate the connection rate where the applicant can show larger pipe size is required for fire-fighting or fire prevention.

Schedule 3 details the different amounts applicable to developments within each scheme.

4.4.2.2 Basis for assessment

Current users and future users benefit equally from the maximum capacity of a water supply system. Based on the assumption that one current user will consume the same amount of system capacity as a future user, they should equally share the cost of providing that maximum capacity.

Residential Zones:

The unit of demand relating to the water systems is the average number of litres per day consumed by a household. Each additional household increases the consumption of water by approximately 2,000 litres per day.

Growth in water consumption volumes and the system’s maximum capacity has been translated into a HUE for the purposes of planning and calculating development contributions. Each new lot established will be charged one development contribution as per the accompanying Schedule. Any additional dwellinghouse established (except a secondary dwelling as permitted under the District Plan) on the same lot will be assessed as one HUE and charged a development contribution as per the attached Schedule.

Rural Zones:

The contribution is assessed on the same basis as for residential zones.
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Business Zones (excluding Southbrook):

For these lots, the contribution is payable in two parts. Firstly, when each new lot is created, a contribution equal to the Residential contribution will be charged. If a larger than standard 15mm pipe connection is required there will be an additional cost. This contribution will be in direct relation to the size of the water inflow pipe. See accompanying schedule for the formula.

Southbrook:

For these lots, the contribution is assessed based on the area of the block being subdivided or developed less the area of land used for roading and stormwater utilities.

In calculating the area of lots being subdivided or developed, the total block being subdivided or developed shall be counted.

4.4.2.3 Circumstances for refunds or reductions for water contributions

In the event that planned system upgrades, or alternative upgrades, are not undertaken, then development contributions will be refunded, after allowing for the cost of investigating the upgrade options.

In the case of the Southbrook DCA development, where a subdivision results in a substantial balance block which is expected to be developed at a later date, the Council may defer charging water development contributions in respect of the balance block until such time as further subdivision or building or connection occurs in respect of the balance block (whichever is the earlier). This discretion will only be available where the area of the balance block is at least 50% of the area of the original block as at 1 July 2007.

Other than as detailed above, there will be no postponements of payments or remissions of payments.

4.4.3 Sewer

4.4.3.1 Introduction

The Council provides reticulated sewer treatment and disposal systems to achieve high quality public health and to minimise adverse effects on the receiving environment. There is an expectation from Maori and the community that high environmental standards will be met.

The Council operates seven different sewerage schemes (areas) - Eastern District, Oxford, Swannanoa, Ohoka Meadows, Mandeville, Fernside and Loburn Lea, and while the policies and methodology for calculating Development Contributions are the same for each scheme, the actual level of contribution varies because of different growth and the level of planned expenditure.

Schedule 3 details the different amounts applicable to developments within each area.

4.4.3.2 Basis for assessment for treatment and disposal costs and reticulation costs

Current users and future users benefit equally from the maximum capacity of a sewerage system. Based on the assumption that one current user will consume the same amount of system capacity as a future user, they should equally share the cost of providing that maximum capacity.

Residential Zones:
The unit of demand relating to the sewerage system is the volume of sewage to be treated and disposed of off the site it is generated from. Each additional residential household adds approximately 1,380 litres of sewage per day. Growth in sewage volumes and the system’s maximum capacity has been translated into the equivalent demand for the typical household.
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Each new residential lot established will be charged one sewerage development contribution as per the attached Schedule. Any additional dwellinghouse, or multi-unit development established on the same lot, will be subsequently charged additional sewerage development contributions as per the attached Schedule depending on the number of additional dwelling units involved.

**Rural Zones:**
The contribution is assessed on the same basis as for residential zones.

**Business Zones (excluding Southbrook):**
For these lots the contribution is payable in two parts:
(i) When each new lot is created, a contribution according to the formula for residential zone contribution will be charged.
(ii) If a larger water inflow pipe is requested then a further contribution will be sought for sewage disposal. This contribution will be in direct relation to the size of the water inflow pipe – see attached schedule for the formula.

**Southbrook:**
For these lots, the contribution is assessed based on the area of the block being subdivided or developed less the area of land used for roading and stormwater utilities.

In calculating the area of lots being subdivided or developed, the total block being subdivided or developed shall be counted.

The funding costs associated with the Southbrook DCA sewer scheme development are met from drainage rates.

**4.4.3.3 Circumstances for refunds or reductions for sewer contributions**

In the case of the Southbrook DCA development, where a subdivision results in a substantial balance block which is expected to be developed at a later date, the Council may defer charging sewer development contributions in respect of the balance block until such time as further subdivision or building or connection occurs in respect of the balance block (whichever is the earlier). This discretion will only be available where the area of the balance block is at least 50% of the area of the original block as at 1 July 2007.

Other than as detailed above, there will be no postponements of payments or remissions of payments.

**4.4 Drainage**

**4.4.1 Introduction**

The Council provides drainage systems to achieve high quality public health and to minimise adverse effects on the receiving environment. Effective drainage systems and networks remove a constraint on land development.

There is an expectation from Maori and the community for high environmental standards to be met.

The Council operates five urban drainage areas and eight rural drainage areas. The methodology for calculating development contributions are the same for each scheme, but the actual level of contribution varies depending on the growth component.

Schedule 3 details the different amounts applicable to developments within each area.
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4.4.2 Basis for assessment

Current users and future users benefit equally from the maximum capacity of a drainage system. Based on the assumption that one current user will need the same amount of system capacity as a future user, they should equally share the cost of providing that maximum capacity.

Residential 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 6A Zones:
The unit of demand relating to drainage systems is the peak run off, measured in cubic metres per second, to cope with a 5-year storm. Each additional household increases the potential run off into the reticulated drainage network by approximately 8 litres per second. Growth in the system’s maximum capacity has been translated into a ‘per lot’ equivalent for the purposes of planning and calculating development contributions. Each new lot established will be charged one HUE as per the accompanying Schedule.

Rural and Residential 4 Zones:
No development contribution for drainage is being sought from new subdivisions in these zones on the basis that development will not significantly impact on the level of run-off from the land.

Business Zones (excluding Southbrook DCA):
For these lots, the contribution is payable when each new lot is created, a contribution equal to the residential zone contribution will be charged.

Southbrook DCA:
For these lots, the contribution is calculated based on the area of the block being subdivided or developed, but excludes that part of a block which is assessed as having been developed.

4.4.3 Circumstances for refunds or reductions for drainage contributions

In the event that planned system upgrades, or alternative upgrades, are not undertaken, development contributions will be refunded, after allowing for the costs of investigating the upgrade options and associated administrative costs.

Other than as detailed above, there will be no postponements of payments or remissions of payments.

4.4.5 Roading

4.4.5.1 Introduction

The Council provides for growth of the District roading network to ensure people have access, and to contribute to a healthy community.

The growth-related component of projected expenditure on strategic and arterial roads as set out in the Council’s Long-Term Plan will provide the basis for calculating the general roading contribution.

4.4.5.2 Basis for assessment

There are two types of roading developments identified which will be funded by development contributions. These are for the general contribution and developments in DCAs.

In recognition of the fact that some of these works will assist in remedying some existing deficiencies in the roading network and that there is a renewal component to some of these works, the Council has apportioned only part of the costs of each project to growth.

Schedule 3 details the different amounts applicable to developments within each DCA.
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4.4.5.3 Circumstances for refunds or reductions for roading contributions

In the event that planned transport network upgrades, or alternative upgrades, are not undertaken development contributions will be refunded, after allowing for the costs of investigating the upgrade options and associated administrative costs.

Other than as detailed above, there will be no postponement of payments or reimbursement of payments.
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4.5 Community infrastructure development contributions

4.5.1 Introduction

Community infrastructure is essential to the ongoing economic, social, cultural and environmental wellbeing of the community. This infrastructure provides opportunities for members of the community and visitors to the District to participate in activities and recreation, provide service to others and to participate in life-long learning experiences.

Community infrastructure for which development contributions may be levied is defined in LGA2002 Section 197 (2) as:

(a) community centres or halls for the use of a local community or neighbourhood, and the land on which they are or will be situated:

(b) play equipment that is located on a neighbourhood reserve:

(c) toilets for use by the public.

Community Infrastructure is those services under the control and management of the Waimakariri District Council, but the levying of development contributions for these is limited to:

\[ \sum \text{Play equipment on neighbourhood reserves} \]

\[ \sum \text{Public toilets} \]

4.5.2 Basis for assessment

Community Infrastructure provides benefits for future residents and the existing community. It is therefore equitable to share these between the owners of future and existing properties and the costs will be allocated on a per household basis. Each project has been assessed to ascertain the amount attributable to growth and the amount attributed to current dwellinghouses.

4.5.2.1 Circumstances for refunds or reductions community infrastructure

In the event that planned community infrastructure upgrades are not undertaken, or alternative upgrades are not completed, then development contributions will be refunded, after allowing for the costs of investigating the upgrade options and associated administrative costs.

Other than as detailed above, there will be no postponements of payments or remissions of payments.

Where the Council and a developer agree to the transfer of community infrastructure assets to the Council which will have benefits to the community and which would have otherwise been provided for by way of community infrastructure development contributions, the Council may agree to a reduction in the community infrastructure contribution to acknowledge the benefit.
4.6 Administration

4.6.1 Basis for assessment

The detailed basis for assessment for development contributions is explained in the formula for each contribution. There are two broad groups of formula. Those that apply to services and facilities for which benefit will accrue to the occupants of new allotments and/or new household units anywhere in the District with the costs are apportioned across the whole district, and include roading and reserves. The second group has benefits for a defined group of users, for which the costs are apportioned to the direct beneficiary and include sewer, water and drainage. These are set out in the respective schedules accompanying to this Policy.

4.6.2 The application of HUEs

All new allotments irrespective of zone will attract development contributions payable for one HUE at the time that the subdivision occurs. Assessments will be made of all development proposals either at the time that a resource consent or building consent is granted or a new or enlarged connection to an infrastructure service is approved. This will ascertain if further development contributions are payable to take account of the additional demand that the development will place on one or more of the Council’s infrastructure services. The bases for these assessments for water, sewer, drainage, roading and community infrastructure are set out in the respective Schedules to this Policy.

Each new lot created, irrespective of zone and proposed activity, will attract the district-wide development contributions payable at the time of creation. Each lot in a DCA will attract the development contributions payable for the DCA in which it is located. New lots in an area serviced by water, sewerage and/or drainage systems will attract the development contributions or connection charges payable for each of these systems.

Any additional dwelling on an allotment which does not comply with the definition of a secondary dwelling will attract development contributions, as will any secondary dwelling which is subsequently subdivided off from its original allotment.

Any allotment, which is created as the result of a boundary adjustment involving an allotment the size of which is below the threshold to qualify for the construction of a dwellinghouse as a permitted activity under the District Plan, to create an allotment of a size that allow the construction of a dwellinghouse as a permitted activity will attract development contributions.

The developers of multi-unit residential developments may apply to the Waimakariri District Council for relief from the payment of roading, community infrastructure and reserves development contributions. The matters that the Council will take into account when making its decision as to whether any relief will be granted, will include (but are not limited to):

∑ The number of units;
∑ The size of the units;
∑ The purpose of the development; and
∑ The future ownership arrangements proposed for the development.

No relief will be granted that reduces the amount of development contributions payable for roading and community infrastructure below the level equivalent of 0.5 HUE for each of these development contributions at the time that the application for relief is received by the Council.
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No relief will be granted for water, sewer and stormwater development contributions. An assessment for the liability for stormwater development contribution will be made based on the anticipated proportion run-off from the site.

4.6.3 Timing of payment of contributions

Development contributions are levied on subdivision, resource consents, building consents and on requests for connection to infrastructure services. Those that are levied on subdivision are payable prior to issue of s.224(c) certificate. Those levied on land use consents will be invoiced prior to the uplifting of the consent. Those levied on service connections are payable prior to connection and those levied on building consents will be payable prior to issue of the building consent.

The Council may invoice for full payment of development contributions at the time of granting resource consent, building consent, or providing service connection. The invoicing of development contributions on land use consents may nevertheless be delayed until the level of servicing required has been determined by the developer in collaboration with the Council. Full payment is to be made at the earlier of the 20th day of the month or the granting of the Section 224C Certificate, Code of Compliance, Certificate of Acceptance or physical connection.

Development Contributions assessed and advised on a subdivision consent shall have a lapsing period of 5 years to give effect to the consent [i.e. section 223 certificate] and then 3 years to plan deposit [i.e. Section 224C Certificate]. If a consent holder is granted an extension or a lapse period of greater than 5 years to give effect to the consent, the development contributions shall be re-assessed at Section 224C Certificate application if this occurs outside of the timeframes as stated above.

4.6.4 Price indexation

For work that is forecast to be undertaken in the period of the LTP, the Council may apply indexation to the development contribution calculations based on the Producer Price Index Outputs for Construction as provided in LGA2002 Sections 106 (2B) and (2C). These provisions, however, exclude interest and financing costs from the adjustments for increases in this producer price index.

4.6.5 Holding costs

The Council will apply holding costs for growth-related expenditure that has been incurred prior to the commencement of the current financial year.

(a) For past capital expenditure, other than for roading, where that expenditure contains a growth component, the Council will annually increase the relevant development contributions by the Council’s cost of funding (currently 6.7%).

(b) For past capital expenditure on roading, where the expenditure was incurred for the purposes of allowing development, the Council allocates the full interest cost and recovers the associated holding cost from the developers.

(c) For past capital expenditure, where the expenditure is incurred for the purposes of allowing development in DCAs, the Council allocates the full interest cost to the development area and recovers the associated holding cost from the developers. The development contribution reflects both the capital cost and the holding cost.

Where funding costs are added to development contributions for historical expenditure in accordance with this clause, the Council will review the level of development contributions at least once every three years with regard to the impact that the inclusion of holding costs may be having on the development of the DCA. On completion of this review, if it is considered in
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the best interests of the Council and the district to do so, then the Council may exclude some or all of the funding costs from the calculation of a contribution.

There are a small number of capital works for the purposes of enabling development in defined areas for which the Council has decided that the funding costs should not be funded by development contributions e.g. Southbrook DCA drainage, where it is considered that there is district wide benefit arising from the works.

4.6.6 Historical capital expenditure

Where provided for in this Policy, development contributions may be charged in respect of historical capital expenditure, as well as for projected capital expenditure.

In determining when development contributions will no longer be charged for historical capital expenditure, a distinction is made between various types of historical expenditure with a growth-related component:

1. DCA-related expenditure
2. General growth-related expenditure
3. Very large projects where the denominator used for calculating Development Contributions in the LTP reflects growth which is likely to occur beyond the LTP period.

With DCA expenditure, it is possible to identify when historical costs have been fully funded. Development contributions will no longer be charged where the costs have been fully recovered or the asset has come to the end of its useful life (whichever is the earlier).

With general growth-related expenditure, development contributions will be collected for future expenditure within the period of the LTP and for historical expenditure incurred in the previous 10-12 years. The number of years of historical expenditure to be included will be 20 years less the number of years covered by the LTP. Accordingly, in Year 1 of the LTP, development contributions will be charged for growth-related expenditure for both the next 10 years and the past 10 years. In Year 2, development contributions will be charged for growth-related expenditure for the next 9 years and the past 11 years, and so on.

The third category of expenditure identified above will continue to be part of the development contributions charge until the growth provided for in the development contributions denominator has eventuated, e.g. a certain number of dwellinghouses have been developed. However, contributions will not be charged beyond the useful life of the asset.

4.6.7 Developer agreements

Section 207A (1) of the LGA2002 provides that territorial authorities may enter into a developer agreement if formally requested by a developer or the Council itself.

When a DCA is established the Council will work with the developer or developers of the area concerned to establish which party or parties will undertake various works. The Council will only charge development contributions for that DCA for infrastructure work which is undertaken and funded by the Council. The extent of the infrastructure work undertaken by the Council in each DCA will vary according to the nature of the development and the type of work involved.

It is the responsibility of the developer to provide infrastructure solutions for the area of the proposed development. In the event that the Council requires the provision of additional capacity in the infrastructure to be provided or improvements to existing infrastructure affected by the development, Council will fund the extra-over portion of the work.
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If a developer desires to enter into a developer agreement with Council, the developer shall make an application to Council in writing. This application shall include the following information for consideration by Council:

1. Scale of the development. Typically a development greater than 75 lots or with the value of infrastructure works exceeding $250,000 will be considered for an agreement. Developments with fewer lots or lower value of infrastructure may be considered at Council’s discretion.

2. Ownership of the development (i.e. joint venture partners).

3. Timeframe for development to be completed (all stages).

4. Works to be included in the agreement.

5. Timeframe for the infrastructure works to be completed.

In considering an application for a developer agreement, the Council will consider the following:

1. The value of the works to be completed by the developer that have a wider Council benefit.

2. The degree of benefit to the wider community.

3. Options for completing the work.

4. Consideration of any increase in resilience to a Council infrastructure network.

5. Alignment of works with Council’s level of service requirements.

6. Alignment of works with the Regional Policy Statement, Council’s District Plan and strategic directions.

7. Risk to Council of development not proceeding as intended by the Developer.

8. Developer’s credit worthiness.

9. Council’s intended funding of the infrastructure works to be included in the agreement.

If as a result of these discussions, a decision is made to establish a formal development agreement under LGA2002, this agreement shall set out the following as relating to shared works:

1. Methodology for determining the share of costs that are the responsibility of the Council.


3. Effects of the completion of the proposed works on the development contributions payable under this Policy. Any departure(s) from the Council’s Development Contribution Policy shall be explicitly stated within the agreement.

4. Timeframe for validity of agreement.

Unless explicitly stated, developer agreements shall not alter the applications of Development Contributions under this Policy. Development Contributions may be locked in for a period of 8 years from agreement to the issuance of the Section 224 Certificate at the discretion of Council.

4.6.8 Requests for reconsideration of development contributions

LGA2002 Section 199A establishes the right for people on whom the Council is proposing to level development contributions to request a reconsideration of the amounts involved. The bases on which such requests can be based are that:
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∑ The amount was incorrectly calculated or assessed under the Council’s Development Contributions Policy;
∑ The Council has incorrectly applied its Development Contributions Policy; or
∑ The information used to assess the development contributions payable by the person seeking reconsideration was incorrect, has been recorded or used incorrectly, was incomplete or contained errors.

LGA2002 Section 202A (2) requires the Council’s Development Contribution Policy to establish a process for addressing requests for reconsideration, which must indicate how these are to be lodged, and the steps that the Council will take in making its determination regarding the request for reconsideration.

The reconsideration process established under this policy will involve the delegation of responsibility for the determination of the outcome of the reconsideration to the Chief Executive. The process to be used to reach this determination is set out in Schedule A to this Policy.

5 LINKS TO OTHER POLICIES AND COMMUNITY OUTCOMES

∑ There is a safe environment for all
∑ Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable affordable and sustainable
∑ There is sufficient clean water to meet the needs of communities and ecosystems
∑ Businesses in the District are diverse, adaptable, and growing
∑ Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable and affordable manner
∑ Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality

6 ADOPTED BY AND DATE

Adopted by Waimakariri District Council on ……………………………………………………

7 REVIEW

Review every years in preparation for the Annual Plan or Long Term Plan. A full review is undertaken every three years.
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SCHEDULES TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTIONS POLICY

SCHEDULE A: RECONSIDERATION PROCESS

1 Requests for reconsideration of the development contribution which the Council proposed to levy on a development must follow within 10 working days of the formal receipt of a notice of the sums involved from the Council. The Council will give formal notice of the development contributions payable as soon as it is practicable after:

∑ the decisions have been made with respect to the servicing of a new subdivision, for contributions payable prior to the release of RMA Section 224C Certificates;

∑ the decision have been released with respect to the impact on Council infrastructure assets for contributions triggered by a land use consent; or

∑ the plans for a new building have been assessed for a Project Information Memorandum (PIM).

2 Applications for reconsideration must be lodged on the prescribed form attached to this schedule, and must state which ground(s) for requests for reconsideration set out in LGA2002 S199A apply to the application.

3 The Council will only accept applications for reconsideration which provide sufficient information to allow Council officers to fully evaluate the basis on which the reconsideration is sought and the concerns of the applicant with respect to the Council’s original process in assessing the contributions payable.

4 The Council reserves the right to suspend the time of 15 working days required to provide determination of its response to a request for a reconsideration set out in LGA2002 Section 199B (1) if, in order to ensure natural justice, further information is required from the applicant regarding the basis for the request for reconsideration.

5 The Council will make its determination of the application for reconsideration based on the information provided by the applicant and the original Council documentation setting out the basis for the original decision regarding the development contributions applicable and the sums to be levied.

6 The reconsideration decision will be made by the Chief Executive on advice from a staff committee.

7 The Council’s reconsideration process will not involve formal hearings or other representations in person for the applicant or parties representing the applicant.
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Waimakariri District Council
Notice of request for a reconsideration of development contributions
Under S199A Local Government Act 2002

Name of person/company requesting reconsideration………………………………………………
Address…………………………………………………………………………………………………..
Phone……………………………………………….
E-mail………………………………………………………

Development Contribution(s) for which reconsideration is sought ……………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Please quote the relevant notice number ………………………………….

Reasons for request for reconsideration (please tick the appropriate statutory reason(s))

(a) Incorrect calculation or assessment
(b) Development Contributions Policy incorrectly applied
(c) Information used incomplete or contains errors

Please provide further information relevant to your request for reconsideration:
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………(use additional paper if necessary)

Relief sought ……………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………

∑ (To be signed by or on behalf of person/company making the request)
∑ Signature ……………………………………………………Date:………………………………
∑ Name of signatory ……………………………………………….(Please print)
∑ Status of signatory ……………………………………………….(Please print)
SCHEDULE 1: FRAMEWORK FOR RECOVERING FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTIONS

Development occurring within the District

Levied under the Local Government Act 2002:

- A development contribution (for projects identified in the LTP) to cater for the planned growth of:
  - Sewer, water & drainage services
  - Roading
  - Reserves
  - Community Infrastructure

Levied at the time of:
- Subdivision or Land Use or Building Consent or (If applicable) connection to services and
- (If applicable) connection to the roading network

Levied under the Resource Management Act 1991:

- A financial contribution to:
  Enable the adverse effects of each development proposal to be offset e.g. land to vest as road, or money to enable the local capacity of services to be increased.

Levied at the time of:
- Subdivision or land use consent.

A Works & Services Condition for:
- Physical works to be undertaken, e.g. construction of a new road

Levied at the time of:
- Subdivision or land use consent.
SCHEDULE 2: RESERVES DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTIONS

2.1 Calculation of contributions

There are two reserves contributions – one for District-wide reserves applicable to all residential developments and the other for neighbourhood reserves, which is only applicable to residential zoned subdivisions.

The capital expenditure is divided into two categories:

1. Growth-related development – this applies to new developments that are needed to cater for the growth of the District.
2. Development of reserves – this category covers development of existing reserves to cater for future residents and also for the changing needs of the community. It is therefore equitable to share these costs between future property owners and existing owners.

District and neighbourhood reserve contributions are levied at the lesser of either the maximum allowable contribution or the per lot contribution calculated on the cost of the capital expenditure as detailed in the LTP associated with the development of reserves. The maximum allowable contribution is the greater of 7.5 percent of the values of the additional lots created by a subdivision, or the market value equivalent of 20 square metres of land for each additional household unit or accommodation unit created the development.

2.1.1 Charges are levied

A charge is levied either:

- On each new residential allotment, or
- On each second or subsequent dwelling, or
- On each residential resource consent or building consent.

Accompanying this policy are the Schedules and related maps. The Schedules provide the basis on which various Development Contributions are calculated, the amounts budgeted and the amounts payable for each Contribution for each scheme area and Development Contribution area across the District.

2.1.2 Rural and Residential 4 Zoned – subdivisions and second and subsequent dwellinghouses

Where:

- \(cg\) = capital expenditure relating to growth for District Wide Reserves
- \(cd\) = capital expenditure relating to the development of existing reserves and facilities
- \(s\) = subsidies, if any
- \(h\) = total estimated number of additional dwellinghouses in the District at the end of the LTP period
- \(th\) = total estimated dwellinghouses at the end of the LTP period
- \(\Gamma_{1-a}\) = the funding rate applied in respect of each year from the time of the works being carried out

Contribution per lot equals the lesser of:

1. The greater of 7.5% of the land value of the additional lot or notional lot or the value equivalent of 20 square metres of land
2. The lesser of the market value equivalent of 20 square metres of land
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(ii) For future expenditure:
\[
\frac{(cg - s)}{h} \times 1 + \frac{(cd - s)}{th} \times 1
\]

Plus in respect of historical expenditure, for each year in which capital expenditure including a growth component has been incurred:
\[
\frac{(cg - s)}{h} \times 1 + \frac{(cd - s)}{th} \times 1 \times \text{a multiplier reflecting funding costs}
\]

Where the multiplier is calculated along the following lines for each year in which historical expenditure occurred:
\[
(1 + r_{t-1}) \times (1 + r_{t-2}) \times \ldots (1 + r_{t-x})
\]

2.1.3 Residential 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 6A Zoned Subdivisions

Where:
- \( cg \) = capital expenditure relating to growth for District Wide Reserves
- \( cn \) = capital expenditure relating to growth for Neighbourhood Reserves
- \( cd \) = capital expenditure relating to the development of existing reserves and facilities
- \( s \) = subsidies, if any
- \( h \) = total estimated number of additional dwellinghouses in the District at the end of the LTP period
- \( hi \) = total estimated number of additional residential zone dwellinghouses in the District at the end of the LTP period
- \( th \) = total estimated households at the end of the LTP period
- \( r_{t-a} \) = the funding rate applied in respect of each year from the time of the works being carried out

Contributions per lot equals the lesser of:

(i) The greater of 7.5% of the land value of the additional lot or the value equivalent of 20 square metres of land created by the development

or

(ii) For future expenditure:
\[
\frac{(cg - s)}{h} \times 1 + \frac{(cn - s)}{hi} \times 1 + \frac{(cd - s)}{th} \times 1
\]

Plus in respect of historical expenditure, for each year in which capital expenditure including a growth component has been incurred:
\[
\frac{(cg - s)}{h} \times 1 + \frac{(cn - s)}{hi} \times 1 + \frac{(cd - s)}{th} \times 1 \times \text{a multiplier reflecting funding costs}
\]

Where the multiplier is calculated along the following lines for each year in which historical expenditure occurred:
\[
(1 + r_{t-1}) \times (1 + r_{t-2}) \times \ldots (1 + r_{t-x})
\]
2.1.4 Increased densities and multi-unit residential developments

Where:

\[ \text{vm} = \text{the value of 20 square metres of land} \]
\[ \text{h} = \text{total dwellinghouse unit equivalents created by the development} \]

Contribution = \( \text{vm} \times \text{h} \)

Multi-unit residential includes, but is not limited to, flats, town houses, retirement villages, traveller’s accommodation. As set out in Section 203 of the Local Government Act 2002, the formula may be applied at the discretion of the Council.

The formula is based upon the value equivalent of 20 square metres of land for each additional residential unit or accommodation unit created by the development, instead of 7.5% of the total land value:
3 Water

3.1 Calculation of contributions

The contribution is calculated on the cost of the capital expenditure associated with increasing the capacity of the system, less any subsidies, less the total of the replacement cost of the existing asset (if any) less the depreciation cost of the existing asset then dividing by the number of dwellinghouses that the area is capable of servicing, or the number of units of water that the scheme can deliver. The schemes that the later applies to are Summerhill, Poyntzs Road, Oxford Rural 1 and 2 and West Eyreton.

3.1.1 Charges are levied

A charge is levied either:

- On each new lot and/or connection granted, or
- On each second or subsequent dwelling or connection on a pre-existing lot.
- Or resource consent, building consent or application for a larger service which will lead to additional demand on the water network, or
- On each second or subsequent connection or application for consent which will lead to additional demand on the water network.

Note: Developments in DCAs incur Development Contributions for the particular DCA area they are in, and in addition, incur Development Contributions for the large scheme area.

Accompanying this policy are the Schedules and related maps. The Schedules provide the basis on which various Development Contributions are calculated, the amounts budgeted and the amounts payable for each Contribution for each scheme area and Development Contribution area across the District.

3.1.2 Calculation of Contribution for water scheme projects other than new source projects (3.1.5.1):

Where:

- \( c \) = capital expenditure that includes a growth component
- \( s \) = subsidies, if any
- \( r \) = replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \( d \) = depreciated replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \( n \) = total estimated number of dwellinghouses in the area planned to be serviced as at the end of the LTP period.
- \( w \) = water connection size factor (for calculating water development contributions)
- \( r_{1-a} \) = the funding rate applied in respect of each year from the time of the works being carried out

Contribution per lot equals:

\[
\frac{c - s - (r + d)}{n w} 
\]
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In respect of future expenditure:

\[ ((c - s) - (r - d)) \times \frac{1}{n} \times w \]

Plus in respect of historical expenditure, for each year in which capital expenditure including a growth component has been incurred:

\[ ((c - s) - (r - d)) \times \frac{1}{n} \times w \times \text{multiplier reflecting funding costs} \]

Where the multiplier is calculated along the following lines for each year in which historical expenditure occurred:

\[ (1 + r_{t-1}) \times (1 + r_{t-2}) \times \ldots \times (1 + r_{t-a}) \]

The significance of the adjustment for replacement cost and depreciated replacement cost is that some assets have years of useful life left but are only being replaced to cope with the demand for extra capacity resulting from new subdivisions.

The effect of this adjustment is that if a new asset is to be replaced those causing the growth should pay for the cost of upgrading the asset as the existing asset would provide many years of future benefit and it is only being replaced because of the growth.

3.1.3 The water scheme development contribution (100% growth projects)

3.1.3.1 Developments outside DCAs:

Where:
- \( c \) = growth component of capital
- \( s \) = subsidies, if any
- \( r \) = replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \( d \) = depreciated replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \( h \) = total estimated number of additional dwellinghouses in the area planned to be serviced by the end of the LTP period.
- \( W \) = water connection size factor (for calculating water development contributions)
- \( r_{t-a} \) = the funding rate applied in respect of each year from the time of the works being carried out.

Contribution per lot equals:

In respect of future expenditure:

\[ ((c - s) - (r - d)) \times \frac{1}{h} \times w \]

Plus in respect of historical expenditure, for each year in which capital expenditure including a growth component has been incurred:

\[ ((c - s) - (r - d)) \times \frac{1}{h} \times w \times \text{multiplier reflecting funding costs} \]
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Where the multiplier is calculated along the following lines for each year in which historical expenditure occurred:

\[(1 + r_{t-1}) \times (1 + r_{t-2}) \times \ldots \times (1 + r_{t-x})\]

3.1.4 The Water Scheme Development Contribution

3.1.4.1 Water scheme new source projects

These include any water supply scheme with a water supply source upgrade and shall be levied over 35 years as below.

Where:
- \(c\) = capital expenditure that includes a growth component
- \(s\) = subsidies, if any
- \(r\) = replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \(d\) = depreciated replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \(n\) = total estimated number of dwellinghouses in the area planned to be serviced as at the end of a period of 35 years from the date of completion of the project.
- \(W\) = water connection size factor (for calculating water development contributions)
- \(r_{t-a}\) = the funding rate applied in respect of each year from the time of the works being carried out

Contribution per lot equals:

\[\frac{((c - s) - (r - d))}{n} \times \frac{1}{n} \times W\]

Plus in respect of historical expenditure, for each year in which capital expenditure including a growth component has been incurred:

\[\frac{((c - s) - (r - d))}{n} \times \frac{1}{n} \times W \times \text{a multiplier reflecting funding costs}\]

Where the multiplier is calculated along the following lines for each year in which historical expenditure occurred:

\[(1 + r_{t-1}) \times (1 + r_{t-2}) \times \ldots \times (1 + r_{t-x})\]

For an existing asset, which is at the end of its useful life and due for replacement, people who connect in the future will only pay for the cost of increasing the system’s size, not the full cost of replacing the existing asset.

3.1.5 Outline Development Plan Areas

In addition to the above Water Scheme Development Contribution calculation, the DCAs have an additional contribution which recognises the costs of the development of infrastructural services that are unique to that particular development.
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3.1.5.1 The DCA Water Scheme Development Contribution (except Southbrook)

Where:

\( co = \) capital expenditure relating to growth in the DCA
\( f = \) funding costs in respect of historical expenditure, if any
\( s = \) subsidies, if any
\( pc = \) development contributions previously received, if any
\( r = \) replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
\( d = \) depreciated replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
\( dca = \) estimated number of additional lots planned to be serviced in the development contribution area over the remainder of the LTP period
\( w = \) water connection size factor (for calculating water development contributions)

Contribution per lot equals:

\[
\left( (co + f - s - pc) - (r - d) \right) \times \frac{1}{dca} \times w
\]

The schedule details the actual costs relating to each Scheme DCA.

3.1.5.2 The Southbrook DCA Water Scheme Development Contribution

Where:

\( co = \) capital expenditure that includes a growth component
\( f = \) funding costs in respect of historical expenditure, if any
\( s = \) subsidies or income received from other sources, if any
\( r = \) replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
\( d = \) depreciated replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
\( m = \) area in m\(^2\) of lot(s) being subdivided or developed
\( a = \) [Total area of the Southbrook DCA area in m\(^2\) less the area dedicated to the stormwater retention pond] less a 15% allowance for roading and reserves
\( w = \) water connection size factor (for calculating water development contributions)

Contribution per lot equals:

\[
\left( (co + f - s) - (r - d) \right) \times \frac{1}{a} \times m \times w
\]

The schedule details the actual costs relating to this Scheme.
3.1.6 Water Connection Size Factor (for calculating Water Development Contributions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Connection Size (mm)</th>
<th>Development Contribution Multiplication Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15mm</td>
<td>1.0 x Standard D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20mm</td>
<td>1.5 x Standard D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25mm</td>
<td>2.1 x Standard D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32mm</td>
<td>3.2 x Standard D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40mm</td>
<td>4.9 x Standard D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50mm</td>
<td>7.8 x Standard D.C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The connection rate may be negotiated where the applicant can show larger pipe size is required for fire fighting or fire prevention.
3.2 Sewer

3.2.1 Calculation of Contribution

The contribution is calculated on the cost of the capital expenditure associated with increasing the capacity of the system, less any subsidies, less the difference between the total of the replacement cost of the existing asset (if any), the depreciated cost of the existing asset, with the total then divided by the number of lots that are planned to be serviced by the scheme. For historical costs, an adjustment is made to reflect funding costs. The result is the cost that will apply to each new lot.

For the purposes of calculating the sewer development contribution the volume flows are calculated on the size of the water inflow pipe as the outflow of sewage from a property is proportional to the inflow of water.

3.2.2 Charges are levied

A charge is levied either:

- \( \sum \) on each new lot and/or connection granted, or
- \( \sum \) on each second or subsequent dwelling or connection on a pre-existing lot.
- \( \sum \) or resource consent or application for a larger service which will lead to additional demand on the sewer network, or
- \( \sum \) on each second or subsequent connection or application for consent which will lead to additional demand on the sewer network.

Note: Developments in DCAs incur Development Contributions for the particular DCA area they are in, and in addition, incur Development Contributions for the large scheme area.

Accompanying this policy are the Schedules and related maps. The Schedules provide the basis on which various Development Contributions are calculated, the amounts budgeted and the amounts payable for each Contribution for each scheme area and Development Contribution area across the District.

3.2.2.1 Sewer Scheme Development Contributions other than the Ocean Outfall Project (Partial Growth)

Where:

- \( c \) = capital expenditure that includes a growth component
- \( s \) = subsidies, if any
- \( r \) = replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \( d \) = depreciated replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \( n \) = total estimated number of lots in the area planned to be serviced as at the end of the TPYLTP period
- \( w \) = water connection size factor (for developing sewer development contributions)
- \( f_{t-a} \) = the funding rate applied in respect of each year from the time of the works being carried out
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Contribution per lot equals:

*In respect of future expenditure:*

\[
((c - s) - (r - d)) \times \frac{1}{n} \times w
\]

*Plus in respect of historical expenditure, for each year in which capital expenditure including a growth component has been incurred:*

\[
((c - s) - (r - d)) \times \frac{1}{n} \times w \times \text{a multiplier reflecting funding costs}
\]

Where the multiplier is calculated along the following lines for each year in which historical expenditure occurred:

\[
(1 + r_{t-1}) \times (1 + r_{t-2}) \times \ldots \times (1 + r_{t-x})
\]

### 3.2.3 The Sewer Scheme Development Contribution (100% growth projects)

#### 3.2.3.1 Sewer Scheme Development Contributions

Where:

- \(c_C\) = growth component of capital
- \(s\) = subsidies, if any
- \(r\) = replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \(d\) = depreciated replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \(h\) = total estimated number of additional lots in the area planned to be serviced by the end of the LTP period
- \(w\) = water connection size factor (for calculating sewer development contributions)
- \(r_{t-a}\) = the funding rate applied in respect of each year from the time of the works being carried out

Contribution per lot equals:

*For future expenditure:*

\[
((c - s) - (r - d)) \times \frac{1}{h} \times w
\]

*Plus in respect of historical expenditure, for each year in which capital expenditure including a growth component has been incurred:*

\[
((c - s) - (r - d)) \times \frac{1}{h} \times w \times \text{a multiplier reflecting funding costs}
\]

Where the multiplier is calculated along the following lines for each year in which historical expenditure occurred:

\[
(1 + r_{t-1}) \times (1 + r_{t-2}) \times \ldots \times (1 + r_{t-x})
\]
3.2.3.2 Ocean Outfall Project

Where:

\[ c = \text{capital expenditure that includes a growth component} \]
\[ s = \text{subsidies, if any} \]
\[ r = \text{replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced} \]
\[ d = \text{depreciated replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced} \]
\[ n = \text{total estimated number of dwellinghouses in the area planned to be serviced as at the end of a period of 35 years from the date of completion of the project.} \]
\[ w = \text{water connection size factor (for calculating water development contributions)} \]
\[ r_{t-a} = \text{the funding rate applied in respect of each year from the time of the works being carried out} \]

Contribution per lot equals:

\[
\frac{((c - s) - (r - d)) \times \frac{1}{n} \times w}{n}
\]

Plus in respect of historical expenditure, for each year in which capital expenditure including a growth component has been incurred:

\[
\frac{((c - s) - (r - d)) \times \frac{1}{n} \times w \times \text{a multiplier reflecting funding costs}}{n}
\]

Where the multiplier is calculated along the following lines for each year in which historical expenditure occurred:

\[
(1 + r_{t-1}) \times (1 + r_{t-2}) \times (1 + r_{t-x})
\]

The significance of the adjustment for replacement cost and depreciated replacement cost is that some assets have years of useful life left but are only being replaced to cope with the demand for extra capacity resulting from new subdivisions.

The effect of this adjustment is that if a new asset is to be replaced those causing the growth should pay for the cost of upgrading the asset as the existing asset would provide many years of future benefit and it is only being replaced because of the growth.

Conversely, for an existing asset, which is at the end of its useful life and due for replacement, people who connect in the future will only pay for the cost of increasing the system’s size, not the full cost of replacing the existing asset.

3.2.4 Development Contribution Areas

In addition to the above Sewer Scheme Development Contribution calculation, the DCAs have an additional contribution which recognises the costs of the development of infrastructural services that are unique to that particular development.

There are two formulae – one for Southbrook and the other for all other DCAs.
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3.2.4.1 The DCA Sewer Scheme Development Contribution (except Southbrook):

Where:

- \( co \) = capital expenditure relating to growth in DCACDA
- \( f \) = funding costs in respect of historical expenditure, if any
- \( s \) = subsidies, if any
- \( pc \) = development contributions previously received, if any
- \( r \) = replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \( d \) = depreciated replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \( dca \) = estimated number of additional lots planned to be serviced in the development contribution area estimated number of lots planned within the DCA over the remainder of the LTP period
- \( w \) = water connection size factor (for calculating sewer development contributions)

Contribution per lot equals:

\[
\frac{(co + f - s - pc) - (r - d)}{dca} \times \frac{1}{w}
\]

The schedule details the actual costs relating to each Scheme.

3.2.4.2 The Southbrook DCA Sewer Scheme Development Contribution:

Where:

- \( co \) = capital expenditure which includes a growth component
- \( f \) = funding costs in respect of historical expenditure, if any (Council’s current policy is to fund these from rates rather than development contributions)
- \( s \) = subsidies or income received from other sources, if any
- \( r \) = replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \( d \) = depreciated replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \( m \) = area in m\(^2\) of lot(s) being subdivided or developed
- \( a \) = [Total area of the Southbrook DCA area in m\(^2\) less the area dedicated to the stormwater retention pond] less a 15% allowance for roading and reserves
- \( w \) = water connection size factor (for calculating sewer development contributions)

Contribution per lot equals:

\[
\frac{(co + f - s) - (r - d)}{a} \times \frac{1}{m} \times w
\]
3.2.5 Water Connection Size Factor (for calculating Sewer Development Contributions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Connection Size (mm)</th>
<th>Development Contribution Multiplication Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15mm</td>
<td>1.0 x Standard D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20mm</td>
<td>1.2 x Standard D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25mm</td>
<td>1.6 x Standard D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32mm</td>
<td>2.1 x Standard D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40mm</td>
<td>2.9 x Standard D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50mm</td>
<td>4.4 x Standard D.C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The connection rate may be negotiated where the applicant can show larger pipe size is required for fire fighting or fire prevention.
3.3 Drainage

3.3.1 Calculation of Contribution

The contribution is calculated on the cost of the capital expenditure associated with increasing the capacity of the system, less any subsidies, less the total of: the replacement cost of the existing asset (if any) less the depreciated cost of the existing asset and then divided by the number of properties that the area is capable of servicing. For historical costs, an adjustment is made for funding costs. The result is the cost that will apply to each new lot.

3.3.2 Charges are levied

(Exemptions: Utility Lots and Boundary Adjustments):

Residential Zones

On subdivision creating additional allotment/s and subsequently for each additional dwellinghouse on the same lot (when either resource consent or building consent is granted).

Business Zones

For business properties, on subdivision creating additional allotment/s or on additional connection or network load on the same lot (when either a resource consent or a building consent is granted or at the time of connection).

Note: Developments in DCAs incur Development Contributions for the particular DCA area they are in, and in addition, incur Development Contributions for the large scheme area.

Accompanying this policy are the Schedules and related maps. The Schedules provide the basis on which various Development Contributions are calculated, the amounts budgeted and the amounts payable for each Contribution for each scheme area and Development Contribution area across the District.

3.3.3 Drainage Contribution

Where:

\[ c = \text{capital expenditure including a growth component} \]
\[ s = \text{subsidies, if any} \]
\[ r = \text{replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced} \]
\[ d = \text{depreciated replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced} \]
\[ n = \text{total estimated number of lots in the area planned to be serviced as at the end of the LTP period} \]
\[ r_{t-a} = \text{the funding rate applied in respect of each year from the time of the works being carried out} \]

Contribution per lot equals:

For future expenditure:

\[ \frac{(c - s) - (r - d)}{n} \]

Plus in respect of historical expenditure, for each year in which capital expenditure including a growth component has been incurred:

\[ \frac{(c - s) - (r - d)}{n} \times 1 \times \text{a multiplier reflecting funding costs} \]
2017/18 DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTIONS POLICY

Where the multiplier is calculated along the following lines for each year in which historical expenditure occurred:

\[(1 + r_{t-1}) \times (1 + r_{t-2}) \times \ldots \times (1 + r_{t-x})\]

3.3.4 The Drainage Scheme Development Contribution

3.3.4.1 Drainage Scheme Development Contributions:

Where:

- \( c \) = growth component of capital
- \( s \) = subsidies, if any
- \( r \) = replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \( d \) = depreciated replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- \( h \) = total estimated number of additional lots in the area planned to be serviced at the end of the LTP period.
- \( r_{t-a} \) = the funding rate applied in respect of each year from the time of the works being carried out

Contribution per lot equals:

For future expenditure:

\[
\frac{((c - s) - (r - d))}{h}
\]

Plus in respect of historical expenditure, for each year in which capital expenditure including a growth component has been incurred:

\[
\frac{((c - s) - (r - d))}{h} \times a \text{ multiplier reflecting funding costs}
\]

Where the multiplier is calculated along the following lines for each year in which historical expenditure occurred:

\[(1 + r_{t-1}) \times (1 + r_{t-2}) \times (1 + r_{t-x})\]

The significance of the adjustment for replacement cost and depreciated replacement cost is that some assets have years of useful life left but are only being replaced to cope with the demand for extra capacity resulting from new subdivisions.

The effect of this adjustment is that if a new asset is to be replaced those causing the growth should pay for the cost of upgrading the asset as the existing asset would provide many years of future benefit and it is only being replaced because of the growth.

Conversely, for an existing asset, which is at the end of its useful life and due for replacement, people who connect in the future will only pay for the cost of increasing the system’s size, not the full cost of replacing the existing asset.
3.3.5 Outline Development Plan Areas

In addition to the above Drainage Scheme Development Contribution calculation, the DCAs have an additional contribution which recognises the costs of the development of infrastructural services that are unique to that particular development.

3.3.5.1 The DCA Drainage Scheme Development Contribution (except Southbrook)

Where:

- $co =$ capital expenditure relating to growth in the DCA
- $f =$ funding costs in respect of historical expenditure, if any
- $s =$ subsidies, if any
- $pc =$ development contributions previously received, if any
- $r =$ replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- $d =$ depreciated replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced
- $dca =$ estimated number of additional lots planned to be serviced in the development contribution area

Contribution per lot equals:

$$\frac{(co + f - s - pc) - (r - d)}{dca}$$

The schedule details the actual costs relating to each DCA.

3.3.4.23.3.5.2 Rangiora / Southbrook Stormwater

Where:

- “Subdivision” is a subdivision of land into separate title, or the signing of a long term lease exceeding 15 years on a portion of the land.

- “Development” is improvement of the land to allow commercial or industrial activity to take place, and includes erecting a building, or changing the use of land.

- $co =$ capital expenditure due to growth
- $m =$ area in m² of that part of the lot(s) to be subdivided or developed less the area which is assessed as having been developed as at 1 July 2007
- $a =$ 0.85X + 0.1 (Z-0.85X)
- $X =$ area in m² of all lots identified as Area X lots on Plan 2878, (those that are largely undeveloped) less the area of each of those lots assessed as developed at 1 July 2007
- $Y =$ lots identified as Area Y lots on Plan 2878 (those that are largely developed)
- $Z =$ gross area in m² of all lots within the DCA, less that area contributing to pond B shown on Plan 2878
- $M =$ 4.0, or other factor as agreed by the Council
- $p =$ area in m² of built-on or surfaced or compacted land that is assessed as contributing to stormwater runoff.

For Subdivision within the Southbrook Industrial Area, the square metre Development Contribution rate is calculated as follows:
For Development of an area within the Southbrook Industrial Area, the square metre Development Contribution rate is calculated as follows:

\[(co \times \text{M} \times \text{p/a}) = (3,519,739 \times 1/542,158) = 6.49\text{ per m}^2\]

**3.3.93.3.6 Drainage Adjustment Factor**

The stormwater HUE is based on the expected runoff from impermeable surfaces. A typical Greenfields residential development on a 600m² allotment is assumed to have a run-off coefficient (or anticipated proportion of run-off) of 55 percent. Runoff coefficient assessments are based on the Compliance Document for New Zealand Building Code Clause E1 Surface Water, which provides a list of typical runoff coefficients. Adjustments for drainage contributions for non-residential activity will be made on resource consent or building consent.

In the case of developments outside of DCAs and special stormwater management areas such as Southbrook, the stormwater development contribution will be calculated on the basis of the run-off coefficient. If the run-off coefficient is greater than 55 percent, additional development contributions will be charged for development serviced by the District’s reticulated stormwater collection systems.
3.4 Roading

3.4.1 Calculation of contribution

The contribution is calculated on the cost of the capital expenditure associated with increasing the capacity of the network, less any subsidies. The value of roading necessary to service the development is subtracted also, so the contribution relates to extra work in the system. This value is then divided by the number of projected new dwellinghouses in the District. For historical costs, an adjustment is made for funding costs. The result is the cost that will apply to each new lot.

The calculation of roading contributions for DCAs relates to the cost of construction of collector roads (if any) that are required to connect the DCA to the District-wide roading network. The development contribution payable for these DCAs is based on the estimated cost of the collector road divided by the number of new allotments to be created in that DCA.

3.4.2 Charges are levied

A charge is levied either:

\[ \sum \text{On each new residential allotment, or} \]
\[ \sum \text{On each second or subsequent dwelling, or} \]
\[ \sum \text{On each residential land use resource consent or building consent.} \]

3.4.2.1 The District Roading Development Contribution

Where:

\[ C = \text{capital expenditure for that project} \]
\[ f = \text{funding costs in respect of historical expenditure, if any} \]
\[ s = \text{subsidies, if any} \]
\[ pc = \text{development contributions previously received in respect of that project} \]
\[ fc = \text{financial contribution applicable to that roading project, if any} \]
\[ h = \text{total estimated number of additional dwellinghouses in the District over the remainder of the LTP period.} \]

Contribution per lot equals:

The sum of the following for each identified district roading project:

\[ \frac{(c + f - s - pc) - fc}{h} \]

3.4.2.2 Development Contribution Areas

In addition to the above development contribution calculation, the Outline Development Plan Areas have an additional formula which apportions the costs of the development of main trunk roads that are unique to that particular development.
3.4.2.3 The Outline Development Plan Area Roading Development Contribution (excluding Southbrook)

Where:
\[ \begin{align*}
    co &= \text{capital expenditure relating to growth in DCA} \\
    f &= \text{funding costs in respect of historical expenditure, if any} \\
    s &= \text{subsidies, if any} \\
    pc &= \text{development contributions previously received in respect of that project} \\
    fc &= \text{financial contribution applicable to roading developments} \\
    dca &= \text{estimated number of additional lots planned to be serviced in the development contribution area} \\
         &= \text{estimated number of lots capable of being serviced within the development over the remainder of the LTP period}
\end{align*} \]

Contribution per lot equals:

\[
\frac{(co + f - s - pc) - fc}{dca}
\]

3.4.2.4 The Southbrook DCA Roading Scheme Development Contribution:

Where:
\[ \begin{align*}
    co &= \text{capital expenditure which includes a growth component} \\
    f &= \text{funding costs in respect of historical expenditure, if any (Council’s current policy is to fund these from rates rather than development contributions)} \\
    s &= \text{subsidies or income received from other sources, if any} \\
    r &= \text{replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced} \\
    d &= \text{depreciated replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced} \\
    m &= \text{area in m}^2 \text{ of lot(s) being subdivided or developed} \\
    a &= \text{[Total area of the Southbrook DCA area in m}^2 \text{ less the area dedicated to the stormwater retention pond] less a 15\% allowance for roading and reserves}
\end{align*} \]

Contribution per lot equals:

\[
\frac{(co + f - s - (r - d)) \times 1 \times m}{a}
\]

3.4.3 Roading adjustment factor

The Council calculated the HUE for roading based on the typical number of vehicle movements generated by a development. A typical household is assumed to generate 8 vehicle trips a day.
SCHEDULE 4: COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTIONS

4.1 Calculation of contribution

The contribution is calculated on the cost of the capital expenditure relating to the development of community infrastructure to cope with growth of the District, less any subsidies, less the total of the replacement cost of the existing asset (if any), less the depreciated replacement cost of the existing asset and then divided by the total estimated number of dwellinghouses in the District at the end of the LTP period. For historical expenditure, an adjustment is made for funding costs. For 100 percent growth project, the calculation is based on the estimated number of additional dwellinghouses projected for the LTP period.

4.2. Community Infrastructure Development Contribution:

Where:
\[ \begin{align*}
    c & = \text{growth component of capital expenditure} \\
    s & = \text{subsidies, if any} \\
    r & = \text{replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced} \\
    d & = \text{depreciated replacement cost of any infrastructure replaced} \\
    n & = \text{total estimated number of rating units in the District as at the end of the LTP period.} \\
    r_{t-a} & = \text{the funding rate applied in respect of each year from the time of the works being carried out.}
\end{align*} \]

Contribution per lot equals:

For future expenditure:

\[
\frac{(c - s) - (r - d)}{n}
\]

Plus in respect of historical expenditure, for each year in which capital expenditure including a growth component has been incurred:

\[
\frac{(c - s) - (r - d)}{n} \times \text{a multiplier reflecting funding costs}
\]

Where the multiplier is calculated along the following lines for each year in which historical expenditure occurred:

\[
\left(1 + r_{t-1}\right) \times \left(1 + r_{t-2}\right) \times \ldots \left(1 + r_{t-a}\right)
\]
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1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is for Council to consider increasing the fees charged for the use of Community Facilities and the ground rent at the Rangiora Airfield charged to hangar owners.

Attachments:

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180117003266

(b) Approves the fees and charges for community facilities as attached in Appendix 1 (P6) for inclusion in the Fees and Charges Section of the Draft LTP.

(c) Approves the community facilities fees and charges applying to all users.

(d) Approves the airfield land rent charge of $4.00 per sq metre for inclusion in the Fees and Charges section of the Draft LTP

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. Background

3.1.1. Fees and charges for Community Facilities have not been reviewed since 2012 and since then the community facilities have been earthquake strengthened and in most instances upgraded.

3.1.2. The other significant difference is that heating is now included in the hire charge and there are no separate coin operated meters plus the halls have all had heating plant upgrades with most now having heat pumps installed.

3.1.3. The Airfield Ground rental charges have not been reviewed since 2011 when the ground rental rate was increased from $2.50 to $2.55 per sq metre.
3.2. Community Facility Categories

3.2.1. It is proposed that there are 3 categories of venues:

Category 1: Performance venues – Rangiora and Oxford Town Halls which are both designed for a variety of performances and large groups.

Category 2: Basic venues: These have a basic level of service and not generally suitable for community meetings. Prime purpose is to support activities on the adjoining domain. This includes Cust Domain; Ohoka Domain; Sefton Domain and View Hill Domain pavilions.

Category 3: Standard venues – includes all venues with the exception of those in Category 1 and 2.

3.3. Categories of Users

3.3.1. Traditionally our fees and charges have had 3 user categories:

∑ Commercial
∑ Casual
∑ Community Group

3.3.2. In reality only 2 categories have actually been used: Commercial and Community Group.

3.3.3. The definition that has been used for community users is:

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

This category would also include an event or meeting where there is a passive or active recreational value to the community and activities where meetings or events are organised on a regular, scheduled basis but attended by members of the public on a casual basis and where a nominal fee is charged to cover the cost of the venue and reasonable operating costs. This would include events such as fitness or aerobic type classes, music and dance groups, gardening groups and other activities designed to provide recreation on a not for profit or minimal profit basis.

3.3.4. The main issue that has arisen with this definition is the fact that there are "commercial" providers of martial arts, dance academies whose business model is to utilise our facilities at the community rate.

3.3.5. It is proposed to amend the definition of community users to remove the reference to make it clear that organisers of subscription based or classes with a rate per term or per month will be charged at a tutor rate.

3.3.6. The Tutor/Coaching category will include sports/dance, martial arts and similar events when there is an admission charge for classes either nightly or on a lesson basis that is beyond the gold coin donation.

3.3.7. There are some issues with group domination of a particular venue and it is proposed that the one group/organisation cannot book more than 16 hours per week at one venue without approval of the Community and Recreation Committee of Council.

3.3.8. Similar arrangements are already in place with the North Canterbury Academy of Music which has an agreement with Council for the use of parts of the complex.

3.3.9. It is also proposed to discontinue the Casual rate as it is seldom used.
3.4. Waiver of fees

3.4.1. Traditionally the Greenspace Manager and the Manager Community and Recreation have had the authority to waive charges for hall hire.

3.4.2. This does cause issues as there is a widespread expectation that any event that has a fundraising element will have the hall hire waived as well as events that can be seen as having a “community education” aspect and events run or administered through the local business/promotion organisations.

3.4.3. The quantum of these requests does vary from year to year but staff estimate that during 2017 calendar year there were in the order of 30 bookings for venues that had the fees waived.

3.4.4. The Council is still incurring costs for those events relating to cleaning and power and it is proposed that no charges can be waived by staff so the charges apply to all users regardless of the type of event.

3.5. Current level of charges for community facilities

3.5.1. Appendix 1 has the current list of charges for the community facilities except for Rangiora Town Hall.

3.5.2. Most venues are charged at $6.00 or $8.00 per hour inclusive of GST, for community groups.

3.5.3. These charges are extremely reasonable and less than most comparable buildings operated by other local authorities.

3.5.4. The current charges are also considerably less than those charged by other providers in the District (mostly church owned). Typical charges for comparable other venues in the District are in the range of $16 - $20 per hour.

3.6. Proposed level of charges for community facilities

3.6.1. The following level of charges, inclusive of GST, are proposed for Category 2 Buildings. This is the basic category of venues indicating no changes for commercial fee and with only minimal proposed increases for all other users:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pavilion</th>
<th>Commercial per hour</th>
<th>Other users per hour</th>
<th>Proposed new charges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cust Domain</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Domain</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sefton Domain</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View Hill</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6.2. The following level of charges are proposed for Category 3 venues (most of the venues) and includes use of facilities and furniture:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Commercial per hour (excl gst)</th>
<th>(New) Tutor Rate per hour (incl gst)</th>
<th>All other users per hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Community Centre – Sports Hall</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Community Centre – entire complex</td>
<td>$360</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other venues excl: Woodend CC, Rangiora Town Hall and Oxford Town Hall</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$6-$8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6.3. The following charges are proposed for Oxford Town Hall:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oxford Town Hall</th>
<th>Commercial users (excl gst)</th>
<th>Other users (incl gst)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current charges</td>
<td>Current charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; P Room</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Hall</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire venue – per hour</td>
<td>$75/hour</td>
<td>$23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire venue – day rate (six hour or more)</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding rate (includes 3 hours set up, full day hire and 2 hours cleaning)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium projection equipment (incl technician)</td>
<td>$50/hour</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB&amp;I League for movies (3 x hours, includes WDC owned projection equipment, wi-fi and electricity)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6.4. Rangiora Town Hall: The only changes proposed for Rangiora Town Hall relate to some minor adjustments to the performance rate and rehearsal day charges to cover the increase in technician support rates which are now $50.00 per hour.

The performance rate will increase from $300.00 to $325.00 per day and rehearsal day charges will increase from $100.00 to $125.00 (all GST inclusive).
3.6.5. Full schedule: A full schedule of all proposed rates is included as Appendix 1.

3.7. Current level of charges for airfield land:
3.7.1. The current rental charges are $2.55 (gst inclusive) per sq metre of land leased. This figure was set in 2010 which came into effect in 2011 and was an increase of 5c per sq metre.
3.7.2. The standard lot size at the Airfield is 150sq metres so currently that equates to an annual rental of $382.50.
3.7.3. The Council supplies water to each lot and maintains all of the surrounding land that is not directly leased.

3.8. Proposed level of charges for airfield land
3.8.1. It is proposed to increase the annual charge to $4.00 sq metre which for a standard lot would equate to $600.00 per annum incl of GST.
3.8.2. Staff have checked with comparable airfields and the $4.00 charge is within the range of rentals charged which was from $3.55 - $5.00. Comparatives are not easy however as different airfields have differing levels of service and the $5.00 charge is at a field that has a sealed runway as well as grass.
3.8.3. The figure of $4.00 has been discussed with the Airfield Advisory Group and there was general acceptance that maintenance costs are continuing to increase and agreement that the airfield is maintained to a good standard.
3.8.4. It is not proposed to increase the landing fees as these are comparable with other fields and now that we have the automated billing system in place we are collecting additional revenue.

3.9. The Management Team/CE has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS
4.1. Community views will be sought during the LTP process but it is likely that there will be community reaction to the proposed changes to charges for community facilities and also the increase of land rental at the Rangiora Airfield.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS
5.1. The Airfield budget has been prepared on the basis of the proposed increased charges for land rental. It is budgeted to receive $95,510 in 19/20 compared with $65,510 in 18/19. The reason for the income not increasing until the 19/20 financial year is the rent renewal clauses in the leases.
5.2. The budgets for the Rangiora and Oxford Town Halls have been prepared based on the current charges. While there will be an increase in the income received the total net increase will be negligible as this will be used to offset additional technician costs.
5.3. The total income currently received from all other buildings excluding the Oxford and Rangiora Town Halls is $32,450. Should the recommendations in this report be approved it is expected that this total income will increase by $15,000. This is not currently shown on the building budget spreadsheets. The income for Rangiora Town Hall hire, excluding the leased area is around $42,000 and Oxford Town Hall around $4,200. In addition there is lease income from Rangiora Town Hall which is in the order of $63,000.

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 Government Act

6.3. **Community Outcomes**
- Public spaces and facilities will be accessible and of a high standard.
- People will involve themselves in a range of recreation activities.

APPENDIX 1:

**PROPOSED LEVEL OF CHARGES EFFECTIVE 01/07/2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pavilion</th>
<th>Commercial per hour</th>
<th>Other users per hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cust Domain</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Domain</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sefton Domain</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View Hill</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woodend Community Centre – Sports Hall</th>
<th>Commercial per hour (excl gst)</th>
<th>Tutor Rate per hour (incl gst)</th>
<th>All other users per hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woodend Community Centre – entire complex</th>
<th>Commercial per hour (excl gst)</th>
<th>Tutor Rate per hour (incl gst)</th>
<th>All other users per hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$360</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All other venues excl: Woodend CC, Rangiora Town Hall and Oxford Town Hall</th>
<th>Commercial per hour (excl gst)</th>
<th>Tutor Rate per hour (incl gst)</th>
<th>All other users per hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oxford Town Hall</th>
<th>Commercial users (excl gst)</th>
<th>Other users (incl gst)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; P Room</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Hall</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire venue – per hour</td>
<td>$75/hour</td>
<td>$40/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire venue – day rate (six hour or more)</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding rate (includes 3 hours set up, full day hire and 2 hours cleaning)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium projection equipment (incl technician)</td>
<td>$50/hour</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Town Hall</td>
<td>Commercial users (excl gst)</td>
<td>Other users (excl gst)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Auditorium – Performance Day</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Auditorium – Pack In/Out, Rehearsal (max 14 days)</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Auditorium – Pack In/Out, Rehearsal (additional days)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Theatre – per hour (min 2hrs)</td>
<td>$100/hour</td>
<td>$50/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Theatre – day rate</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Theatre – Projection Equipment (incl Tech)</td>
<td>$50/hour</td>
<td>$50/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio Room</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OB&I League for movies (3 x hours, includes WDC owned projection equipment, wi-fi and electricity) | n/a | $45 |
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to present to the Council the Draft Community Green Space Activity Management Plan 2017. The plan has been written over the last 8 months following guidelines prepared by the Asset Management Steering Group. The Asset Management Steering Group is an internal Council staff working group that has been set up to provide some best practise support and consistency to the preparation and ongoing update and development of Activity Management Plans.

1.2. The format of the plan has changed from the last Activity Management Plan which was prepared in 2012. The previous plan focused strongly on the park categories and key asset types. The previous plan provided a large amount of information in each category which was beneficial in enabling a one stop shop for greenspace planning. The problem with this approach is that it is difficult and time consuming to continuously update the Activity Management Plan to reflect all the information which is being produced in other relevant strategies and Reserve Management Plans as they are developed. The new version will where practical reference other plans rather than providing full detailed summaries.

1.3. The Asset Management Steering Group has created an Activity Management Plan format. This format is a guide which covers all the relevant topics which an Activity Management Plan is required to cover. The Community Green Space Activity Management Plan has followed this format which should make it consistent with other Activity Management Plans for other assets within Council.

1.4. In terms of the Levels of Service contained within the Plan these have not substantively changed. Levels of Service for land provision have remained unchanged as have the majority of the Levels of Service which relate to the development of parks with specific categories. The main level of service changes are contained within five specific asset groups, which are community facilities, sports facilities, public toilets, play space and tree maintenance. Separate strategies and a levels of service review (for the tree maintenance) which describe the levels of service for these assets have been prepared.

Attachments:

i. Draft Community Green Space Activity Management Plan 2017 (TRIM 171110122373)
2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 171107120943.

(b) Notes that a preliminary version of the Draft Community Green Space Activity Management Plan was presented to the Community and Recreation Committee in November 2017.

(c) Notes that the Draft Community Green Space Activity Management Plan has been sent to an external consultant for peer review.

(d) Adopts the Draft Community Green Space Activity Management Plan (TRIM 171110122373).

(e) Approves the Community Green Space Manager to make minor amendments if required as a result of the peer review.

(f) Notes that the final Activity Management Plan will be adopted by Council in conjunction with the adoption of the Final LTP.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. The Local Government Act 2002 requires the Council to undertake asset management planning including defining levels of service, demand management, life cycle strategies etc. In line with these requirements an Activity Management Plan has been prepared for the green space activity. The first Activity Management Plan for green space assets was completed in 2007. Following this a new plan was prepared in 2012 which adopted the New Zealand Recreation Association Park Categories and Levels of Service. These Levels of Service have been very well used and valuable over the last 5 years ensuring that parks and reserves have been developed in an appropriate and affordable way. In order to be able to ensure that green space continues to be developed and maintained to meet the needs of a changing community and is affordable today and in the future, a new Draft Community Green Space Activity Management Plan has been created.

3.2. The new Draft Community Green Space Activity Management Plan 2017 has been created using a different format from the 2012 version. The previous plan focused strongly on the park categories and key asset types. The previous plan provided a large amount of information in each category which was beneficial in enabling a one stop shop for greenspace planning. The problem with this approach is that it is difficult and time consuming to continuously update the Activity Management Plan to reflect all the information which is being produced in other relevant strategies and plans as they are developed. The new version will where practical reference other plans rather than providing full detailed summaries.

3.3. For consistency, the Draft Community Green Space Activity Management Plan follows a new format, which has been created by the Asset Management Steering Group. This group is an internal staff group that has been set up to provide some best practise support and consistency to the preparation and ongoing update and development of Activity Management Plans.

3.4. Audit New Zealand recommend that all Activity Management Plans are peer reviewed. The Council’s Asset Management Steering Group support this recommendation and have sent the document for peer review. It is expected that if changes are required as a result
of the peer review that these will be minor. This report therefore recommends that Council approve the Community Green Space Manager to make any minor changes.

3.5. The levels of service contained within the draft plan are much the same as the previous 2012 plan. The changes relate to 5 separate asset types including community facilities, sports facilities, public toilets, play space and tree maintenance. Council will receive separate reports which will outline the service levels changes for these assets.

3.6. Any good Activity Management Plan should be a living document with information relating to capital works, contracts, valuation and trends etc being updated on a regular basis. This information will be updated annually to ensure the plan is kept up to date.

3.7. The Draft Community Green Space Activity Management Plan 2017 does not cover the Te Kohaka O Tuhi Tura Trust land. A separate business plan will be presented to Council which will include request for financial assistance as part of the LTP process.

3.8. The Management Team/CE has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. No community views have been specifically sought while developing the Draft Community Green Space Activity Management Plan 2017. The Plan does, however, make reference to a number of strategies which have been developed as a result of direct consultation with users of green space in the Waimakariri District.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. Not having an up to date Activity Management Plan has both financial implications and risks. If information regarding trends in the green space activity are not known there is a real risk that assets will not be developed to cater for need in the right areas. This may lead to under-used assets which become a financial liability for the Council.

5.2. The Activity Management Plan allows for long term operations, renewal and capital works planning in line with specified levels of service. Having this level of long term planning allows the Council to be able to provide assets which are affordable.

5.3. The Draft Community Green Space Activity Management Plan identifies both capital projects and renewals funding required to meet levels of service over the next ten year period.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy

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

6.2. Legislation


6.3. Community Outcomes

This report relates to a number of community outcomes including the following:

- There is a safe environment for all
- There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all
- There are areas of significant vegetation and habitats for indigenous fauna
- The communities cultures, arts and heritage are conserved and celebrated
People are friendly and caring, creating a strong sense of community in our District
Public Spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality
Businesses in the district are diverse adaptable and growing
The communities need for health and social services are met
The distinctive character of our takiwā - towns, villages and rural areas is maintained
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is for the Council to consider potential funding for art in public spaces and the establishment of a Public Art Advisory Trust.

1.2. This was considered by Council in 2016 and there was a recommendation for the incoming Council to consider forming a Waimakariri Public Art Advisory Trust and to consider the proposed funding for the Trust.

1.3. Staff have included funding of $5,000 for this in the Draft LTP to cover servicing costs of the proposed Trust but to help to keep the proposed rate increase as low as feasible have not included any provision for any cash grant to the Trust which was originally discussed as $25,000 pa.

1.4. A copy of the 2016 report is attached for background information.

Attachments:

i. Art in Public Places Policy (draft) (TRIM No: 150922133742)
ii. Waimakariri Public Art Advisory Trust Deed (draft) (TRIM No: 151216164871)
iii. Art in Public Places Policy and Waimakariri Public Art Advisory Trust Deed Report (TRIM 160623059826)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 180118003966

(b) Receives the Art in Public Places Policy and Waimakariri Public Arts Trust Deed.

(c) Approves the inclusion in the Draft LTP of the Proposal to establish a Waimakariri Public Art Advisory Trust.

(d) Notes that the expectation is that the Trust will externally source funds for art installations

(e) Approves funding of $5,000 in the Recreation Account for the Servicing of the Art Trust. – Note that this is included in the Draft LTP Recreation Budget.
3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. In June 2015 Council approved the development of an Art in Public Places Policy prompted in part by an initiative from the Kaiapoi Community Board (KCB), to recommend the Council establish an art in public places policy for the District and to propose a process for its development. It was intended the policy should provide a framework for the acquisition, installation/placement and maintenance of public space art works in the District.

3.2. Council also approved the establishment of a working party to provide advice to staff and facilitate community engagement as part of the policy development. The working party has met three times, and developed the attached draft policy and trust deed.

3.3. The model decided on by the working party involves setting up of a charitable trust to administer the policy with a mandate to foster a wide range of art in public places. The trust may also facilitate funding applications and can commission art work. The trust will seek to minimise cost to ratepayers by seeking independent funding via donations and applications to funding agencies.

3.4. At their meeting on 24 November the working party agreed that the draft policy and trust deed should go to the Board for comment. This was undertaken in February 2016 along with consultation with the Runanga Executive of Ngai Tuahuriri who asked that the policy be reviewed by Matapopore. Subsequently Dr Areta Wilkinson provided feedback on the policy and her comments have been incorporated into the policy document.

3.5. Formation of a Trust will require specific consultation with the community and this will need to be done through a LTP or Annual Plan process because of the commitment of initial and ongoing funding for the Trust.

3.6. While the working group is of the opinion that without sufficient funding the Trust would not be able to meet its objectives and suggest initial seed funding of $25,000 with provision for annual grants of $25,000 thereafter, it would still be possible to form the Trust to advise on installation of externally funded art and also the Trust will have the ability to seek external funding and support artists in their application for external funds.

3.7. The Waimakariri Public Art Advisory Trust is intended to be a charitable trust set up as a council controlled organisation.

3.8. Charitable Trusts may be set up for the advancement of education, or other purposes beneficial to the community. Set up as a discretionary trust, it may call on publicly listed charities and organisations to apply for funds. A charitable trust is exempt from paying tax on income.

3.9. Registering as a charity has other benefits such as: detailed information about the Trust is available on the Register which is particularly useful for applying for public funding; provides proof of charitable status through registration; there is the potential for greater public confidence and trust about the Trust through the information available on the register.

3.10. Setting up the Trust as a council controlled organisation means that there are clear lines of reporting and accountability to the council regarding the operation of the Trust. Before the trust can be established consultation must be undertaken in accordance with Section 82, Local Government Act 2002.

3.11. The Working party also developed the Art in Public Places Policy which has also been supported by the Community Boards. The policy will be referred separately to the...
Council for adoption once a final decision on the formation of the Trust has been made by Council.

3.12. The Management Team/CE has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. Representatives from the Community and Ward Advisory Boards, Runanga Executive of Ngai Tuahuriri, and the wider arts community have been consulted via the working party in developing this policy and trust deed.

4.2. The working party included representatives of: Waimakariri Arts Trust, Creative Communities Arts Funding Committee, Waimakariri Community Arts Council, Oxford Arts Trust and the Waikuku Artists Incorporated as well as Community Board members and Councillors Doody and Allen.

4.3. If Council agrees to this proposal further consultation, particularly around funding, will be undertaken with the community through the Annual Plan and Long Term Plan processes.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. It is expected that associated compliance and audit costs, including secretarial servicing will be in the order of $5,000 per annum which has been incorporated into the Draft LTP budget.

5.2. The proposed Trust could be considered to be a Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) and that will require statutory reporting on a similar basis to that for the Waimakariri Libraries Trust.

5.3. The only allocation the Council currently makes in this area is to the Arts Collection Trust which buys artworks for display in public buildings and for 2016/17 year the Council granted $2,360.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Legislation**

*Local Government Act 2002*

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

The community’s cultures, arts and heritage are conserved and celebrated

- Different cultures are acknowledged and respected.
- There are wide ranging opportunities to participate in arts and cultural activities.
ART IN PUBLIC PLACES POLICY

1 Introduction
Artworks are commonly used in public outdoor spaces as a means to enhance the environment, reinforce the cultural and community identity and promote cities and towns as centres of artistic and cultural excellence.
In her article on ‘creative place-making’ Cynthia Nikitin suggests that “Public art projects will be most effective when they are part of a larger, holistic, multidisciplinary approach to enlivening a city or neighbourhood”.1

2 Why have an ‘Art in Public Places’ policy?
The purpose is:
- To demonstrate an open and enabling approach to the concept of public art.
- To provide a consistent approach and clarity around the process of acquisition, siting and ongoing management of art works in the District.
- To set clear Council expectations for any provider/proposer/funder of public art work in the consideration of potential future installations.

3 What are the benefits of having art in public places?
Public Art:
- Reflects our identity as a community
- Makes art accessible to all
- Promotes civic pride and a sense of “place” by supporting and showcasing creativity
- Challenges perceptions, community ideas and feelings
- Enriches the cultural life of our District
- Enhances public spaces
- Celebrates and promotes an understanding of our cultural diversity and identity

4 Policy Objectives
- Enabling art in public places will promote the Waimakariri District’s sense of community, civic pride, recognition of other cultures and our distinctive identity. The Treaty of Waitangi is honoured and practises of partnership are respected through the arts.
- Where feasible, public art will be integrated into the design and landscape of selected open spaces.
- Public art will be installed where it will enhance the public’s enjoyment of public spaces.
- Installations will increase understanding and enjoyment of public art.
- Public art will contribute to the development of cultural tourism in the District
- To support the Waimakariri Public Art Trust (WPAT).

5 What are the principles that Waimakariri District Council will apply to public art?
- Art reflects a celebration of the uniqueness of the District’s environment, history and cultural identity.
- Art enhances the experience by our community and visitors of the built and natural environment.
- The Council will respect the recommendations of the Waimakariri Public Art Trust as it recognises that art can be contentious

1 Project for Public Spaces, Cynthia Nikitin (http://www.pps.org/reference/collaborative-creative-placemaking-good-public-art-depends-on-good-public-spaces/)
Public Art Process

The WPAT evaluates and commissions potential public art works (including gifts and bequests) according to the following considerations:

- Standards of excellence and innovation
- Durability of artwork
- Ownership structure and conditions for movement or disposal of the art works
- Potential of artwork to capture the public’s imagination and to help create a sense of place and identity for the Waimakariri District
- Fit with the topography and character and use of the relevant public places
- Cost implications including on-going maintenance costs and insurance where appropriate.

The WPAT will, in particular, consult with mana whenua at the earliest stages of planning new projects to identify and work together on areas of shared interest.

6 Maintenance and care of public art works

The Waimakariri District has a number of art works displayed in public places throughout the District that have arisen over time by a variety of processes. The Council is committed to ensuring that all public art works are identified and labelled and that each artwork’s status and condition is recorded and regularly reviewed.

Council, through the WPAT, will ensure the collection of public art is properly cared for and maintained. It will seek advice and work closely with mana whenua in the care and maintenance of Māori taonga and Māori art in public space. Any additional cost associated with this will need to be considered and approved through the Council’s Annual Plan process.

7 Re-siting, removal and deaccessioning of public art works

While the Council understands and values the need to retain the integrity of art works and their relationship to their sites, from time to time as the District changes and evolves, there may be reasons to review the location or retention of a public art work. If the result of this review is not to move the artwork the Council, through the WAPT, may also consider deaccessioning the work.

Re-siting, removal or deaccessioning of a public art work may be requested by the Council and/or the WAPT if one or more of the following criteria apply.

Note: these criteria may prompt a review, but they are not the criteria upon which a final decision is made.

- the artwork requires temporary removal for treatment or safe-guarding during redevelopment or works being carried out in its immediate vicinity;
- the art work is irreparably damaged or deteriorated;
- the public art work endangers public health and safety and remedy is impractical, unfeasible or would undermine the integrity of the public art work;
- Council is unable to reasonably guarantee the condition or security of the public art work in its present location;
- the public art work requires a high level of maintenance/or conservation, rendering unsustainable asset management expenses;
- the public art work possesses serious or dangerous faults in design or workmanship and repair or remedy is impractical, not feasible or undermines the integrity of the art work.

The WAPT will follow the same process as if the artwork was offered for the first time. The decision will also be made on consideration of consultation with the artist(s) (or the family of the artist(s) if necessary) and other relevant people or organisations involved in its establishment. If an artwork needs to be moved or altered in any way, consideration will be given to the moral rights of an artist under the Copyright Act 1994.
Options for deaccessioning artworks will include:

- selling or gifting the artwork back to the artist
- donating to a community group or facility, or organisation that operates for public benefit
- open sale or auction

Decisions on the above options will be made by the WAPT with guidance from the Council, based on criteria that include:

- resale value
- sensitivities around how Council came to own the artwork
- condition of the artwork.

8 Māori

The Council acknowledges Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri as mana whenua (people) of the Waimakariri District. Mana whenua have an interest in all Public Arts evaluations, commissions and placement in their takiwā (tribal area) regardless of the artworks maker, concept or installation protocols. The special position and interests of Ngāi Tahu generally and mana whenua specifically in relation to public land, waterways and sites of cultural importance are recognised.

Through this Public Art Policy the Council and the Trust will respect and promote Māori culture in partnership with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga.

Any artist creating art work referencing Māori must demonstrate consultation with iwi. Any art work referencing Māori will involve consultation regarding the installation e.g. karakia (prayer).
Appendix

9 Definitions

Public Art:
- Includes but is not limited to: sculpture, murals, sculptural architecture, water features
- Includes works of a permanent or temporary nature located in public places
- Does not include cemetery or war memorial architectural features (reference to agreement with RSA to maintain and restore war memorials)
- Does not include privately owned works of art on private property that simply happen to be visible or accessible to the public; or publically owned works on New Zealand Transport Agency Land.

Public Place:
- A place that is owned or administered by the Council where the public has free access.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL
("the Settlor")

______________________________
______________________________
______________________________
______________________________
______________________________
______________________________
______________________________

[name, address and occupation of trustees]  
("the Trustees")

______________________________

Waimakariri Public Arts Trust Deed

______________________________

CORCORAN FRENCH
LAWYERS & NOTARY
INCORPORATING WALKER RODGER

1518.1023
THIS DEED made this day of 2016

PARTIES
1  WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL at Rangiora ("the Settlor")

2

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

[name, address and occupation of trustees]
("the Trustees")

BACKGROUND
A  The Settlor wishes to establish a charitable trust to develop public art projects in the Waimakariri district that are of enduring quality, are accessible to the public and stimulate public interest. The aim is to educate the public about art and artists and support artistic endeavours.

B  The parties have agreed to enter into this deed specifying the purposes of the trust and providing for its control and governance.

C  The Trustees have agreed to act as initial Trustees of the trust.

D  The Settlor has contemporaneously with the execution of this deed paid the sum of $25,000.00 to be held by the Trustees on trust and with the powers set out in this deed.

E  The Settlor proposes that in due course additional property may fall into and form part of the assets of the trust and the trustees will own the assets of the trust and will, along with certain advisory trustees (in this deed referred to as the charitable trustees) manage these within the framework of the trust.

F  The Settlor intends the charitable trustees be appointed to give appropriate guidance and instruction to the Trustees and to perform certain specific functions in relation to this trust.

OPERATIVE PROVISIONS
1  NAME
The name of the Trust shall be the "Waimakariri Public Arts Trust".
OFFICE
The office of the Trust shall be such place in North Canterbury or the Waimakariri district as the Board of Trustees may determine.

PURPOSES
The purposes of the Trust are as follows:
(a) To promote art and culture in the Waimakariri district including but not limited to the matters set out in Schedule C;
(b) To encourage public art in all new developments and redevelopments in the Waimakariri district;
(c) Establish and support a Waimakariri Arts Fund to commission art works and promote the arts;
(d) To apply for independent funding to secure art works and commission art works for specific sites.
(e) To educate the public about art and artists.
(f) To support artistic endeavours in the community.
(g) To benefit the public and local community with art works and events.

TANGATA WHENUA
In attaining its purposes the Trust shall recognise the views and expectations of tangata whenua.

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

5.1 Numbers
The Board of Trustees ("Board") shall consist of no fewer than five (5) nor more than seven (7) members. The initial members of the Board shall be the signatories to this deed.

5.2 Term of Board
Trustees shall be appointed on a rotational basis as follows:-

(a) Two of the initial trustees will retire at the end of a two year term
(b) Two of the initial Trustees will expire at the end of a four year term.
(c) The remaining initial Trustee(s) shall retire at the end of a three year term.
(d) Each subsequent term of the Trustees shall be for a period of three years.

Unless otherwise specified in this deed each member of the Board shall hold office for a term of three years or until he or she dies, or is declared bankrupt, or shall have his or her property affairs managed under the Protection of Personal and Property Rights Act 1988 upon the grounds of lack of competency to manage those affairs, or is a "patient as defined in s2 of the Mental Health (Compulsory Assessment and Treatment) Act 1992, or indicates in writing that he or she wishes to resign from the Board. Any retiring member shall be eligible for re-appointment.
5.3 Appointment and Removal of Trustees
The Waimakariri District Council shall have the power to appoint and remove all Trustees to the Board of the Trust. The Trustees shall include people of the Waimakariri District Council and representatives from the art community in the Waimakariri or North Canterbury district at the Council's discretion.

The Trust Board is to comprise of a minimum of five (5) and up to seven (7) Trustees and include two elected member representatives ("Councillors") who may be the Council appointed Trustees. The Trustees (other than the Councillors) are appointed by the Council based on a "call for expressions of interest". The Council's landscape architect will be a advisory trustee but may also serve as a Trustee of the Board. The Trust Board may include a professional advisor to be called upon for professional or cultural advice then required.

5.4 Appointment of further trustees
The Council may at any time appoint up to two (2) further Trustees for terms which shall expire no later than the time when the terms of the members of the then current Board expire. Such trustees may be advisory Trustees referred to as "Charitable Trustees".

5.5 Termination of trusteeship
The Board may, by a motion decided by a two-thirds majority of votes to recommend to the Waimakariri District Council that a Trustee's membership in the Board be considered for termination if they believe on reasonable grounds that such action is in the best interests of the Trust.

5.6 Recording trustee appointments, resignations and removals
The appointment of a trustee and the cessation of the appointment of any trustee shall not be effective until recorded by resolution recorded in the Council's meeting minutes or by deed.

5.7 Name of the Board
The name of the Board shall be the Waimakariri Public Arts Trust Board.

6 POWERS
6.1 General and specific powers
In addition to the powers implied by the general law of New Zealand or contained in the Trustee Act 1956, the powers which the Board may exercise in order to carry out its charitable purposes are as follows:

(a) to use the funds of the Trust as the Board thinks necessary or proper in payment of the costs and expenses of the Trust, including the employment of professional advisers, agents, officers and employees as appears necessary or expedient; and

(b) to purchase, take on lease or in exchange or hire or otherwise acquire any land or personal property and any rights or privileges which the Board
thinks necessary or expedient for the purpose of attaining the objects of the Trust and to sell, exchange, bail or lease, with or without option of purchase, or in any manner dispose of any such property, rights or privileges as aforesaid; and
(c) to carry on any business; and
(d) to invest surplus funds in any way permitted by law for the investment of trust funds and upon such terms as the Board thinks fit; and
(e) to borrow or raise money from time to time, with or without security, and upon such terms as to priority and otherwise as the Board thinks fit; and
(f) to pay, apply or appropriate from income or capital such amount as the Trustees may decide for or towards one or more of the objectives of the trust; and
(g) to do all things as may from time to time be necessary or desirable to enable the Board to give effect to and to attain the charitable purposes of the Trust.

6.2 Trustee Person Specification
The Council shall consider the matters set out schedule A when deciding on the appointment of initial, new, additional or replacement trustees.

6.3 Incorporation
The Board is empowered to seek incorporation in accordance with the provisions of the Charitable Trusts Act 1957.

6.4 Employment
Under clause 6.1(a) the Board may employ as agents, officers, and employees, persons who are members of the Board.

7 INCOME, BENEFIT OR ADVANTAGE TO BE APPLIED TO CHARITABLE PURPOSES
7.1 Application
Any income, benefit or advantage shall be applied to the charitable purposes of the Trust and may take into account the matters set out in Schedule B.

7.2 Influence
No member of the Trust or person associated with a member of the Trust shall participate in, or materially influence, any decision made by the Trust in respect of the payment to or on behalf of that member or associated person of any income, benefit or advantage whatsoever, except where that income, benefit or advantage is derived from:
(a) professional services to the trust rendered in the course of business charged at no greater rate than current market rates; or
(b) interest on money lent at no greater rate than current market rates.
7.3 **Reasonableness required**
Any such income paid shall be reasonable and relative to that which would be paid in an arm's length transaction (being open market value).

7.4 **Entrenchment**
The provisions and effect of this clause shall not be removed from this document and shall be included and implied into any document replacing this document.

8 **PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD**

8.1 **Meetings**
The Board shall meet at such times and places as it determines, and shall elect a chairperson from amongst its members at its first meeting and at every subsequent annual general meeting.

8.2 **Chairperson**
The chairperson shall preside at all meetings of the Board at which she or he is present. In the absence of the chairperson from any meeting, the members present shall appoint one of their number to preside at that meeting.

8.3 **Quorum**
At any meeting of the Board a majority of members shall form a quorum and no business shall be transacted unless a quorum is present.

8.4 **Voting**
All questions before the Board shall be decided by consensus. However, where a consensus decision cannot be reached on a question, it shall, unless otherwise specified in this deed, be put as a motion to be decided by a majority of votes. If the voting is tied, the motion shall be lost.

8.5 **Reports**
The Board shall report regularly on its activities to the Waimakariri District Council and, in particular, shall present a detailed annual report to the Council if required.

8.6 **Guidance**
The Board shall be guided in its decisions by the views of the Waimakariri District Council and may take into account the matters set out in Schedules A, B and C.

9 **ACCOUNTS**

9.1 **True and fair accounts**
The Board shall keep true and fair accounts of all money received and expended.

9.2 **Audit**
The Board shall, as soon as practicable after the end of every financial year of the
Board, cause the accounts of the Board for that financial year to be audited by an accountant appointed for that purpose and the audited accounts shall be made available to the public.

10     POWER TO DELEGATE
  10.1   Power to delegate
The Board may, from time to time, appoint any committee and may delegate any of its powers and duties to any such committee or to any person, and the committee or person, as the case may be, may without confirmation by the Board exercise or perform the delegated powers or duties in like manner and with the same effect as the Board could itself have exercised or performed them.

10.2    Delegate bound
Any committee or person to whom the Board has delegated powers or duties shall be bound by the charitable terms of the Trust.

10.3    Delegation revocable
Every such delegation shall be revocable at will, and no such delegation shall prevent the exercise of any power or the performance of any duty by the Board.

10.4    Delegate need not be trustee
It shall not be necessary that any person who is appointed to be a member of any such committee, or to whom any such delegation is made, be a member of the Board.

11     COMMON SEAL
The Board shall have a common seal which shall be kept in the custody of the secretary, or such other officer as shall be appointed by the Board, and shall be used only as directed by the Board. It shall be affixed to documents only in the presence of, and accompanied by the signature of, two members of the Board.

12     ALTERATION OF DEED
The Board may, by consensus or pursuant to a motion decided by a two thirds majority of votes, by supplemental deed, make alterations or additions to the terms and provisions of this deed provided that no such alteration or addition shall:

(a) take effect unless it is confirmed by resolution of the Board;
(b) detract from the exclusively charitable nature of the Trust or result in the distribution of its assets on winding up or dissolution for any purpose that is not exclusively charitable; or
(c) be effective until registered with and accepted under the Charities Act 2005 by the Charities Board;
(d) be approved by the Waimakariri District Council.
13 Disposition Of Surplus Assets
If, either on the winding up, failure or dissolution of the Trust, or in the case of the Board having incorporated in accordance with the provisions of the Charitable Trusts Act 1957 (or other Act passed in substitution for the same) on the liquidation of the Board or on its dissolution by the Registrar, there remains, after payment of all of the trust debts and liabilities, any property or assets whatsoever, they shall be given or transferred to the Trustees of such trusts or organizations in the Waimakariri or North Canterbury District in New Zealand as the Board with the support of the Waimakariri District Council considers in its discretion carry out charitable purposes within New Zealand similar to those set out in this deed, or be applied for such charitable purposes Waimakariri or North Canterbury District as the Board with the support of the Waimakariri District Council considers in its discretion, by resolution, determine at, before, or during the winding up, failure, dissolution or liquidation. If the Board is unable to make such decision, such property shall be disposed of in accordance with the directions of a Judge of the High Court pursuant to section 27 of the Charitable Trusts Act 1957 on the application of any member of the Board.

14 WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL
The Waimakariri District Council will support the trust by way of initial funding. The Waimakariri District Council may also provide further ongoing technical administration support through (but not limited to) providing resource management advice, secretarial support, and covering resource consent costs where the Waimakariri District Council considers it appropriate to do so.

The Waimakariri District Council may also assist with physical work such as site preparation and maintenance through the Waimakariri District Council’s Green Space team where the Waimakariri District Council considers it appropriate to do so.
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SCHEDULE A

Trustee Person Specification

In considering suitability for the appointment of a Trustee, the Council may consider the following attributes:

1. Enthusiasm and/or expertise in the arts and a willingness to champion public art in the Waimakariri District.
2. Integrity of member.
3. A commitment to the trust and its objectives.
4. An understanding and accepted of the legal duties, responsibilities and liability of the trusteeship.
5. A willingness to devote the necessary time and effort to their duties as a trustee.
6. Good independent judgment.
7. An ability to think creatively.
8. The ability to work effectively as a member of a team and a willingness to state personal conviction and, equally, to accept a majority decision and be tolerant of the views of other people.
9. A belief in equal opportunities and diversity.
10. Not have any orders under the Protection of Personal and Property Rights Act 1988 or otherwise relating to the mental capacity of the member.
11. Have no convictions for fraud or any fraud related activities.

SCHEDULE B

Basis for decision-making

1. The trustee will evaluate and commission potential public art works (including gifts and bequests) taking into account (but not limited to) the following:
   a) Standards of excellence and innovation
   b) Durability of the art work.
   c) Ownership structure and conditions for movement or disposal of the artworks.
   d) Potential of artwork to capture the public's imagination and to help create a sense of place and identity for the Waimakariri District.
   e) Fit with the topography and character, and use of the relevant public places.
   f) Cost implications including ongoing maintenance costs.

2. All proposed installations will be consulted with the local Community Board before any decisions are made. This will ensure no conflicts are likely to arise in terms of land use, will ensure Council has no significant concerns and to check that Council does not foresee any risk, liability or unscheduled costs associated with any potential installation.

3. All artwork is subject to the provisions of the Resources Management Act 1991 (treated as a structure potentially required resource consent) and must comply with the provisions of the Waimakariri District Plan, Resource Management Plans and policies.
SCHEDULE C

Roles and Responsibilities

1. Public Art Programme
   - Develop a public art project and opportunities programme and budget

2. Public Works of Art
   - Evaluate and approve opportunity and sit in accordance with the Waimakariri Public Art policy.
   - Approval consent and site
   - Approval budget

3. Gifts
   - Ensure all gift offers are considered in a fair, transparent and consistent manner
   - Approval consent and site
   - Approve budget

4. Re-siting and Removal
   - Approval decision to re-site or remove art work in accordance with the original intentions, consistent with the rights afforded by contractual agreement and copyright legislation
   - Undertake careful and robust evaluation and consider re-siting or removal only when no other option exists

5. Renewals, care and maintenance
   - Ensure all public works or art are identified and catalogues and their location and condition are recorded and reviewed regularly
   - Ensure all works of art are cared for and maintained in accordance with the artistic and cultural protocols appropriate to their origin, intended purpose and location
   - Develop a programme of renewals and care and maintenance plans
   - Maintain the integrity of public works of art through their useful life
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to advise the Council of the progress that has been made in developing the Art in Public Places Policy and associated Waimakariri Public Art Advisory Trust Deed and to receive feedback on the options presented in this report to bring into effect the policy.

1.2. A working party of representatives of the Boards and established arts organisations in the District was convened in September 2015, and met to develop the policy.

1.3. As development of the policy progressed it was decided that a model where the Art in Public Places Policy is administered by a Charitable Trust would be most appropriate for this District. A trust deed was developed by the working party and a legal draft of the Deed completed by Corcoran French, Solicitors.

1.4. At their meeting on 27 November 2015 the working party agreed the policy and trust deed should now go to the Community and Ward Advisory Boards for comment. This was undertaken in February 2016. The Runanga Executive was included in this consultation and asked for the draft policy to be sent to Matapopore for comment from a policy perspective. Dr Areta Wilkinson subsequently provided comments on the policy which have been incorporated into the document.

1.5. Setting up a charitable trust to implement the policy will require initial and ongoing funding. The working party suggest $25,000 per annum to be considered by Council for seed funding and ongoing top-up to ensure the success of the trust.

1.6. The only allocation the Council currently makes in this area is to the Arts Collection Trust which buys artworks for display in public buildings and for 2016/17 year the Council granted $2,360.

Attachments:

i. Art in Public Places Policy (draft) (TRIM No: 150922133742)
ii. Waimakariri Public Art Advisory Trust Deed (draft) (TRIM No: 151216164871)
2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 160623059826.

(b) Receives the Art in Public Places Policy and Waimakariri Public Arts Trust Deed.

(c) Requests the incoming Council to consider the formation of the Waimakariri Public Art Advisory Trust as a charitable trust and a council controlled organisation.

(d) Requests the incoming Council to consider the proposed funding for the Waimakariri Public Art Trust.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. In June 2015 Council approved the development of an Art in Public Places Policy prompted in part by an initiative from the Kaiapoi Community Board (KCB), to recommend the Council establish an art in public places policy for the District and to propose a process for its development. It was intended the policy should provide a framework for the acquisition, installation/placement and maintenance of public space art works in the District.

3.2. Council also approved the establishment of a working party to provide advice to staff and facilitate community engagement as part of the policy development. The working party has met three times, and developed the attached draft policy and trust deed.

3.3. The model decided on by the working party involves setting up of a charitable trust to administer the policy and with a mandate to foster a wide range of art in public places. The trust may also facilitate funding applications and can commission art work. The trust will seek to minimise cost to ratepayers by seeking independent funding via donations and applications to funding agencies.

3.4. At their meeting on 24 November the working party agreed that the draft policy and trust deed should go to the Boards for comment. This was undertaken in February 2016 along with consultation with the Runanga Executive of Ngai Tuahuriri who asked that the policy be reviewed by Matapopore. Subsequently Dr Areta Wilkinson provided feedback on the policy and her comments have been incorporated into the policy document.

3.5. Formation of a Trust will require specific consultation with the community and this will need to be done through an LTP or Annual Plan process because of the commitment of initial and ongoing funding for the Trust.

3.6. The working group is of the opinion that without sufficient funding the Trust would not be able to meet its objectives and suggest initial seed funding of $25,000 with provision for annual grants of $25,000 thereafter.

3.7. The Waimakariri Public Art Advisory Trust is intended to be a charitable trust set up as a council controlled organisation.

3.8. Charitable Trusts may be set up for the advancement of education, or other purposes beneficial to the community. Set up as a discretionary trust, it may call on publicly listed charities and organisations to apply for funds. A charitable trust is exempt from paying tax on income.
3.9. Registering as a charity has other benefits such as: detailed information about the Trust is available on the Register which is particularly useful for applying for public funding; provides proof of charitable status through registration; there is the potential for greater public confidence and trust about the Trust through the information available on the register.

3.10. Setting up the Trust as a council controlled organisation means that there are clear lines of reporting and accountability to the council regarding the operation of the Trust. Before the trust can be established consultation must be undertaken in accordance with Section 82, Local Government Act 2002.

3.11. The Management Team/CE has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Representatives from the Community and Ward Advisory Boards, Runanga Executive of Ngai Tuahuriri, and the wider arts community have been consulted via the working party in developing this policy and trust deed.

4.2. The working party included representatives of: Waimakariri Arts Trust, Creative Communities Arts Funding Committee, Waimakariri Community Arts Council, Oxford Arts Trust and the Waikuku Artists Incorporated as well as Community Board members and Councillors Doody and Allen.

4.3. If Council agrees to this proposal further consultation, particularly around funding, will be undertaken with the community through the Annual Plan and Long Term Plan processes.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. Developing an art in public places policy will incur costs in staff time and public consultation, although these are accounted for in approved budgets.

5.2. Other than through the grant to the Waimakariri Arts Trust there is no provision in the Council’s Long Term Plan for the purchase of art works. There is a risk that in itself the policy will be seen as a commitment to fund artworks.

5.3. Initial funding of $25,000.00 is proposed with ongoing funding on an annual basis as part of the Annual Plan and Long Term Plan processes. In addition it is expected that associated compliance and audit costs, including secretarial servicing will be in the order of $5 -10,000 per annum.

5.4. The proposed Trust could be considered to be a Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) and that will require statutory reporting on a similar basis to that for the Waimakariri Libraries Trust.

5.5. The only allocation the Council currently makes in this area is to the Arts Collection Trust which buys artworks for display in public buildings and for 2016/17 year the Council granted $2,360.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy

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

*Local Government Act 2002*

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

The community’s cultures, arts and heritage are conserved and celebrated

- Different cultures are acknowledged and respected.
- There are wide ranging opportunities to participate in arts and cultural activities.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: RDG-28 /180104000506

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 30th January 2018

FROM: Chris Brown, Community & Greenspace Manager & Mike Kwant Community Projects Officer

SUBJECT: Cones Road Proposed Walkway link to Boundary Road

SIGNED BY:
(for Reports to Council or Committees)

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to provide Council with further costing information and a community action plan for the construction and maintenance of the proposed Cones Road walkway. This was requested by Council at the Council meeting dated 5th September 2017.

1.2. This report seeks approval for $11,800 to be included in the Draft Long Term Plan, which is currently included in the Draft Recreation Budget.

Attachments:

i. Action Plan.
ii. Aerial photograph of Cones Road Walkway approximate route.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No.180104000506

(b) Notes that the Rangiora / Ashley Community Board supported the construction of a walkway between Cones Road and Boundary Road at its March 2017 meeting subject to a number of safety initiatives being implemented including the reduction of the speed limit to the unsealed portion of Cones Road.

(c) Approves funding of $11,800 being included in the draft Long Term Plan for the construction of a track from Cones Road to Boundary Road.

(d) Notes that a budget of $11,800 for the track construction has already been included in the draft budget sheets in the 2018/19 financial year.

(e) Notes that the Roading report Trim # 170822090365 regarding the reduction of the speed limit on Cones Road and other safety related changes to Cones Road is still lying on the table and will be considered when the Long Term Plan is finalised.
3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. The Rangiora Community Board were approached by Mr Harris at the July 2015 meeting with his proposal for the development of a walkway in Loburn between the existing northern terminus of Cones Road and following the unformed portion of legal road to its connection with Boundary Road. The proposed walkway would provide a worthwhile and safe pedestrian link between Rangiora and the Ashley Forest area as well as providing additional options as part of local walking circuits for Loburn residents.

3.2. At the October 2015 meeting of the Rangiora Community Board, Greenspace and Roading presented reports advising that staff would work with Mr Harris to construct the walking track. The next steps to progress the walkway at that time were to:

- undertake further consultation with the community, and
- seek professional advice regarding the potential impacts the walkway would have on existing traffic and pedestrian movements.

3.3. Staff consulted each adjacent landowner by letter inviting them to have their say on the proposal.

3.4. A public meeting was then held to hear the community's views, the feedback received at this meeting being collated and documented.

3.5. Following this meeting Roading staff commissioned a report from Abley Traffic Consultants to assess possible safety issues that may arise as a result of walkway development.

Abley Consultants found that while there were some safety concerns which were considered valid these are low risk and a reduced speed limit on the unsealed portion of Cones Road was recommended.

3.6. At the March 2017 Rangiora / Ashley Community Board meeting a resolution was passed supporting the construction of the track subject to a series of safety changes first being implemented on Cones Road.

3.7. The Roading report to Council (TRIM 180104000506), presented to Council on 5th September 2017, recommended the implementation of a number of the safety related changes including a reduced speed limit of 40 km/h and is currently lying on the table. Council requested additional information relating to costs for the project and a community action plan for the construction and maintenance of the proposed track. The action plan is included in this report as attachment i.

3.8. The action plan includes information relating to costs for the track construction. The Council at the 5 September 2017 meeting requested additional information relating to the safety improvements identified in the Roading report. Roading staff will provide this information as an update at the Council meeting on the 30th January 2018.

3.9. The construction of the track currently relies on the successful implementation of the safety changes to Cones Road which include the lowering of the speed limit. It also relies on Council approving $11,800 for the track construction. Should the recommendations in the Roading report (TRIM 180104000506) be approved and funding of $11,800 be approved then staff will work closely with local residents on the track construction.
3.10. Maintenance of the track will initially be undertaken by the community although it is likely that Council will ultimately be responsible for this maintenance which will be of minimal cost.

3.11. Staff believe that there are a number of options available to Council. These include the following:

∑ Include no financial provision for the development of the track. Staff do not support this option. Staff believe that the development of the track is a positive addition to the district's walking and cycling network. If funding is not provided it is possible that those in the community who want the track to be constructed will start to do so. This has the potential have a track created that is not fit for purpose.

∑ Defer the allocation of funding until a later financial year. Staff do not support this option. The process regarding the track development which has included a large amount of community consultation has now been going for more than two years. Those members of the community who want to start building the track have already expressed concern over the time it has already taken.

∑ Include the $11,800 in the Draft Long Term Plan. Staff support this option. The $11,800 has already been added to the Reserve budget sheets. Support for the track has already been provided by the Rangiora Ashley Community Board and Roading staff have undertaken consultation regarding the lowering of the speed limit on the unsealed part of Cones Road.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Letter to concerned residents - sent out 30th October 2015 to adjacent residents.

4.2. Council Roading and Greenspace staff held a site meeting on 14th December 2015 with residents in support and against the walkway proposal.

4.3. In February 2016 a letter was received on behalf of 14 residents of the area immediately surrounding the site highlighting their concerns and opposition to the proposal.

4.4. Council facilitated a public meeting in Rangiora in July 2016 which was attended by approximately 100 people. The concerns raised were summarised in a previous report to Council (Greenspace report to Rangiora-Ashley Community Board 13th March 2017).

4.5. Stu Harris presented a petition in favour of the walkway signed by 200 supporters and this was included in a Greenspace report to the Woodend – Ashley Community Board dated 9th November 2016.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. It is anticipated that for the project to be feasible, much of the track would need to be constructed using volunteer labour with personally owned hand tools. This would save considerably on contractor operator and machinery time and reduces the budget to $11,800 mostly required for excavator operation and materials.

5.2. Staff have already added this budget to the draft Long Term Plan budget sheets for Council's consideration.

5.3. The Roading report (TRIM 180104000506) identifies the costs associated with the implementation of the safety changes to Cones Road.
5.4. With a land status of unformed legal road the Council is responsible for the health and safety of the volunteers undertaking track building works. Staff will work closely with the volunteers to ensure health and safety is managed as required under HASWA 2015.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy

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

The Cones Road walkway is consistent with the desired outcomes as outlined in the Council’s strategies:

- The Community Greenspace Activity Management Plan includes the desired outcome of provision of open space that …..provides recreational and ecological linkages as these provide opportunities for linked walking and cycling networks.

- The Walking and Cycling Strategy 2017 - 2022 seeks to achieve the key priorities of inclusive infrastructure, community connections, safe travel and healthy lifestyles.

6.2. Legislation


6.3. Community Outcomes

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

Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and of a high quality.

---

Chris Brown

Community and Greenspace Manager
Attachment 1 – Cones Road Walkway Community Action Plan November 2017

Vision

To provide an enhanced recreational opportunity in the Ashley/Loburn area in close proximity to Rangiora combining quiet country roads, bush walk and great views.

Objectives

∑ Utilise the unformed section of Cones Road to construct a 600 metres section of walking track to act as a linkage to provide a 5 km walking circuit. Track to be built utilising DOC Track Construction and Maintenance Guidelines 2008.

∑ Provide for more direct pedestrian access from Rangiora up to Two Tree Hill which could potentially be enhanced with picnic tables, car park, and a plain table (outside scope of this plan).

∑ Potential for future development of a separate mountain bike track (outside scope of this plan).

∑ Enhance fitness activity opportunities in this rural area.

∑ Transform this unformed section of Cones Road that is currently overgrown in gorse and blackberry into a native bush gully with the planting of native trees and shrubs which will enhance indigenous biodiversity values and provide a desirable setting for walkers.

Table 1: Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>By Whom</th>
<th>By When</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clearance of vegetation to provide initial access to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∑ determine and mark legal boundaries.</td>
<td>Volunteers with scrub bars, hand tools &amp; excavator. WDC staff to establish legal boundaries.</td>
<td>Within 2 months</td>
<td>Excavator $1200.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∑ mark most practical route for track within road reserve.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteer hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Legal boundaries will be established using existing fence line located on legal boundary as a reference point. Known bearings and dimensions of legal road can then be offset from established boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WDC staff time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear vegetation on walking track route by scrub cutters, hand tools and excavator to enable track formation.</td>
<td>Volunteers with scrub bars, hand tools &amp; excavator.</td>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>Excavator $1200.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formation of walking track built to (DOC Guidelines &amp; SNZ HB 8630:2004) including:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∑ benching</td>
<td>Volunteers with scrub bars, hand tools &amp; excavator.</td>
<td>Within 12 months</td>
<td>Excavator hours $1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∑ steps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shingle $5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∑ stiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Steps $1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∑ stiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stiles $300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∑ culverts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Signage $500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∑ surface metal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PPE $300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteer hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spray off weeds along track. Growsafe trained volunteer

Within 12 months

∑ Chemical $500

Planting native seedlings in areas cleared by hand. Gorse and broom will be retained where possible to protect soil and water values and provide nursery for new plantings.

Seedlings sourced for free and planted by volunteers.

Commence within 12 months and then ongoing

∑ Volunteer hours

Ongoing Maintenance including:

∑ Track surface/culverts
∑ Overgrowing vegetation
∑ Releasing seedlings

Volunteers

Ongoing

∑ Volunteer hours

Total cost $11,800

Notes:

∑ Volunteers – core group of 14 supporters, MTB Club with 100 members plus offers of use of excavators.
∑ Signage – walkway entrances and H & S (temporary).
∑ Excludes road safety improvements.

Attachment 2 – Aerial photo of proposed Cones Road walkway route (approximate)
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to present Te Kōhaka ō Tūhaitara Trust’s (TKTT) Business Case for additional funding. The business case for additional funding considers the additional cost of the recently acquired Eastern Conservation Management Area (ECMA) and Western Conservation Management Areas (WCMA).

1.2. The report seeks Council approval to commit to an additional annual grant of $150,000 to assist TKTT in operations and continue to provide community access to the ECMA & WCMA.

1.3. Catherine McMillan (Chairperson) Greg Byrnes (General Manager) will be in attendance at the meeting to present the TTKT Reserve Management Plan and speak to the report.

Attachments:

i. Te Kōhaka ō Tūhaitara Trust’s Business Case (TRIM 180124005989)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 180119004236;

(b) Receives the Summary Business case for Te Kōhaka ō Tūhaitara Trust;

(c) Approves an annual Grant of $150,000 plus GST to Te Kōhaka ō Tūhaitara Trust that would contribute towards the additional operations cost of the conservation areas.;

(d) Notes that budget provision is to be funded from the Governance Grants account and that this amount has tentatively been included within the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan. Excluding contributions in kind, the total amount provided within the 2018-28 LTP for grants and leases is $243,391 p.a.;

(e) Notes Te Kōhaka ō Tūhaitara Trust are also receiving land as a result of the Regeneration Plan and is be funded from a number of other external sources.

(f) Notes that Te Kōhaka ō Tūhaitara Trust is to incorporate into the Reserve Management Plan and the Statement of Intent additional objectives and measures in relation to the recently acquired ECMA & WCMA.
3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. TKTT is a Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) under the Local Government Act 2002, because it appoints half (3) of the Trustees. The other three Trustees are appointed by Ngāi Tahu. The Trust was formed in response to negotiation between the Crown and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu. The settlers of the Trust are Council and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu. The coastal reserve is managed by the Trust and includes the Tūhaitara coastal reserve (which is subject to the Reserves Act 1971) and the Tūtaepatu Lagoon.

3.2. The current Tūhaitara Coastal Park covers approximately 575 hectares of land along the coastline from the Waimakariri River mouth to the Waikuku township. Stretching along the coast comprises many natural features of local, regional and national importance to the people of New Zealand. As a coastal park, it provides a range of opportunities to preserve Ngāi Tahu values, retain and enhance biodiversity and provide recreational and educational opportunities for all.

3.3. As previously agreed with Council, that there are significant synergies and benefits of the area being vested into TKTT. It will extend opportunities and enhance the coastal area and recreational capabilities.

3.4. The two recently acquired conservation areas has a fee simple land status and was transferred into TTKT ownership (for the consideration of $1) by the Todd’s Property Pegasus Town Limited in January 2018. The Trust is incorporating the areas into the Reserve Management Plan which will open up public access to the areas and treat the areas as a recreational reserve. The areas of land are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eastern Coastal Management Area</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7270</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0616</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9881</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4768</td>
<td>600&amp;14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14.2535</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western Coastal Management Area</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.7761</td>
<td>141,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.7394</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>93.5155</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.7690</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5. The Council have the option to:

3.5.1. Accept the recommendation as presented;

3.5.2. Request additional information, alter or reject the recommendations in the report.

3.6. The Management Team/CE has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.
4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. It has been advised by the Trust that Ngāi Tahu and the Ngāi Tuahuriri Rūnanga have been consulted and are happy to endorse the Plan.

4.2. The objectives and measures will be reported within the adopted LTP & Annual Plan in June and reported to within the Annual Report 2018-19.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. The Council has budget provision for $213,391 in the 2018-2028 LTP as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directors insurance</td>
<td>5,350</td>
<td>5,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting fees</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Operations</td>
<td>33,340</td>
<td>34,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional conservation area grant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates conservation area</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Fees</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry land lease</td>
<td>20,680</td>
<td>21,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp lease</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79,570</td>
<td>243,391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2. Ngāi Tahu make a cash contribution of $241,000 paid over three years ($80,000 p.a.).

5.3. The Council also provides for the accounting, payroll and administrative services for the Trust.

5.4. The additional funding will assist TTKT operationally by allowing for additional staffing to assist the General Manager.

5.5. The Statement of Intent provides the opportunity for Council to participate with setting direction, objectives, and the accountability measures the Trust will use to communicate its activities to Council.

6. **CONTEXT**

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

6.2. The Audit and Risk Committee has the jurisdiction to “review annually draft performance agreements, including Statement of Corporate Intent of the Council-controlled organisations and recommend adoption to Council” (Delegation S-DM 1022).

6.3. Community Outcomes

The work of Te Kōhaka ò Tūhaitara Trust contributes to the outcomes that:

- Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality;
- The distinctive character of our takiwa – owns villages and rural areas are maintained;
- There are wide ranging activities for enjoying the outdoors;
- Public Organisations give effect to the spirit of the Treaty of Waitangi;
- The community’s cultures, arts and heritage are conserved and celebrated;
- People have a wide ranging opportunities for learning and being informed;
- People are friendly and caring, creating a strong sense of community in our district and;
- There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision-making that affects our District.

Jeff Millward
Manager Finance & Business Support
Business plan for
Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara
Trust

Date: January 2018
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# Business details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business name</th>
<th>Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trading name</td>
<td>Tūhaitara Coastal Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Charitable Trust; Council Controlled Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date on Charities register</td>
<td>13/07/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration number</td>
<td>CC44619</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Contact details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact name</th>
<th>Greg Byrnes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landline</td>
<td>+64 3 313 1768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>+64 21 02455398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tkot@farmside.co.nz">tkot@farmside.co.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical address</td>
<td>Te Tai Kōhaka 1 Woodend Beach Road WOODEND BEACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal address</td>
<td>C/ K FRIE DAUER Private Bag 1005 RANGIORA 7440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Online/social media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Website</th>
<th><a href="http://www.tuhitarapark.org.nz">www.tuhitarapark.org.nz</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>Friends of Tūhaitara Coastal Park <a href="https://www.facebook.com/search/top/?q=friends%20of%20t%C5%ABhaitara%20coastal%20park">https://www.facebook.com/search/top/?q=friends%20of%20t%C5%ABhaitara%20coastal%20park</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background

The Tūhaitara Coastal Park was established as an outcome of the Ngāi Tahi settlement with the Crown. The lands were gifted to the people of New Zealand and are managed by the Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust. The Trust is run by six trustees; three appointed by Te Runanga o Ngāi Tahu and three by Waimakariri District Council. The Trust employs a fulltime General Manager and a part time Secretary.

Tūhaitara Coastal Park covers approximately 700ha of land along 10.5 kilometres of coastline between the Waimakariri River mouth and the township of Waikuku. The Park comprises many natural features of local, regional and national importance to the people of New Zealand. These include the Tūtaepatu Lagoon, Taranaki Stream and Saltwater Creek freshwater coastal system, and The Pines Wetland. The park provides a range of opportunities to preserve Ngāi Tahu values, retain and enhance rare indigenous biodiversity, and provide recreational and educational opportunities for all people.

The Trust operates in a range of sectors including environment and conservation, education, training and research, community development and social services, sport and recreation, and promotion of volunteering. The recreation opportunities are diverse and unique, from walking, cycling and bridle trails, to formal picnic and event settings, through to semi wilderness natural sites, all with easy access to some of the most pristine beaches of the Northern Pegasus Bay.

Charitable Purpose

The purpose of the Trust is to manage and administer the Tūhaitara Coastal Reserve classified as a recreation reserve pursuant to the Reserves Act 1977. The Trust operates in a range of sectors including environment and conservation, education, training and research, community development and social services, sport and recreation, and promotion of volunteering. The beneficiaries are the general public (Charities Service, n.d.).

History

The residents of Kaiapoi Pā and in more recent years, members of Ngāi Tūahuriri Runanga, have had a close relationship with the lands. Tūtaepatu Lagoon was a rich and important source of mahinga kai, particularly tuna (eel).

In addition, the area surrounding Tūtaepatu Lagoon contains the urupa for Tu Rakautahi, who was the founder of the Kaiapoi Pā. It is part of the area known as the greatest pounamu trading centre in the South Island.

The name Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara acknowledges whakapapa and tikanga. Tūhaitara was an ancestress of Ngāi Tūahuriri. The occupiers of the Kaiapoi Pā and North Canterbury were known as te hapu o Tūhaitara people / the family of Tūhaitara. Kōhaka refers to a nest, to the season of spring, indicating a time to apply vision, new concepts, the sowing of thoughts or seeds.

Tēnei mātou ngā tangata o te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara
This is us the people of the nest of Tūhaitara
E mihi nui te aroha ki a koutou katoa
Greetings/acknowledgement of great love to you all
Mauri ora, mauri tū
Living essence, standing essence
Wai ora me Te Wairua Tapu
Living water and the Holy Spirit
Figure 1 Map of Tūhaitara Coastal Park

**Expansion activities**

The awarding of the regeneration areas in Kairaki and The Pines Beach, as well as the inclusion of the Eastern Conservation Management Area (ECMA) and Western Conservation Management Area (WCMA) into the Trust lands are increasing the activities of the Trust such that the current organisational structure is not able to accommodate the increased workload. Even though we are only in the initial stages of this expansion, this increased workload is already visible with the increased usage of the Tūhaitara Coastal Park for educational and recreational areas.

Discussions regarding possible structures and funding options are being explored and documented through a comprehensive business plan, so they can be implemented through a sound, sustainable structure.
Contribution to national and WDC outcomes

The activities of Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara align with a range of national and regional strategies.

Contribution to national policies

The activities of the Trust align with a number of government initiatives including:

- Coastal enhancement and protection, with the Trust being acknowledged nationally as a leader in coastal environmental rehabilitation
- Conservation efforts including cleaning up waterways, carbon sequestration
- A strong bicultural focus, which underpins all the Trust’s activities

Contribution to WDC community outcomes

The activities of the Trust contribute to a number of the community outcomes identified by the Waimakariri District Council in its Annual Plan (WDC, 2017, p12) including:

- Public effect is given to the spirit of the Treaty of Waitangi
- The air and land [is] healthy
- There are areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats for indigenous fauna
- The community’s cultures, arts and heritage are conserved and celebrated.
Our strategy

A range of options were considered as possible ways forward.

- **Option 1: Status quo option (retained as a baseline comparator)**
- **Option 2: Minimal**
- **Option 3: Realistic (the preferred way forward)**
- **Option 4: Aspirational**

**Option 1: The status quo**

**Description**

This option would retain the current organisational structure of one full-time General Manager, part-time secretarial assistance and ad hoc contracted assistance

**Advantages**

The main advantages are:

- this is a familiar way of operating.
- in the short-term, this is a low-cost option, with limited increase in funding levels required.

**Disadvantages**

The main disadvantages are:

- the education programme will stall
- the capacity to maintain the standard of the Park is at risk, with a risk of failing to deliver planned services
- the outcomes of stakeholders such as WDC are at risk
- there is increased dependence on volunteer services
- funding is uncertain and dependent on winning grants, resulting in a variable level of service to the community.

**Conclusion**

This option is not viable in the medium to long-term.
Option 2: Minimal

Description
This option would retain the current organisational structure of one full-time General Manager and part-time secretarial assistance. It would add more permanent contracted assistance for either educational/visitor services or environmental/operational services.

Advantages
The main advantages are:
- this is a familiar way of operating.
- short-term, this is a low-cost option, with limited increase in funding levels required.
- It relieves some of the pressure off the General Manager

Disadvantages
The main disadvantages are:
- Either the education programme will stall, or the capacity to maintain the standard of the Park is at risk, depending on which branch of activity receives the more permanent contracted assistance. Either has the risk of failing to deliver planned services
- the outcomes of stakeholders such as WDC are at risk
- there is continuing dependence on volunteer services
- funding is uncertain and dependent on winning grants, resulting in a variable level of service to the community.

Conclusion
This option is not viable in the medium to long-term.
Option 3: Realistic

Description
This option would expand the organisational structure of one full-time General Manager and part-time secretarial assistance to include an educational/visitor services person, an environmental/operational services person and a part-time funding person (see Figure 2 below. The use of volunteers would continue as this meets a number of the aims of the Trust in engaging with our community and extending the intergenerational interest in the Park.

We will also need to increase our assets and expand the size of the physical base of operations. In conjunction with a third party, additional premises would be explored to accommodate teaching and research facilities. These would also provide room for our offices. Improved workshop and garaging facilities would also be explored.

Advantages
The main advantages are:
\[\sum \text{ This would allow the Trust to meet the demands from the increased land area and use of the Park.}\]
\[\sum \text{ It furthers the strategic plans of the Trust and contributes to the national policies and WDC community outcomes}\]

Disadvantages
The main disadvantages are:
\[\sum \text{ Additional sustainable permanent funding is required to meet increased salary and operational costs}\]

Conclusion
This is the most desired option in the medium to long-term.

Option 4: Aspirational

Description
In addition to option 3, this option allows for the employment of additional people in the educational/visitor services and/or the environmental/operational services teams.

Advantages
The main advantages are:
\[\sum \text{ Accelerates the development within the Park.}\]

Disadvantages
The main disadvantages are:
\[\sum \text{ Larger amount of sustainable funding required.}\]

Conclusion
This option is not viable at this stage but is a good direction to aim for.
**General Manager**
* Maintain and develop external and internal stakeholder relationships
* Promotional work and advocacy
* Innovation and new initiatives
* Managing regeneration activities
* Overseeing research

**Education/Visitor services**
Outward focus, linked to:
* education
* recreation
* external "customer" stakeholders

Responsible for:
* Event bookings; liaising with Park users
* Managing schools, UC
* Lesson plans

**Administration**

**Environmental/Operational services**
Operational focus:
* practical skills
* understand the rehabilitation of the land
* competent with managing contractors etc

Responsible for:
* practical work within the Park, e.g. planting and maintenance of the environment
* keeping trails clear

---

**Secretarial**
(similar to the current secretarial assistance provided by WDC)

**Funding**
(seeking external funding sources and preparing funding applications)

*Figure 2: Proposed organizational structure*
Financial sources

The Trust generates income to support the maintenance of the park and facilitation of our current education programmes. However, we are reliant upon sourcing external funding to support the rehabilitation of the park.

We have been fortunate to receive an annual grant from WDC as a Settlor partner. Additionally, we have been supported for specific projects by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee, Vodafone Foundation, the World Wildlife Fund for Nature, Walking Access NZ, Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga, Landcare Research, Environment Canterbury and the Department of Conservation.

Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara is a registered Charitable Trust, and we welcome bequests and donations.

Our request

As a contribution to fund this expansion, we are requesting that WDC allocate an additional $150,000 per annum to Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust, on a permanent basis.

Next Steps

This business case process is organised around a five-case structure designed to systematically ascertain that the proposal:

- is supported by a compelling case for change - the 'strategic case'
- optimises value for money - the 'economic case'
- is commercially viable - the 'commercial case'
- is financially affordable - the 'financial case', and
- is achievable - the 'management case'.

Once completed this Business Case will develop into a business plan for implementation by the Trust. It will include:

- Organisation structure
- Board skills matrix
- Risk classifications and matrix
- Education strategy
- Environmental restoration strategy
- Cultural enhancement strategy
- Recreation strategy
Appendix A: Education strategy - background

Learning for Life
Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust provides environmental education to many of North Canterbury and Christchurch's primary and secondary schools. These range from regular fortnightly sessions through to a few visits per year.

The modules are based around our biota node development (see the projects page) and provide for a mix of theory and experiential learning.

The Trust has developed our own learning resources and supplements these with visits by topic experts covering subjects including freshwater, invertebrates, microscopy, and animal pest control.

Bruce Banks Environmental Education Award
The Bruce Banks Award is offered annually to any primary or secondary school student who aims to further native biodiversity in the Waimakariri District. The award has been established by the Trust to recognise the important work Bruce did establishing the animal pest control programme at the park.

Bruce had also recognised the importance of encouraging young people to become involved in caring for the park and often brought his young grandchildren to work with him, nurturing their interest in biodiversity.

Resources
The Trust also has a range of environmental education lesson plans. The content is available for reuse and redistribution under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 3.0. Please reference Te Kohaka o Tuhaitara Trust, Note © Peter Langlands Wild Capture research & photography all fauna photos.

Hard copies of the Tūhaitara Coastal Park Field Guide are available from the Trust Office or WDC Kaiapoi Service Centre, cost $20. Original oil pencil art is available from Katherine.jacob@xtra.co.nz.

Additionally, the Trust has under graduate and post graduate resources. These can be sourced by contacting the Trust office.
Appendix B: Environmental restoration strategy - background

Tūhaitara Coastal Park is made up of a number of ecosystems including the fore and back dunes, exotic plantation and coastal protection plantings and the coastal freshwater network made up of a series of wetlands, a lagoon and streams which run parallel to the sea and connect the Waimakariri and Ashley-Rakahuri Braided Rivers.

The Trust has a 200-year plan to rehabilitate the lands to an indigenous coastal ecosystem supporting a diverse range of native flora and fauna species and providing sustainable mahinga kai. There are numerous projects underway or in the planning stages involving environmental rehabilitation, trail development, dune restoration, forestry, education and research.

Currently, our keystone projects include the establishment of a biota node network and the rehabilitation of Tūtaepatu Lagoon and The Pines Beach Wetland. In addition, we are actively managing and restoring the coastal dunes.

Biota Nodes

The Trust is establishing a series of 'biota nodes' along the 10.5km length of the Trust’s lands at approximately 250m centres.

With ‘biota’ meaning the ecological system (flora and fauna) of a particular environment, and ‘node’ being a point of intersection, these biota nodes are a series of small, localised points of native wildlife, which, as they mature, will extend outwards to form a ‘biodiversity skeleton’ stretching the length of the park. Each contains a freshwater pond and native plant life that will attract birds, aiding seed transfer for easy and eventual self-maintaining propagation.

Each Node is adopted and maintained by a school, class or community group.

Currently we have 17 biota nodes, which have been established. As of April 2016, over 5,000 native plants including manuka, harakeke, tikouka, tarata, ake ake, kahikatea and totara, among others, have been planted.

In October 2015, with the support of the Working Waters Trust, Kowaro/Canterbury Mudfish fry were released into a number of the nodes, to extend the habitat of these threatened species within Tūhaitara. In March 2016, during our first monitoring survey, we located mudfish in each of the nodes ranging in size from 53 - 91mm.

Tūtaepatu Lagoon

The Tūtaepatu Lagoon site includes the largest area of natural open water in the coastal strip between the Waimakariri and Ashley Rakahuri Rivers, and an area of surrounding vegetation, totalling over 54 hectares. It is a spring fed freshwater wildlife sanctuary which is home to many species of native fauna and flora. The overall goal of the proposed restoration of Tūtaepatu Lagoon is “a lagoon with indigenous vegetation that supports mahinga kai and spiritual values”.

Tūtaepatu Lagoon discharges north into the Taranaki Stream which then flows into the Ashley Rakahuri and south into the Saltwater Creek which discharges into the Waimakariri at Kairaki. The Lagoon and its freshwater network support a diverse range of indigenous biota, e.g. wetland and swamp plants, fish e.g. inaka, tuna (eel), kowaro (mudfish) and birds, e.g. kotuku (white heron) bittern, kotare (kingfisher) kōrimako (bellbird) and ruru (morepork).

Over the past 5 years 30,000 natives have been planted, female grey willow and old man’s beard controlled and over 1,000 animal pests eradicated.
The Pines Beach Wetland
The Pines Beach Wetland is a 36-hectare open reedland, surrounded by dunes. Originally, it was a lagoon open to the sea; however, around 1970, the opening was closed and the area has converted to a freshwater wetland.

The Trust has commenced an extensive weed control programme primarily targeting willow and beggars tick. Additionally, we have commenced planting on the periphery with a range of native wetland shrub and tree species.

The work, along with a comprehensive animal pest control programme will result in a rapid transformation of the area.

Carbon Sequestration - Trees that Count
We commenced the planting of a proposed 10,000 podocarp forest in April 2016 with a mix of 2000 kahikatea, matai and totara planted at Woodend Beach on the southern side of Tutaepatu Lagoon. This coincided with New Zealand and 174 other countries signing the Paris Agreement on Climate Change in New York the previous night. In what is probably the first tree planting to sequester carbon from the atmosphere after the agreement was signed, about 150 volunteers organised by the Student Volunteer Army descended on the Park. The planting was a truly international effort (with lots of international students participating) in a truly bicultural project. For Trees that Count, which provided the trees, this is hopefully the beginning of a much larger nationwide project that combines biodiversity restoration and action on climate change.

On Anzac Day 2017, we added another 1,000 totara and 1,000 assorted native tree species to the Woodend Beach forest including kowhai, ribbonwood, ake ake, tarata and kanuka.

We had over 200 volunteers on site from all walks of New Zealand life, small children to great-grandparents, pai rawa atu, excellent.

Coastal Management
Tūhaitara Coastal Park runs for 10.5 kilometres of the Northern Pegasus Bay coastline, between the Waimakariri and Waikuku Beach.

The Park includes all of the back dunes along this stretch and some of the fore dunes and fore shore areas. Tūhaitara Coastal Park is managed under the Tūhaitara Coastal Reserve & Waikuku Beach Reserves, Reserve Management Plan.

The fore dunes and fore shore are managed under the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016.

The dunes are an ecosystem for many native fauna and flora species, they provide protection from storm surges and sea events including Tsunami, have significant cultural and archaeological values arising from the occupation of Maori and; act as filters for coastal water.

Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust and Environment Canterbury have commenced the restoration of the dunes system, with a number of fore dune trial plots planted with native sand binding plants including Spinifex and Pingao. Additionally, we have numerous back dune native planting sites.

Over time we will extend these plantings so that they reflect the Trusts 200-year vision to restore the lands, protect our coastal communities and provide opportunities for mahinga kai.
Appendix C: Recreation Strategy - background

The Tūhaitara Coastal Park contains a variety of walking, cycling and bridle trails with access from all of the adjoining communities. A number of the walking and cycling trails link to the adjoining Waimakariri River and Ashley Rakahuri Regional Parks. There are many natural features to view and enjoy including Tūtaepatu Lagoon.

Tūtaepatu Lagoon
The lagoon is a 49ha spring fed freshwater wildlife sanctuary which is home to many species of native fauna and flora. A viewing platform allows you to see over the raupo beds into the open water to view the many species of waterfowl, wetland and forest bird species.

Tūtaepatu Trail
Tūtaepatu Trail is a 5km all weather walking and cycling trail running between Woodend Beach Road and Kiwi Ave Waikuku. It can also be accessed from Tiritirimoana Drive Pegasus Town. The trail passes Tūtaepatu Lagoon and its viewing platform and a seated area with views north to Maukatere Mt Grey. Dogs may be taken on the trail but are required to be on a leash between Woodend Beach and Pegasus Town. This trail is for all levels of fitness.

Pegasus Walkway
Pegasus Walkway meanders the 10.5km length of the park between The Pines and Kairaki Beaches and Waikuku Beach. It is a shared trail with walkers, mountainbikers and horses. It is a natural surfaced trail which requires a reasonable level of fitness if mountain biking. The walkway meanders along the back of the dune system and through the coastal protection pine forests. There are numerous sign-posted access points leading to the beach.

Horse riding
Horse Float carparks are located at Kiwi Avenue Waikuku Beach (Key available from Waimakariri District Council) and Ferry Road Woodend Beach. Bridle Trails are clearly marked. Horse are not permitted on the Tūtaepatu Trail or in the Woodend Beach Domain.

Picnics/Events
Woodend Beach Domain provides a great picnic and event area and bookings can be made by contacting the Trust. Vehicles are permitted in the designated picnic area. NOTE: the gate is shut in the evenings and there is a charge to get out if you are locked in. Details are on the signs located at the entrance to the domain.

Beaches
Tūhaitara Coastal Park borders 10.5km of the Northern Pegasus Bay. Surf patrols operate at Waikuku Beach between mid-November and mid-March. Woodend Beach is patrolled during the Christmas New Year period. The beaches bordering Kairaki, The Pines and Pegasus Town are not patrolled. The entire length of beach is covered by the Northern Pegasus Bay bylaw.
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1 SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to:

a) Confirm to Council a number of risks and issues associated with the Rangiora Service Centre building as previously presented in Council briefings – including critical renewals, performance issues and capacity constraints within the building

b) Identify options to address the above matters

c) Seek approval for funding of $3.985 million for years 1 and 2 of the 2018/20 LTP for the preferred option - to complete required renewals and the refurbishment of the existing building so as to address identified risks, improve building performance and accommodate growth in staff numbers over the next 10 years.

d) Note a presentation will be provided to the Council prior to the consideration of the report. The presentation will outline the options, including benefits and cost for each of the options.

Attachments:

i. Table comparing Status Quo with three alternate refurbishment options

ii. Break-down of cost estimate for Option 3

iii. Preliminary Internal layout plans

iv. Preliminary Structural Layout

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report CPR-05-04 / 180119004578

(b) Approves The Rangiora Service Centre Refurbishment Project at 215 High Street and budget $3,985,000.

(c) Notes that:

i. The expenditure timing in the LTP as 2018/19 ($2,300,000), 2019/20 ($1,685,000)

ii. The option attends to identified hazards and risks – both health & safety as well as business continuity and performance

iii. Provides future proofing for staff growth over the next 10 years and aligns with Ta Matou Mauri and the Council’s organisational culture.

iv. several lease and refurbishment options have been reviewed and evaluated and this is considered the preferred and most viable option.
v. Adds value to the existing asset and improves the working environment for existing staff, as well as allowing for a more adaptable re-use of the building either for sale or for integration with a building extension, if needed.

3. **ISSUES & OPTIONS**

**Current Risks and Performance Issues**

3.1. The building services and fit-out for the Rangiora Service Centre is between 20 and 36 years old and suffers from a combination of old age, wear and tear and functional obsolescence.

3.2. Poor performance and anticipated asset failures in the building could affect service delivery, breach compliance and policy requirements and compromise staff health and safety. Some systems, equipment and parts are no longer manufactured. This may result in all or part of the building being closed for a period of weeks, impacting staff and customers.

3.3. Relative to modern systems and equipment the existing ones are difficult to manage, have poor performance and response times and struggle to cope with peak loads. They also tend to be expensive to operate, especially by comparison with the modern energy efficient designs now available. Over time continuing the somewhat reactive approach to maintenance and renewals is likely to be more expensive than a planned project with good design and procurement processes.

**Capacity and Growth to 2028**

3.4. Further to this, the cramped and poor quality work environment alongside the need for additional staff / capacity all has an effect on the effectiveness of staff and on customer service. The building is currently at capacity with five staff still located in the Portacoms. However, the spatial layout of the office space is poor, partly due to the earthquake braced walls and other partitions.

3.5. Allowing for the five staff still in the Portacoms and anticipated growth over the next 10 years provision for between 35 and 60 staff needs to be made. This puts immediate pressure on addressing the office accommodation question in Rangiora.

**Feasibility Study**

3.6. A feasibility assessment considering a number of refurbishment options has been completed.

3.7. These explored how to address the poor performance issues around HVAC and other systems and to get better spatial utilisation out of the existing building, prior to leasing additional space or considering other alternatives. These were presented to Council in a briefing in December 2017.

**Status Quo**

3.8. The various options were benchmarked against a 'status quo' approach whereby equipment, systems and fit-out are only replaced when they fail. Over the next 10 years a reactive approach was considered likely to cost in the order of $1.75 million or $175,000 per year.

3.9. However, this option does not address in a timely or comprehensive way the risks that currently exist or allow for any increased capacity within the building. Some performance issues are associated with fundamental design constraints and are not just a function of age and normal wear and tear. These would not be addressed with this approach.

3.10. It is also important to note that the costs of this approach are generally higher than where a planned renewal program is in place and there may be some redundancy when a full renewal replacement is implemented.

**Base Refurbishment Options**

3.11. All of the other options considered allowed for a comprehensive renewal of building systems, equipment and fit-out such as carpets, ceilings and painting. The total renewals expenditure is estimated to be approximately $2.3 million.

3.12. It is important to note that most of this expenditure will be required over the next 10 to 20 years and should be included in the normal LTP / Infrastructure Strategy budgets.
3.13. The replacement of the roof removes a significant risk factor to the structural performance of the building, as well as removing a high consequence risk associated with falling tiles in the event of a major earthquake.

3.14. A table summarising the status quo and the three options presented is provided in Attachment 1. However, the preferred option has been presented in more detail in this report.

**Preferred Refurbishment Option**

3.15. The preferred option provides an additional 50 to 54 spaces, the largest increase in capacity.

3.16. This involved the removal of most internal non-loadbearing walls on the ground floor and most internal walls at the first floor level - made possible by the replacement of the heavy tile roof with a new lightweight roof and the installation of new steel bracing frames.

3.17. Key benefits included:

   a) future proofing the building for staff increases (maximised).
   b) some cross bracing remains but this is less intrusive than other options and there are fewer existing structural walls and new structural frames (6 no. less)
   c) an updated fit-out with the most flexible / adaptable open plan layout design and a variety of new work and meeting room spaces
   d) (enabled by) a new lightweight roof, which may also prolong building life (weather-tightness of envelope) and in a severe earthquake reduce the risk of structural damage and improve staff and public safety by removing the hazard of heavy tiles falling from the roof.
   e) Improved environmental performance: i.e. increased daylight for employees with fewer obstructions to windows & skylights, modern HVAC, lighting and electrical systems enabled with potential energy efficiencies along with integrated Information Technology solutions.

3.18. The cost of this option equated to $3.985 million. This is the preferred option.

3.19. A table in Attachment 2 provides a breakdown of this expenditure.

3.20. It should be noted that the cost estimate provided by Aecom Quantity Surveyors is based on a high level design. Of note, further design work is required to validate this cost estimate which could result in a higher or lower sums.

3.21. In line with normal budget practice $2.3 million can be assigned to asset renewals.

3.22. The balance of $1.685 million can be assigned to asset improvements and growth. If this is amortized over a 10-year period, it equates to $218,215 per year. the preferred option and several others include the removal of the extremely heavy tile roof and replacement with a lightweight roof. This could also be considered a renewal but as it is in good condition and not due to be replaced for over 20 years the cost has been allocated to asset improvements and growth.

**Alternate Lease Solution**

3.23. An alternate solution could be enter into a lease of commercial office space to accommodate an equivalent number of staff as enabled by the proposed refurbishment.

3.24. This would be very similar to the space the Council leases in the Farmers building which costs approximately $160,000 per year and has a capacity of around 55 staff.

3.25. The fit-out for this office cost $500,000 and if this annualized over 10 years at 5% equates to $64,752 per year (separate to maintenance, rates and insurance).

3.26. The combined annual cost of Farmers lease therefore equates to $224,752 per year.

3.27. The Farmers lease deal was quite advantageous to Council as it was negotiated as part of a larger development where the primary tenant for the building pays a high retail based rent and significant economies of scale exist. The Farmers tenancy in effect underwrote the development as a whole with Council's tenancy helping to make the development overall more profitable. This was a win / win for both Council and the developers, and also helped secure the return of the Farmers retail operations to the township.
3.28. The lease on this space has an initial term of 6 years with two rights of renewal each of 3 years. The final expiry is 2029 and this means Council will need to make a decision about its long-term office accommodation strategy well in advance of this date.

3.29. From informal discussions with Registered Valuers and developers active in the Rangiora commercial property market it is unlikely that the rental rates achieved with the Farmers office lease could be achieved for comparable space in the current market.

3.30. The rates for existing office space vary considerably depending on size, location and quality however there is no appropriate space readily available to accommodate 46 to 55 staff in reasonably close proximity to the main Rangiora Service Centre. It is likely that a new building would be needed to meet such a requirement.

3.31. For similar quality space a more realistic rent for new office accommodation is likely to be around $300 per square meter. This includes a base fit-out similar to the Farmers arrangement and would equate to a rent of $254,400 per annum. Allowing for a comparable tenant fit-out paid for by Council would result in a total annual cost of $319,152 excluding rates, maintenance and insurance.

3.32. The following Table shows a comparison of the lease verses refurbishment scenario's.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation of Costs Over a 10 Year Horizon</th>
<th>Cost per year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Centre Refurbishment Project – Annualized cost allocated to increased capacity</td>
<td>$218,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison with Farmers Office Lease – Rent + Annualized fit-out cost</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison - Office Lease at market for new office building - Rent + Annualized fit-out cost</td>
<td>$319,152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.33. The annual cost of leasing office accommodation is likely to range from $225,000 and $319,000 with a lead in time for this to be available of 18 to 24 months.

3.34. By comparison the annual cost of expenditure within the project that is allowed for increased capacity is $218,000 per year. This has a lead in time of between 12 and 18 months.

3.35. The refurbishment option is recommended as the lowest cost scenario. However, it not only provides good quality additional capacity for 50 staff but also significantly improves the working environment for the existing 150 staff.

3.36. Depending on strategic decisions about the longer term accommodation strategy, it is likely that the payback period is more like 20 to 25 years rather than 10 modelled. By comparison the funds rent paid and funds invested in the fit-out for a lease a written off at the expiry of the lease.

3.37. The design and investment in the building makes it a useable facility which better meets current and future needs of the business.

3.38. The investment in the building also adds value to the asset by making it a far more acceptable building for Council and potentially for other uses. As such it would be more attractive if it were to be offered up for sale at the end of the 10-year period, should a sale and redevelopment on an alternate site become a viable and preferred option for Council in the future.

3.39. Consideration was given to leasing or developing a new facility for all staff within the LTP period. This has been discounted partly due to the existing fit-out and lease commitment with the Farmers building, the recent refurbishment of the Ashley building and the likely impact on rates.

**Staging for the Project**

3.40. If the project is approved as recommended the high-level feasibility work already completed will provide the lead into the design phase which will involve the engaging of a consultant team, namely the designers, engineers and the quantity surveyors.

3.41. There are three phases to this - Preliminary Design, Developed Design and Detailed Design, each having input from Governance, senior management and internal teams.
3.42. Quantity Surveyors would also contribute to the value management process throughout these phases with the aim of coming up with a design that is robust, economical, aligns with Council values and agreed design principles and supports the effective operation of Council’s administration.

3.43. At each stage there will be approval gates for Councillor’s guidance and direction.

3.44. Following this is the construction phase this involves:
   a) Procurement: - the engagement of the main contractor and the best and most economical methodologies to use
   b) Scheduling: - acceptance of the construction time lines and tasks to complete the project
   c) Monitoring and controlling: - ensuring work is done to the right standards and time frames
   d) Documentation: - ensuring all the process are signed off and recorded as complete
   e) Handover / Completion: - commissioning and integration with facility management

3.45. The Management Team/CEO has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. This proposal is being considered as part of the LTP process and the views of the public will be canvased through the LTP consultation process.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. The financial costs are detailed earlier in this report for each phase of work

5.2. The costs for this project would be met by way of loan which will be serviced and cleared from the Accommodation Account. The loan would be for period of 10 years.

5.3. There was no provision for the project in the 2015 – 2025 LTP. If Council does not approve the recommended option an allowance for capital renewals will need to be made totalling $2.5 million in the 2018 – 2028 LTP and 30 Year Financial Strategy.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy

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

6.3. Legislation

   N/A

6.4. Community Outcomes

   N/A

Rob Hawthorne

Property Manager
attachment 1 - table comparing status quo with three alternate refurbishment options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Principles Met</th>
<th>Remaining Issues / Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status Quo</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Need to fit-out &amp; rent additional offices (poor payback 10 not 20 yrs), no future proofing, silo effect made worse, space compromises productivity &amp; customer service as well as recruitment, heavy tiles in major earthquake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>$3,625,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>Less responsive to changing organizational needs due to braced walls, capacity constraints from around year 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>$3,600,000</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Capacity adequate (middle growth forecast), Some windows &amp; workstations have steel bracing visible, heavy tiles in major earthquake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>$3,985,000</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>Some windows &amp; workstations have steel bracing visible (but less than option 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

attachment 2 - break-down of cost estimate for option 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Estimates - Preferred Option (3)</th>
<th>$3,984,664</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Fit-out</td>
<td>$2,340,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site preparation</td>
<td>$260,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>$233,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>$79,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior walls</td>
<td>$16,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall finishes</td>
<td>$10,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling finishes</td>
<td>$116,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Development Contingency</td>
<td>$35,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary &amp; General</td>
<td>$88,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margin</td>
<td>$41,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Consent</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contingency &amp; Professional Fees</td>
<td>750,355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Project Total | $3,984,664 |
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval for inclusion in the Draft 2018/2028 Long Term Plan of outer year loan funding of $4.131 Million for Phase 2 of the District Plan Review to completion in 2022/23. This relates to pre-RMA notification of a consultation Draft Reviewed Plan, formal RMA notification of the Proposed Reviewed District Plan, including supporting public submission and hearings processes, preparing recommended decisions on submissions, and decision-making. This process is statutorily defined and is part of the Council’s statutory obligations to review its District Plan every 10 years.

1.2. This report follows earlier reports. In February 2016 the Council confirmed an accelerated rather than rolling review and provided for inclusion in the Annual Plan of initial loan funding to support that. In May 2016 it confirmed the approach and budget for initial plan drafting to mid-2019 while noting that funding for promoting the draft and following statutory processes would be sought as part of the 2018/2028 Long Term Plan.

**Attachment:**

i. Tables 1 and 2 (estimated costs).

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 171215136380.

(b) **Approves** loan funding of $4.131 Million to complete the statutory process of the District Plan Review over the five-year period to 2022/23 as set out in paragraph 3.6 below.

(c) **Notes** the estimated total cost of the District Plan Review is $8 Million.

(d) **Notes** a loan funding repayment period of 15 years (to 2032/33).
3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. In a report dated 17 May 2016 to the then Resource Management and Regulation Committee (Report No. 160505040697) the following recommendations were made to and subsequently carried by the Council:

- **Recommends** to Council to confirm proposed additional budget of $1.75 million to undertake the accelerated District Plan review to be spread over 3 years as set out in Attachment ii.

- **Notes** that the costs of the hearings stage of the District Plan review are to be determined through the 2018/2028 Long Term Plan.

- **Notes** that a full Project initiation Document will be reported to the Committee at its July Meeting

3.2. In terms of the loan funding budget of $1.75 million (through to and including 2018/19) sought and approved to undertake Phase 1 of the Review (preparation of the draft reviewed plan to mid-2019) the following were considered:

- Background information prepared to date and the need for additional technical assessments;

- Staff resourcing available with the Development Planning Unit and other units; and

- The timeframe to substantially complete the preparation of the review within the current term of Council.

3.3. Over the period from July 2016 to November 2017, substantial progress has been made on the preparation and drafting phase of the District Plan Review including:

- Developing the overall programme and structure of this multi-year project including Project Control Group (2nd Tier managers); internal Technical Advisory Group (3rd Tier Managers/Team Leaders), and internally recruiting as far as possible senior planners to assist in drafting the Plan;

- Implementing a major programme of existing Plan Effectiveness assessment - as reported to District Planning and Regulation Committee;

- Preparing and beginning to implement a District Plan Review Communications Plan;

- Researching, drafting and engaging widely at multiple times to prepare a District Development Strategy (on 13 December the Hearings Panel met to prepare their recommendations to the Council);

- Preparing and engaging on a suite of Issues and Options Papers which along with the DDS inform Plan drafting (feedback summarised);

- Selecting and commencing implementation of ‘e-Plan’ software to radically improve the online accessibility and usability of first the existing; and, then the reviewed District Plan;

- Researching options for and deciding the structure for this ‘Second Generation’ District Plan in the context of best practice and evolving National Planning Standards;

- Developing detailed plans and scopes for approximately 30 Chapters and commencing drafting of the highest priority Chapters;
• Collating and analysing internally held and identifying new/externally required baseline information requirements to draft and be in a position to defend District Plan provisions;

• Participating in the Greater Christchurch Partnership agreed collaborative approach to meeting National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity requirements in the context of progressing the Settlement Pattern Review.

3.4. Among the challenges faced and absorbed over this period were:

• Three Unit staff have taken parental leave requiring significant recruitment, orientation and reprogramming to recruited contract staff as well as greater use of consultant staff than anticipated due to chronic shortages of suitably qualified planners in the market (this is nationwide problem but particularly affecting Greater Christchurch; recruitment;

• Significant reallocation of Planning Analyst and Manager time into participation in meeting the new NPS-UDC requirements introduced by Government at short notice with aggressive compliance timeframes;

• Assimilating the impacts of RMA amendment requirements especially with respect to National Planning Standards but also prospective new National Policy Statement requirements (such as for Natural Hazards);

• Monitoring and learning through formal and informal means the District Plan Review experiences and approaches of other Councils, especially Queenstown Lakes and Selwyn District Councils as being particularly comparable.

3.5. The reminder of this financial year and into the 2018/19 year will see more significant expenditure as plan chapter drafting ramps up together with baseline information assembly and analysis by experts in specialised topic areas where expertise within Council does not exist. This includes accounting for likely climate change impacts, matters of significance relating to Mana Whenua, significant natural areas ecological assessment, outstanding natural features and landscapes assessment, retail distribution, acoustic engineer, urban design, transport planning and rural character. Allowance has also been made for additional district planner input in conjunction with some of the above topic areas, through consultant recruitment to offset ongoing internal/contract recruitment difficulties while still keeping to time to produce a ‘fit for purpose’ draft Reviewed Plan within this term of Council.

3.6. Funding of $4.131 Million over five years to be loan funded over 15 years is sought to complete the Review through to completion thereafter accounting for the significant costs of navigating the public participation and approvals stages. This timeframe takes into account an anticipated mid-2020 formal public notification date, followed by the submission and further submissions periods, case preparation, hearing of submissions, deliberations, decisions by Commissioners and any mediation or appeals to the Environment Court. These costs are anticipated to fall as set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
<th>2020/21</th>
<th>2021/22</th>
<th>2022/23</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional funding sought by year</td>
<td>$365,800</td>
<td>$565,000</td>
<td>$1,310,000</td>
<td>$1,510,000</td>
<td>$380,000</td>
<td>$4,130,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The specific activities that inform the funding sought include legal services, contract and consultant planning staff remaining technical expertise to complete baseline information,
additional technical support, hearing evidence preparation including topic specialists as required, and commissioners as detailed in Table 1 attached. Funding for the technical inputs (equivalent to those required for the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan Review) to undertake a review of the Rangiora Town Centre Strategy in time to input to the District Plan Review is also included in this amount.

3.7. Table 2 attached summarises the ‘total cost’ of preparing, deciding and defending the Reviewed District Plan. We currently estimate the total cost of completing the review over the seven-year period 2016/17 to 2022/23 be in the order of $8 Million. This figure is a derived estimate being a mix of operational expenditure and capital funded costs. It reflects a complex resource management legislative system that requires substantial justification for District Plan provisions, exposes the Council through the Review to potentially significant legal challenge and also reflects the significant shift being made from a ‘first generation’ effects focused District Plan to a more modern ‘second generation’ activities based District Plan.

3.8. There are many assumptions about future costs with a significant uncertainty associated with them. It could be argued that some of the cost elements in Table 1 warrant inclusion of contingency amounts, but the basis for a contingency provision is itself highly uncertain. Otherwise, given the multi-year nature of the exercise that from here will span two LTPs it means that close cost control and budget monitoring and reporting is especially warranted.

3.9. Comparative costs on an equivalent basis with other relevant Councils are hard to precisely establish. Selwyn District Council has embarked on a full review on a similar timeframe with similar resource management issues. It is understood Selwyn District has to date spent approximately $4 Million and is anticipating an additional $6 million to completion. The Queenstown Lakes District Plan Review has been both complex and somewhat controversial. Approximately $4.8 million has been reported spent so far and of the order of a further $12 Million is anticipated.

3.10. The Christchurch City Council Replacement Plan Review while not directly comparable was reported through the External Review to be in the $40-$50 Million range. Environment Canterbury has indicated it has spent approximately $30 Million on regional planning over the last 6 years and approximately $20 Million is budgeted for the next 4 years.

3.11. The Management Team/CE has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1 Views on accelerating the District Plan Review were sought through the 2016/17 Annual Plan and were generally supportive. In relation to the proposals in this report, they would be subject to community views through the draft Long Term Plan process.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. Financial Implications:

Total District Plan review costs are estimated at the order of $8 Million. Of this, $5.88 Million would be loan funded reflecting the multi-year benefits of having a fit for purpose contemporary District Plan for future generations. The loan-funded costs, including the budget sought in paragraph 3.6, are proposed to be serviced by repayments over 15 years (to 2032/33) from the general account.

The annual rating impact of this additional expenditure over the District Plan Review period to be funded is $557,984. This equates to a $21.90/property or a 0.87% increase on total
rates. This reflects the value of the loans shown in paragraph 3.6 and table 2 of attachment 1.

5.2. Risks:

The additional funding sought will be progressively loan funded, meaning that expenditure through the Plan review period can be managed and monitored to limit expenditure to within the overall budget allocated.

There is a risk of any Environment Court appeals running over budget. However, this can be mitigated to some degree by good project management and regular financial reporting through the project so that any additional expenditure required is identified and reported as soon as possible. The proposal to promote a non-statutory draft for community engagement in advance of the formal RMA process also seeks to identify early areas of contention with a view to their resolution without recourse to expensive legalistic processes.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy

This matter is a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy and as such is being dealt with through the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

6.2. Legislation


6.3. Community Outcomes

A wide range of community outcomes are advanced by the District Plan. Those particularly relevant to the expenditure discussed in this report include:

*There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making by local, regional and national organisations that affects our District*

- Local, regional and national organisations make information about their plans and activities readily available.
- Local, regional and national organisations make every effort to take account of the views of people who participate in community engagement.
### Table 1: Breakdown of District Plan Review Stage 2 Additional Funding to Completion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
<th>2020/21</th>
<th>2021/22</th>
<th>2022/23</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal services $^1$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract/Consultant Planning Staff $^2$</td>
<td>265,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>480,000</td>
<td>680,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,705,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical support staff $^3$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing evidence $^4$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioners $^5$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disbursements $^6$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Town Centre Strategy Review $^7$</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$365,000</td>
<td>$565,000</td>
<td>$1,310,000</td>
<td>$1,510,000</td>
<td>$380,000</td>
<td>$4,130,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Assumes $200,000 up to but not including appeal hearing time and $200,000 for appeal mediation and Environment Court processes.
2. Factors in consultant planners due to recruitment difficulties to cover two additional plan drafting staff required from the start of April 2018. Budget is anticipated for staff to continue through to the end of the 21/22 year for case management.
3. Additional technical support staff for submission/hearing processes.
5. Assumes a pool of five commissioners, including two experienced practitioners, likely an Iwi commissioner, plus accredited ‘local’ commissioners.
6. Includes facilities, postage, hard copies and other miscellaneous requirements.
7. Budget for technical inputs to a review of the Rangiora Town Centre Strategy to feed into the Review, ahead of plan notification.

Notes:
1. The total budget does not include specific itemisation for other factors such as structure planning or outline development plan preparation for development areas.
2. Whilst all factors above will be variable, key variables that will influence individual budget items include external procurement costs and staff/consultant recruitment and retention pre-notification and the extent and nature of submissions, mediation and appeals post-notification.
### Table 2: Estimated Total Cost of District Plan Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 16/17</th>
<th>Year 17/18</th>
<th>Year 18/19</th>
<th>Year 19/20</th>
<th>Year 20/21</th>
<th>Year 21/22</th>
<th>Year 22/23</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Permanent staff costs¹</strong></td>
<td>270,930</td>
<td>275,620</td>
<td>315,090</td>
<td>320,130</td>
<td>325,580</td>
<td>331,440</td>
<td>337,400</td>
<td>$2,176,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loan Funded approved budget - Draft Reviewed Plan preparation ²</strong></td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>625,000</td>
<td>625,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total approved funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,926,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Loan Funded costs to complete Review³</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>365,800</td>
<td>565,000</td>
<td>1,310,000</td>
<td>1,510,000</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>$4,130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Total Budgeted Cost”⁴</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,056,190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Permanent Establishment staff costs within Development Planning Unit inputting into District Plan Review Project.
2. Approved loan funding through 2016/17 Annual Plan process to input to preparing the Draft Reviewed Plan
3. From Table 1.
4. A mix of inflation adjusted annual staff costs plus loan amount funded costs.
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to provide Council with an overview of the Business and Centres Unit functions and activities, and to seek approval for the additional funding required to appoint a second full time equivalent staff member to the Business and Centres Unit.

1.2. This report also aims to demonstrate the added value that would be derived through additional resourcing, through the increased number of projects, pace of the work and outcomes being achieved.

Attachments:

i. Business and Centres Unit – Resourcing Business Case 180109001097

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives Report No. 180109001129

(b) Notes the information contained in the attached Resourcing Business Case.

(c) Notes the potential resourcing options illustrated in the Options and Issues section below.

(d) Approves an annual inclusion of $100,000 into the Business and Centres Unit budget for a permanent full time Business and Centres Advisor (Resourcing Option 3C as per section 3.3 below).

(e) Circulates a copy of this report to Community Boards for their information.
3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. **Business and Centres Unit Functions and Activities**

3.1.1. A primary purpose of the Business and Centres function is to provide senior relationship management advice and support for business interaction with the Council’s regulatory functions and services to maximise the Council’s contribution to business development while effectively discharging its statutory and service responsibilities.

3.1.2. A further fundamental aspect of the Business and Centres Unit is to provide leadership and programme coordination to effectively maintain and implement Town Centre strategies, plans & projects and the Council’s economic development strategy while enhancing its working relationship with business at large and the economic development agency, Enterprise North Canterbury.

3.1.3. The following objectives provide an overview of the core Business and Centres functions:

- Act as an effective point of business liaison and internal coordination in relation to new and existing business interactions with the Council’s regulatory functions and related activities, aiming to ensure effective engagement and support in the pre-application phase of consent and approval processes, and to provide ongoing relationship management and support (case management) to business customers of Council;

- Be a key point of engagement and coordination in the working relationship with Enterprise North Canterbury in support of its business attraction programme;

- Be a source of information, a sounding board and a facilitator of business sector ideas and proposals for effective Council service delivery, District needs & opportunities, and new to the District business activities & proposals - in the spirit of building mutual understanding, trust and confidence between business and the Council;

- Lead, guide and support the coordinated development and implementation of the Council’s programmes that support its Town Centre strategies and plans, the maintenance and development of those strategies and plans and the effective communication of their intent, progress and achievements;

- Be the custodian of the Council’s Local Economic Development Strategy in terms of its development and implementation of relevant strategies and plans, fostering engagement between the commercial/business sector and Council with regards to those strategies and plans, and assisting the Council’s economic development agency (ENC) in the achievement of its business attraction and support programmes;

- Coordinate and manage key business and Town Centre related projects, ensuring efficient use of internal resources and effective project communication with both internal and external stakeholders;

- Actively lead and contribute to the Council’s Organisational Development Strategy with a specific focus on ‘Business Friendliness’, improved alignment of Council regulatory services, and the development of better internal systems and processes.

- Provide advice and support during the development of key Council strategies and documents such as the District Development Strategy and District Plan Review, through mechanisms such as the Town Centre Plan reviews, Local
Economic Development Advisory Group, and through targeted research and business sector consultation.

3.2. Work Programme Opportunities and Constraints

3.2.1. The Business and Centres Manager (BCM) role was established late in 2015 after an organisational restructure. Whilst the Position Description articulated the broad roles and responsibilities for this position well, the growth of the specific activities within each area of responsibility, and the time allocation to these activities were somewhat unknown. In addition, there has been benefit in having the Business and Centres (BCU) function become involved in a number of organisation wide and multi-departmental projects and tasks.

This has led to a reasonably significant list of projects and work tasks being placed on a single full time equivalent position. Whilst not all of the projects or tasks are led by the BCU, a reasonable number of the projects require either leadership or input, and this has led to the current resource being spread thin across a wide range of activities. This in turn slows down the progress of any one activity, and increases the risk of delayed completion, or missed actions and processes.

3.2.2. A number of important projects/tasks have also not been started due to the risk of setting expectations that cannot be met as the actions and deliverables for those tasks begin to accrue.

3.2.3. In addition, a number of projects are nearing completion of their first stages; however the logical follow on tasks will also result in a likely increase in the expected level of service and delivery from the BCU. Once example of this is the Business Friendly Resources, which are almost complete, but upon implementation are likely to increase the amount of case/key account management required. Whether case management is managed by the BCU or by another area, it will require the appropriate resourcing.

3.2.4. It is worth noting, that with only one BCU resource, most projects/tasks require a ‘whole of process’ approach. For example, the leadership of any given project would require the BCM to initiate the project, create agendas, chair meetings, and collate minutes, circulating/distribute information, undertake a reasonable number of the actions created, and overseeing outcomes and timeframes etc. This ‘whole of process’ approach limits the overall number of projects or tasks that can be undertaken simultaneously, and requires significant prioritization of actions across a wide number of projects.

3.2.5. It is hard to provide a precise weekly schedule of time allocation for the BCM position due to the variation in tasks, priorities on any given week, emerging issues that require attention, and timeframes/priorities of other departments. However, a summary assessment of the last 12 months would illustrate a current resourcing input of around 45 – 50 hours per week. As described above, not all identified projects/tasks have been able to be initiated, and the progress speed of some current projects/tasks is not optimal. Should all identified projects/tasks be moved forward simultaneously at an appropriate rate, it is anticipated a further 40 – 45 hours per week (one FTE) would be required.

3.2.6. The following illustration and table provides an overview of the Business and Centres Unit activities and work programme:
Waimakariri District Council - Business and Centres Unit

1. Key Account Management
   Larger external projects with multiple stakeholders, reasonable complexity, and/or of high value

2. Business Case Management
   One point of contact for coordination of Council regulatory services for smaller external local business

3. Customer Interfacing 'Business Friendly' Resources
   Development and ongoing management of Council business friendly resources, from hard copy document to future coordinated electronic processing

4. Surveys, Research and Information Collection and Production
   Development and management of key information sets based on future and existing customer requirements (surveys)

5. Promotions Associations Relationship Management
   Liaison with each Town Centre Promotion Association

---

1. Alignment of Internal Functions, Processes and Resources
   Continued work to assess and develop better alignment of Council work streams and processes with specific focus on businesses undertaking regulatory functions

2. Embedding of Ta Matou Mauri into business interactions and processes
   Via mentoring and coaching of staff as well as the development of processes that include these principles

3. Influencing/advising various Council work streams and policies
   Participating in key working groups and forums to ensure work practices and project outcomes consider the audience/customer/end user

4. Support/Advocacy of Relevant OD Work Streams
   Continue to participate in key projects in each of the Organisational Development Pilots

5. Project Management/Involvement – Cross Council Initiatives
   Lead/Coordinate certain relevant projects that require participation of a number of units

---

1. Kalipol Town Centre Plan
   Project manage the review of the current KTC Plan, and lead on implementation. Oversee existing/interim projects.

2. Rangiora Town Centre Plan
   Project manage the review of the current RTC Plan, and lead on implementation.

3. Oxford Town Centre Plan
   Undertake monitoring report of OTC Plan and develop key follow on actions.

4. Woodend Pegasus Area Strategy
   Consider potential involvement in the 'best DDS' review of this strategy and impacts on DPR and local business stakeholders.

5. District Development Strategy
   Consider the impacts of the finished DDS on Town Centre Plans, DPR, local economic development and the local business communities

6. District Plan Review
   Continue to participate in the DPR as a key advocate for Town Centre’s and business zoning etc.

7. Council Long Term Plan
   Contribute, where relevant, to the Annual Plan and LTP processes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Sector Engagement</th>
<th>Strategies and Planning</th>
<th>Internal OD and Project Leadership</th>
<th>Local Economic Development</th>
<th>Administrative &amp; Research</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Number of Projects/Tasks</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Average Hours Allocation (1 FTE)</td>
<td>9.5 hrs</td>
<td>16.5hrs</td>
<td>10hrs</td>
<td>2hrs</td>
<td>10hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Number of Projects/Tasks</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Average Hours Allocation (2 FTEs)</td>
<td>16.5 hrs</td>
<td>33hrs</td>
<td>25.5hrs</td>
<td>6hrs</td>
<td>12hrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.7. As you will see from the table above, an additional full time resource does not equate to a doubling of the individual projects and work tasks. This is because a number of the hours going into specific tasks increases, providing existing tasks/projects with a greater/more appropriate level of resource, and therefore increasing the speed and efficiency in which these projects are delivered within.

Additional resourcing as proposed in this report will enable greater attention to business sector engagement, pace at which town centre development is supported and implemented, and hasten the implementation of sustainable change in internal processes.

3.3. **Resourcing Options and Considerations**

3.3.1. There are a number of options that could be considered concerning resource allocation for the Business and Centres Unit. Options include continuing with the current situation, maintaining the same level of resource and reprioritizing how that resource is assigned, or increasing the level of resource. The option of increasing the level of resource comes with further considerations relating to how that resource is assigned. Additional resource could be assigned in the form of administrative support, or assigned to specific ‘specialist tasks’, or be introduced across the BCU functions in a more of a ‘generalist’ way.

3.3.2. With this in mind, the attached Business Case identifies the following five resourcing options:

- **Option 1 – Continue with Current Approach** – A legitimate option is to continue with the current approach to the BCU’s business plan. Essentially that is to spread the existing resource across a wide variety of task with the aim of provide some benefit to a variety of projects and work streams.

- **Option 2 – Maintain Current Resource level but Reprioritise** – Under this option, a new business plan could be developed, with key objectives and projects being decided, and resource allocated to these accordingly. Other
projects and tasks would then be either reassigned back to other units, or rescheduled for completion later.

∑ **Option 3A – Assign an Administrative Resource** - Administrative resource could be assigned to undertake tasks associated with a range of projects and work streams.

∑ **Option 3B – Assign a ‘Specialist’ Resource** – Provision of a ‘specialist resource’ would allow certain tasks across the identified ‘four-quadrant’ diagram above to be reassigned.

∑ **Option 3C – Assign a ‘Generalist’ Resource** – Unlike the specialist resource above, the provision of a generalist resource would provide support across a wide range of work tasks and projects. The generalist resource could be assigned tasks and projects from across the ‘four quadrants’.

### 3.3.3.
An assessment considering the benefits and drawbacks of each options within the attached Resourcing Business Case concluded that Option 3C (Generalist Resource) was the preferred option. This is also the option supported by the Management Team.

### 4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. The community’s views have not specifically been canvased in relation to this matter. However, there has been strong support from the business community about the ongoing improvement of business friendliness, and proactive case management of key projects and developments. There is an ongoing community expectation that the good progress made recently in town centres planning and development will continue.

### 5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. Should Council decide to support the recommendations in this report, an annual increase of $100,000 would be included into the Business and Centres Unit budget. This budget provision is currently factored into the draft LTP.

5.2. If approved, the appropriate job evaluation exercise would be conducted to ensure the position is costed correctly. The $100,000 represents the whole cost associated with the proposed resource, and includes the associated overheads etc.

5.3. This budget increase represents a 0.17% increase on the total rate, and would be sourced from the General Rate.

### 6. CONTEXT

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

6.2. Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable, affordable and sustainable

6.3. Businesses in the District are diverse, adaptable and growing

Simon Hart
BUSINESS AND CENTRES MANAGER

Simon Markham
MANAGER, STRATEGY AND ENGAGEMENT
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1 Executive Summary

This Business Case describes the current operating environment and activities associated with the Business and Centres Unit (BCU) of Council and points to the growing need for further resource to effectively respond to the growing demand for the functions of this unit.

It provides a summary assessment of the current projects and tasks the BCU undertakes and demonstrates how this has resulted in a dilemma but also opportunity for Council to be more effective in business attraction and development as well as progressing our town centres as vibrant business locations.

Further information and context relating to this business case is available upon request.

2 Business Situation

2.1 Business Purpose and Environment

Business & Centres Unit Purpose Statement

A primary purpose of the Business and Centres function is to provide senior relationship management advice and support for business interaction with the Council’s regulatory functions and services to maximise the Council’s contribution to business development while effectively discharging its statutory and service responsibilities.

A further fundamental aspect of the Business and Centres Unit is to provide leadership and programme coordination to effectively maintain and implement Town Centre strategies, plans & projects and the Council’s economic development strategy while enhancing its working relationship with business at large and the economic development agency, Enterprise North Canterbury.

The following objectives provide an overview of the core Business and Centres functions:

∑ Act as an effective point of business liaison and internal coordination in relation to new and existing business interactions with the Council’s regulatory functions and related activities, aiming to ensure effective engagement and support in the pre-application phase of consent and approval processes, and to provide ongoing relationship management and support (case management) to business customers of Council;

∑ Be a key point of engagement and coordination in the working relationship with Enterprise North Canterbury in support of its business attraction programme;

∑ Be a source of information, a sounding board and a facilitator of business sector ideas and proposals for effective Council service delivery, District needs & opportunities, and new to the District business activities & proposals - in the spirit of building mutual understanding, trust and confidence between business and the Council;
∑ Lead, guide and support the coordinated development and implementation of the Council’s programmes that support its Town Centre strategies and plans, the maintenance and development of those strategies and plans and the effective communication of their intent, progress and achievements;

∑ Be the custodian of the Council’s Local Economic Development Strategy in terms of its development and implementation of relevant strategies and plans, fostering engagement between the commercial/business sector and Council with regards to those strategies and plans, and assisting the Council’s economic development agency (ENC) in the achievement of its business attraction and support programmes;

∑ Coordinate and manage key business and Town Centre related projects, ensuring efficient use of internal resources and effective project communication with both internal and external stakeholders;

∑ Actively lead and contribute to the Council’s Organisational Development Strategy with a specific focus on ‘Business Friendliness’, improved alignment of Council regulatory services, and the development of better internal systems and processes.

∑ Provide advice and support during the development of key Council strategies and documents such as the District Development Strategy and District Plan Review, through mechanisms such as the Town Centre Plan reviews, Local Economic Development Advisory Group, and through targeted research and business sector consultation.

Organisational Environment Summary (SWOT Analysis)

This SWOT summary provides a holistic assessment of the current operating environment in which the Council Business and Centres function exists. It is not intended to be a complete account of all strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats relating to the Council, and is aimed at simply providing some ‘point in time’ context to support this specific Business Case.

Strengths

Typically in any SWOT analysis, Strengths and Weaknesses relate to internal factors, and Threats and Opportunities relate to external factors. As such, a major identifiable strength on the Council as a whole is the significant technical knowledge contained within the collective staff. There is a good number of ‘subject matter experts’ within the individual units of Council and this provides an excellent platform for the development of systems and processes. It also aids the achievement of the Council’s legislative and statutory requirements.

In addition, Council staff have the support of elected officials concerning a number of important pieces of work (District Development Strategy, District Plan Review and Town Centre Plan Reviews) which will provide a strong framework from which to grow the districts economic environment, social and community wellbeing, and infrastructure network.
Council has strong, stable senior leadership, as well as a number of relatively new unit managers who provide an injection of enthusiasm and new ideas.

Externally, population growth continues with the Districts resident population now over 59,000 placing the district as the fourth largest population in the South Island. This growth is projected to continue over the next 30 years bringing with it a steady demand for employment, preferably through locally based jobs. Commercial sector growth continues with a series of key retailers and hospitality organisations establishing, reopening, or growing their presence in the district. Some initial signs of a slowing economy are beginning to emerge, however local commercial growth over the last two years has resulted in a reasonable amount of community excitement, which in turn is likely to support the commercial sector going forward.

Recent Market Economics studies have also shown ‘gaps’ in key parts of the retail sector which provide further growth opportunity as the community grows, and would result in the reclaiming of retail spend within the district, and therefore continuing local economic growth.

Other external strengths that have direct benefit to the Council include the local economic development agency, Enterprise North Canterbury, who continue to grow their presence in the business support and attraction areas. The district also benefits from a number of key business people and developers who have shown continued support through investment and development into the districts business sectors.

**Weaknesses**

Like all organisations, a number of weaknesses exist that should be considered, managed and/or resolved. The Waimakariri District Council is now a reasonably large organisation with more than 24 individual business units, and a reasonably diverse set of operational activities.

One of the current observations is the continued existence of silos within some areas of the Council. A number of examples exist where units have operated in an individual manner at the expense of integrated service to business customers who need to liaise across various functions of Council. In some cases not only has there been a silo mentality, but also Council units have actually provided differing/inconsistent advice to business customers. While the introduction of the Business and Centres function has begun to address this issue, further work on ‘Business Friendliness’ is required. This work involves the development of processes, alignment or key services, and professional development of key staff.

A significant part of Council business is regulatory in nature and its reputation is strongly influenced by (perceived) performance in this area. Building consents, resource consents, liquor and environmental health licensing, etc., are all part of day-to-day activities for Council. One side of this type of work is enforcement, and working in a regulatory environment requires an understanding of legislation that is prescriptive in nature. In some cases this has led to a focus on policing and enforcement as opposed to the provision of ‘an enabling service seeing consenting as a pathway’. This approach of ‘enforcing the rules’ as
opposed to ‘helping people through the process’ illustrates a clear weakness in business related customer service and is the source of continued negative customer feedback such as through the recent LGEP stakeholder engagement process.

The combination of the above two points (the development of silo’s and the enforcement mindset) have led to the development of ‘sub cultures’ within the work place. The Council has a clear set of stated values including, ‘working with you and each other’ and ‘doing better every day’. Given the above-identified weaknesses, it would seem that these values have been replaced with other values in some areas/teams, resulting in sub cultures that do not necessarily align with the wider organisation.

Certainly the above points seem to have led to Council having some challenges around reputation with a reasonably large portion of the business sector. A number of businesses have expressed this directly, and some indirectly. This reputation has a negative effect on day-to-day business relationships and activities with the business community, and certainly hampers business attraction activities. Whilst the introduction of the Business and Centres function has improved business interactions on a day-to-day basis, a more sustainable set of practices is still required.

Opportunities

There are a number of projects that will have significant ongoing benefits to the Council. The first of these is the Organisation Development Strategy that is currently being implemented. This strategy aims to develop capability and culture within the organisation and therefore aligns nicely with the Business Friendliness work stream. It will also support the management and delivery of key internal and external projects.

A further opportunity relates to the development and implementation of more robust and defined customer focused systems that aim to provide business customers with an integrated regulatory processes experience, and greater pre-application information. Case/Key Account management scenarios have been discussed and can be furthered to support this customer service focus, and a number of draft customer interfacing resources are almost ready to be launched. A question around resourcing remains, to ensure the level of service offered can be met. However, planned and resourced Case/Key Account management, delivered in a sustainable way remains a legitimate opportunity.

Alongside Case/Key Account Management exists an opportunity to develop and align ‘back of house’ processes and systems. In part this might involve an element of ‘business analysis’, and align with the current Business Process Mapping project that is underway. It will be important that any improvement to the customer interfacing processes be matched by the back of house functions to ensure a better ‘whole experience’ for business customers.

There are also a number of technology advances that could be explored. Again this would support improved and aligned business friendly processes to make doing business with the Council more efficient and transparent. Being able to conduct a greater amount of business online with Council would be well received, as would being able to access a greater amount of business specific information in a quick and easy way.
The Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan Review is underway, and will come with a number of recommendations to the District Plan Review and the Long Term Plan. Upon the completion of the new plan, an opportunity exists to look at how the delivery is managed, and how engagement with key stakeholders both within Council, and in the District’s business community is managed. A reviewed KTC Plan which embraces the adjoining mixed use business areas will inevitably lead to implementation workstreams requiring resourcing.

In addition, our current knowledge of projects either planned or underway in Rangiora provides an element of urgency concerning the review of the Rangiora Town Centre Plan. Taking a proactive and coordinated approach to the framework for this ongoing development, and Councils involvement in the renewal of this plan will result in a number of opportunities not being missed as these activities occur.

In addition to the review and implementation of updated KTC and RTC plans, there exists opportunity/need to review the progress of both the Oxford Town Centre and Woodend/Pegasus Area Strategies. This in itself could lead to a number of recommendations and opportunities to be more proactive in these areas. Supporting strategies such as the Local Economic Development Strategy, and the form and function of the associated Advisory Group also require updating, and provide opportunities for greater business sector engagement and involvement.

When considering the reasonably significant number of cross department projects currently being undertaken, or currently being discussed within the organisation, it seems that a greater level of project management resource would provide more certainty around meeting set deadlines and community expectations. Often the project lead sits within the unit or department that might begin the project, or have ‘the most input’, however there is an opportunity for project management to be led from a customer focused area, rather than a specialist area, hence providing a more considered approach to achievement of key outcomes.

Development of a more structure relationship between Council and Enterprise North Canterbury also presents an opportunity, particularly is relation to future and ongoing business attraction, information and data collection and sharing, research, and business sector engagement. Strong relationships between the two organisations already exist, and articulating a plan which has specific business community related surveying and information sharing outcomes would benefit both organisations.

Threats

One of the most significant threats from a Business and Centers perspective will be the resistance to change that might be experienced during the implementation of various new Organisation Development Strategy initiatives and the ‘business friendly processes’ (customer interfacing and back of house). How this resistance is managed could largely determine the success of these strategies and systems. A good system managed poorly by unhappy staff will not provide a better customer experience.

From an external perspective, the changing and slowing economy could also provide an element of threat. Although local developers still remain ‘bullish’ about attracting new
business to the district, and would warn that the most significant challenges relate to planning/zoning issues, and the opportunity to obtain the right amount of land within the right areas at an economically viable rate for new developments.

As described above, the Councils reputation within the business community still provides a challenge with respect to existing and attracting new businesses. A number of economic benefits are gained from new businesses entering the district, such as job creation, reduced traffic/commuting for residents into Christchurch, and a greater level of local consumer spend within the district. However, should businesses determine that the Waimakariri district is not ‘business friendly’ the risk is that they opt to establish in other parts of the country. Hence, a poor Council reputation in the business community is a direct threat to the local economy.

## 2.2 Problem Analysis

The Business and Centres Manager role was established late in 2015 after an organisational restructure. Whilst the Position Description articulated the broad roles and responsibilities for this position well, the growth of the specific activities within each area of responsibility, and the time allocation to these activities were somewhat unknown. In addition, there has been benefit in having the Business and Centres (BCU) function become involved in a number of organisation wide and multi-departmental projects and tasks.

This has led to a reasonably significant list of projects and work tasks being placed on a single full time equivalent position. Whilst not all of the projects or tasks are led by the BCU, a reasonable number of the projects require either leadership or input, and this has led to the current resource being spread thin across a wide range of activities. This in turn slows down the progress of any one activity, and increases the risk of delayed completion, or missed actions and processes.

A number of important projects/tasks have also not been started due to the risk of setting expectations that cannot be met as the actions and deliverables for those tasks begin to accrue.

In addition, a number of projects are nearing completion of their first stages; however the logical follow on tasks will also result in a likely increase in the expected level of service and delivery from the BCU. One example of this is the Business Friendly Resources, which are almost complete, but upon implementation are likely to increase the amount of case/key account management required. Whether case management is managed by the BCU or by another area, it will require the appropriate resourcing.

It is worth noting, that with only one BCU resource, most projects/tasks require a ‘whole of process’ approach. For example, the leadership of any given project would require the BCM to initiate the project, create agendas, chair meetings, and collate minutes, circulating/distribute information, undertake a reasonable number of the actions created, and overseeing outcomes and timeframes etc. This ‘whole of process’ approach limits the
overall number of projects or tasks that can be undertaken simultaneously, and requires significant prioritization of actions across a wide number of projects.

It is hard to provide an exact weekly schedule of time allocation for the BCM position due to the variation in tasks, priorities on any given week, emerging issues that need to be resolved, and timeframes/priorities of other departments. However, a summary breakdown of recent months would illustrate that a ‘normal week’ might consist of between 45 – 50 hours. As described above, not all identified projects/tasks have been initiated, and the speed of current projects/tasks is not optimum. Typically, around 40 - 45% of the BCM time is currently spent preparing for, attending and documenting meetings. A further 30% of time could be spent of responding to/sending emails, and the remainder 25 – 30% of time being allocated towards all other tasks, including document and process development, reporting, follow up actions, attending to emerging issues etc.

The information on the following pages helps to define the current known business and town centres activities, and the current and potential BCU work programme, these include:

1. Updated Projects/Developments maps
2. Business and Centre Unit Current Work Programme Overview
Current Rangiora Projects and Developments

1. Presbyterian Church Development
2. 194 King Street (4 Tenancies)
3. Durham St. (Ron van Til)
4. North of High Project
5. Old Post Office and Courthouse
6. Service Lane, 124 High, Good Street
7. 106 High St. Development
8. Sports Shop & Resene - Movement
9. A&P Building - Bar
10. Council BNZ Corner
11. Capitola Site – Petrol/FF/Retail
12. Warehouse – LFR Briscoes etc.
13. RSA Building Development
14. New Bunnings Development
15. Freemasons Site
Current Kaiapoi Projects and Developments

1. Silverstream Commercial Area
2. Smiths Street Development
3. West Mixed Business Area
4. NZFS & Go Bus Projects
5. 137 Williams Street Development
6. PLC Riverview Development
7. BNZ Bank Building Project
8. Eastern Mixed Use Business Area
9. Eastern Mixed Use Business Area
10. Eastern Mixed Use Business Area
11. South Mixed use Business Area
12. Kaye Buchan Project
Current Woodend, Pegasus & Ravenswood Projects and Developments

1. Progressive Proposal
2. Woodend Town Centre
3. Ravenswood Commercial
4. Proposed Accommodation
5. Pegasus Business Zone
6. Consented 83 Room Accommodation
7. Proposed NZTA Bypass
8. Pegasus Linkage Road
9. Pegasus Linkage Road

9. Pegasus Linkage Road
Waimakariri District Council - Business and Centres Unit - Overview

1. **Key Account Management**
   Larger external projects with multiple stakeholders, reasonable complexity, and/or of high value

2. **Business Case Management**
   One point of contact for coordination of Council regulatory services for smaller external local business

3. **Customer Interfacing ‘Business Friendly’ Resources**
   Development and ongoing management of Council business friendly resources, from hard copy document to future coordinated electronic processing

4. **Surveys, Research and Information Collation and Production**
   Development and management of key information sets based on future and existing customer requirements (surveys)

5. **Promotions Associations Relationship Management**
   Liaison with each Town Centre Promotion Association

---

**Alignment of Internal Functions, Processes and Resources**
Continued work to assess, and develop better alignment of Council work streams and processes with specific focus on businesses undertaking regulatory functions

**Embedding of Ta Matou Mauri into business interactions and processes**
Via mentoring and coaching of staff as well as the development of processes that include these principles

**Influencing/advising various Council work streams and policies**
Participating in key working groups and forums to ensure work practices and project outcomes consider the audience/customer/end user

**Support/Advocacy of Relevant OD Work Streams**
Continue to Participate in Key Projects in each of the Organisational Development Pillars

**Project Management/Involvement – Cross Council Initiatives**
Lead/Coordinate certain relevant projects that require participation of a number of units

---

**Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan**
Project manage the review of the current KTC Plan, and lead follow on implementation. Oversee existing/interim projects.

**Rangiora Town Centre Plan**
Project manage the review of the current RTC Plan, and lead follow on implementation.

**Oxford Town Centre Plan**
Undertake monitoring report of OTC Plan and develop key follow on actions.

**Woodend Pegasus Area Strategy**
Consider potential involvement in the ‘post DDS’ review of this strategy and impacts on DPR and local business stakeholders.

**District Development Strategy**
Consider the impacts of the finalised DDS on Town Centre Plans, DPR, local economic development and the local business communities

**District Plan Review**
Continue to participate in the DPR as a key advocate for Town Centre’s and business zoning etc.

**Council Long Term Plan**
Contribute, where relevant, to the Annual Plan and LTP processes

---

**Local Economic Development Strategy and Advisory Group**
Review the Local Economic Development Advisory Group Terms of Reference, and action accordingly. Review and refresh the Council’s Economic Development Strategy

**Enterprise North Canterbury – Business Attraction and Support Partnership**
Continue to support the Business Attraction and Support functions of Enterprise North Canterbury

**Wider Sector/Regional Networking, Information Gathering and Collaboration**
Develop key relationships with local, regional and national agencies/organisations to grow sector knowledge and be able to influence key projects and policies

**Town Centre Amenities/Car Parking**
Continue to lead and/or participate in relevant Council work related to the ongoing management or development of key Town Centre amenities
2.3 Current Work Programme

The top two rows of the following table provides an overview of the current number of Business and Centres projects being undertaken (either led or involved in) by type, and the hours per week (on average) allocated to those tasks. The bottom two rows then illustrate the increased number of projects that could be undertaken with an additional full time equivalent resource.

As you will see, an additional full time resource does not equate to a doubling of the individual projects and work tasks. This is because a number of the hours going into specific tasks increases, providing existing tasks/projects with a greater/more appropriate level of resource, and therefore increasing the speed and efficiency in which these projects are delivered within.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Sector Engagement</th>
<th>Strategies and Planning</th>
<th>Internal OD and Project Leadership</th>
<th>Local Economic Development</th>
<th>Administrative &amp; Research</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Number of Projects/Tasks</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Average Hours Allocation (1 FTE)</td>
<td>9.5 hrs</td>
<td>16.5 hrs</td>
<td>10hrs</td>
<td>2hrs</td>
<td>10hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Number of Projects/Tasks</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Average Hours Allocation (2FTEs)</td>
<td>16.5 hrs</td>
<td>33 hrs</td>
<td>25.5hrs</td>
<td>6hrs</td>
<td>12hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Potential Options

There are a number of options that exist, that could be implemented concerning the identified problem. Options include continuing with the current situation, maintaining the same level of resource and reprioritizing how that resource is assigned, or increasing the level of resource. In addition, the option of increasing the level of resource comes with further considerations concerning how that resource is assigned. Further resource could be assigned in the form of administrative support, or assigned to specific ‘specialist tasks’, or be developed across the BCU functions as a more of a ‘generalist’.

As you would expect, each option has benefits and drawbacks, and these are explored in more detail in the below table.
3.1 Options

3.1.1 Description

Option 1 – Continue with Current Approach – A legitimate option is to continue with the current approach to the BCU’s business plan. Essentially that is to spread the existing resource across a wide variety of task with the aim of provide some benefit to a variety of projects and work streams.

Option 2 – Maintain Current Resource level but Reprioritise – Under this option, a new business plan could be developed, with key objectives and projects being decided, and resource allocated to these accordingly. Other projects and tasks would then either be reassigned back to other units, or rescheduled for completion later.

Option 3A – Assign an Administrative Resource - Administrative resource could be assigned to undertake tasks associated with a range of projects and workstreams. Tasks might include (but not be limited to) organizing agendas, taking and distributing minutes, ensuring appropriate record keeping is maintained, overseeing communications with key stakeholders, recording and report against work or project progress, working with other Council departments to collate and present key information to the business community, act as a first point of contact for enquires etc.

This resource would then in turn allow a greater proportion of the existing BCU resource to be assigned to a greater number of tasks, and/or the more technical or complex aspects of certain tasks.

Option 3B – Assign a ‘Specialist’ Resource – Provision of a ‘specialist resource’ would allow certain tasks across the identified ‘four-quadrant’ diagram (page 11) above to be reassigned. One possible option might be to assign case/key account management, and project management tasks to the new resource. Another option might be to assign resource to the planning, strategy and research related tasks, both from a development and implementation perspective.

There would be a number of ways to divide up work tasks and projects, but regardless of how this is undertaken, the result would again be that a greater level of overall tasks and projects being undertaken.

Option 3C – Assign a ‘Generalist’ Resource – Unlike the specialist resource above, the provision of a generalist resource would provide support across a wide range of work tasks and projects. The generalist resource could be assigned tasks and projects from across the ‘four quadrants’. Depending on the resource, it is likely that less complex and lower risk tasks and projects are assigned in the first instance, providing an opportunity for familiarization with processes and people to occur, and for the development of the appropriate skills.

As above the result would again be that a greater level of overall tasks and projects being undertaken and improved completion timeframes for key tasks.
### 3.1.2 Benefits and Drawbacks

The following table describes the forecast benefits and drawbacks for each of the above options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Drawbacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 1</strong>&lt;br&gt;Maintain Current Approach</td>
<td>- No additional cost to Council</td>
<td>- Slower progress against a wide range of progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Known level of output</td>
<td>- Less ability to influence various important pieces of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increased risk of missing opportunities to proactively engage in both Council and private projects impacting on business and town centres</td>
<td>- Increased risk of not meeting community expectation with regards to various projects or work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increasing need to be responsive to emerging issues, rather than engaging at early stages with key stakeholders.</td>
<td>- Very limited ability to undertake new/additional projects or work tasks without postponing other work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Very limited ability to undertake new/additional projects or work tasks without postponing other work.</td>
<td>- Limited ability to develop and implement new work processes and systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Limited ability to undertake key areas of research or develop key business networks beyond the existing.</td>
<td>- Limited succession planning and potential for greater dependency on a single resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 2</strong>&lt;br&gt;Reprioritise Projects and Tasks</td>
<td>- No additional cost to Council</td>
<td>- A number of projects/work tasks would be put on hold periodically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ability to speed up progress, or improve outcomes on particular projects or work streams.</td>
<td>- Increased risk of missing opportunities to proactively engage in both Council and private projects impacting on business and town centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ability to set clear expectations on what is, and what is not going to be prioritized.</td>
<td>- Increased risk of not meeting community expectation with regards to various projects or work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Very limited ability to undertake new/additional projects or work tasks without postponing other work.</td>
<td>- Very limited ability to undertake new/additional projects or work tasks without postponing other work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Limited ability to develop and implement new work processes and systems.</td>
<td>- Limited ability to develop and implement new work processes and systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Limited ability to undertake key areas of research or develop key business networks beyond the existing.</td>
<td>- Limited ability to undertake key areas of research or develop key business networks beyond the existing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 3A</strong>&lt;br&gt;Provide</td>
<td>- A greater level of overall work/productivity from the BCU</td>
<td>- Additional cost of a new resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Limited resourcing of technical and...</td>
<td>- Limited resourcing of technical and...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Resource</td>
<td>Administrative work could be assigned to at a more appropriate cost level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A small improvement in sustainability of the BCU, and slightly less dependency on a single resource.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An administrative resource is likely to be obtained at less cost than a specialist or generalist resource.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to improve efficiency of administrative processes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 3B Provide Specialist Resource</th>
<th>Greater cost to provide the extra resource.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ‘specialist’ approach based on particular types of work could result in an imbalance of workloads at any given time based on the needs of the organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a greater chance of a silo mentality being formed over time if the delineation of tasks is too rigid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative tasks still need to be undertaken by project/task holder.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 3C Provide Generalist Resource</th>
<th>Greater cost to provide the extra resource.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative tasks still need to be undertaken by project/task holder.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Increased time given to existing resource may be consumed by current projects requiring more time, rather than the uptake of new projects or work.
- Some risk still associated with all technical knowledge and capability being dependent on one resource.
3.1.3 Costs and Funding Plan

The table below provides a summary of the potential costs and funding approach to each of the options described above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Associated Additional Costs</th>
<th>Additional Value</th>
<th>Existing Budget</th>
<th>Budget Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 Maintain Current Approach</td>
<td>∑ Nil – only Existing budget required</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>10.562.894.2589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2 Reprioritise Projects and Tasks</td>
<td>∑ Nil – only Existing budget required</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>10.562.894.2589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3A Provide Administrative Resource</td>
<td>∑ 1 x Administrative Employee</td>
<td>$50,000 to $60,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3B Provide Specialist Resource</td>
<td>1. 1 x Specialist Employee</td>
<td>$90,000 to 100,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3C Provide Generalist Resource</td>
<td>2. 1 x Generalist Employee</td>
<td>$80,000 to 90,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.4 Assumptions

The following list of assumptions apply to the options explored in the above sections of this business case:

1. The BCU will continue to operate across Council departments to improve processes, systems and service to business customers.
2. The current capacity for support for BCU activities across other Council teams remains the same or similar.
3. There are no unforeseen or emerging issues that require the BCU to divert time or resources away from the activities (or type of activities).
4. No new technology or processes are implemented which impacts time spent on various tasks.
4 Recommended Option

Based on the assessment provided in this business case, it is recommended that Option 3C (Additional Generalist Resource) is approved for the Business and Centres Unit. This option would provide greater resourcing across the four quadrants of work, and therefore allow for more projects and work tasks to be undertaken simultaneously.

It is acknowledged that Option 3C attracts additional costs; however it also results in the achievement a number of key BCU outcomes within reduced timeframes. Option 3C also provides for greater BCU sustainability, with a second resource eliminating the risks associated with a single person unit, and providing succession possibilities.

It is anticipated, on the basis of the assessment conducted on pages 12 – 17, that the additional resource would be one full time equivalent employee that would report directly to the existing Business and Centre Manager. As it is a ‘generalist’ type of position, similar in nature to the Business and Centres Manager, one possible position title could be ‘Business and Centres Advisor’.

This option is the favoured option by Simon Markham, Manager Strategy & Engagement, and Jim Palmer, Chief Executive.

Simon Hart
Centres and Business Manager
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: SHW-13-05 / 171123127385

REPORT TO: Council

DATE OF MEETING: 5 December 2017

FROM: Hearings Panel: Waste Management & Minimisation Plan 2017

Councillor Robbie Brine (Chair)
Councillor Wendy Doody
Councillor Paul Williams

SUBJECT: Waste Management & Minimisation Plan 2017

SIGNED BY: (for Reports to Council or Committees)

Department Manager

Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

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

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

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

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

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

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

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 171123127385.

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

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

2. Insert the below targets in Section 2.2
   a. Reduce annual per capita waste to landfill from 294kg per capita in 2015/16 to 236kg per capita by 2029
   b. Increase the annual per capita quantity of materials diverted from 170kg per capita in 2015/16 to 228kg per capita by 2029

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**


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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

   To

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

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

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

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

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

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

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

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

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

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

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

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

7. CONTEXT

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

7.2. Legislation

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

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

Simon Collin
Infrastructure Strategy Manager

Kitty Waghorn
Solid Waste Asset Manager

On behalf of
Cr. R. Brine
Chair: Waste Management & Minimisation Plan Hearing Panel
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO: 171122126970/ IFR-02

REPORT TO: Utilities and Roading Committee

DATE OF MEETING: 12 December 2017

FROM: Gerard Cleary, Manager Utilities and Roading, and Simon Collin. Infrastructure Strategy Manager

SUBJECT: Utilities and Roading Activity Management Plans 2018

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to present to the Committee the draft 2018 Roading, Water Supply, Wastewater, Drainage, Stock Water and Solid Waste Activity Management Plans, noting their role as supporting documents to the draft 2018-28 LTP.

1.2. These are revisions of the Activity Management Plans that were adopted by the Council in 2015.

1.3. The draft Activity Management Plans (AMP’s) will be used to inform the Council’s draft 2018–2028 Long Term Plan (LTP). The Activity Management Plans will be subsequently updated to reflect changes resulting from the approved LTP so that the final AMP’s align with the LTP.

Attachments:

i. Introductory Chapter for the Utilities and Roading Activity Management Plans (170724076981)

ii. Utilities and Roading Activity Management Plans (available in electronic format in the folders shown)

- Roading AMP, IFR-02-02.04
- Water Supply AMP, IFR-02-03
- Wastewater AMP, IFR-02-04
- Drainage AMP, IFR-02-05
- Stockwater AMP, IFR-02-06
- Solid Waste AMP, IFR-02-07
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Utilities and Roading Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No 171122126970.

(b) **Notes** the following draft 2018 Activity Management Plans for Roading, Water, Wastewater, Drainage, Stockwater, and Solid Waste which are works in progress, with completion programmed before the January LTP Budget Meetings.

i. **Introduction, IFR-02-01, TRIM 170724076981**

ii. **Roading AMP, IFR-02-02.04**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Scheme / Document Reference</th>
<th>TRIM Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1 Executive Summary Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2 Introduction Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3 Levels Of Service Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4 Future Demand Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5 Risk Management Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6 Life Cycle Management Plan Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 7 Financial Summary Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 8 Asset Management Practices Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 9 Plan Improvement And Monitoring Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 10 Appendices Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A Glossary of Terms Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B 2018 Draft Strategic Business Case</td>
<td>171025115475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C Level Of Services Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix D 2018 Roading Valuation Report Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>171201130750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix E Capital Works Forward Works Programme Waimakariri Transport AMP 2018</td>
<td>170321027277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. **Water Supply AMP, IFR-02-03**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme / Document Reference</th>
<th>TRIM Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply AMP Overview Document 2018</td>
<td>170822090191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ii. Wastewater AMP, IFR-02-04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme / Document Reference</th>
<th>TRIM Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater AMP Overview Document 2018</td>
<td>161116117659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern District’s Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pines/Kairaki Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Beach Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loburn Lea Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernside Wastewater Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117682</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
iii. Drainage AMP, IFR-02-05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme / Document Reference</th>
<th>TRIM Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drainage AMP Overview Document 2018</td>
<td>161116117610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal urban Drainage Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Urban Drainage Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Rural Drainage Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Rural Drainage Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loburn Lea Rural Drainage Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Urban Drainage Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Rural Drainage Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkville Rural Drainage Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Urban Drainage Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust Rural Drainage Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Urban Drainage Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Rural Drainage Scheme AMP 2018</td>
<td>161116117602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iv. Stockwater AMP, IFR-02-06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme / Document Reference</th>
<th>TRIM Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stock Water Race AMP 2018</td>
<td>161115117090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

v. Solid Waste AMP, IFR-02-07

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme / Document Reference</th>
<th>TRIM Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste AMP November 2018</td>
<td>171129129620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Notes that the levels of service provided for are reflected in the draft budgets for the Long Term Plan (LTP).

(d) Notes that the suite of draft utilities and roading Activity Management Plans will be reported to Council at the January 2018 LTP Budget Meetings for adoption

(e) Circulates a copy of this report to all boards for their information.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. Activity Management Plans
3.2. The Utilities and Roading Activity Management Plans cover the following activities:

- Roading
- Water Supply
- Wastewater
- Drainage
- Stockwater
- Solid Waste

3.3. Activity Management Plans (AMPs) are important documents that state how the Council will manage its assets and activities in the future. They provide the supporting information for the LTP and 30 Year Infrastructure Strategy. The plans outline the significant issues associated with the activities and assets. The plans summarise the various components of the schemes and identify future funding requirements and upgrades to maintain levels of service and manage growth.

3.4. For each activity there are a number of key aspects that the plans cover, these include:

- Desired & Actual Levels of Service
- Asset Condition
- Capacity & Performance
- Risks
- Disaster resilience
- Growth predictions

3.5. The AMPs cover future works and financial projections which include:

- Operations and maintenance
- Renewals programmes
- New capital works for growth and Levels of Service
- Financial projections

3.6. The documents also include improvement plans that summarise the future improvements the Council proposes to carry out as part of the ongoing asset management process.

3.7. Document Hierarchy

3.8. The Roading, Solid Waste and Stockwater AMPs are stand-alone documents that (including appendices) provide a complete picture of the activity, its assets and how they are managed.

3.9. For 3 Waters with the numerous different water, wastewater and drainage schemes, the AMPs have been structured so that two documents need to be referenced to get a complete picture for each scheme. These are the Overview document relevant to the activity and the scheme specific AMP.

3.10. Each of the Water Supply, Wastewater and Drainage activities has an Overview AMP. This document describes the processes and asset management practices that are common to all schemes for that activity. It includes high level scheme descriptions, and a district wide view of levels of service, asset condition, risk, growth and financial projections etc. It also contains an executive summary which is used as the basis for relevant text in the 30 year Infrastructure Strategy.

3.11. The individual scheme AMPs contain all the detail specific to each scheme, but need to read in conjunction with the Overview documents.
3.12. 2018 Revision – General Comments

3.12.1. In 2005 the Waimakariri District Council adopted Activity Management Plans (AMPs) for Utilities and Roading that were substantially different and improved from previous plans. These documents were subject to extensive public consultation particularly in terms of levels of service.

3.12.2. The 2009, 2012, and 2015 revisions have not had substantial changes in terms of level of service. See Section 4 for ways in which levels of service have been tested with the public over these periods.

3.12.3. Each of the updated AMPs across all the activities reference a number of data and process improvements and additional assessments that have been undertaken since the 2005 versions. The plans therefore incorporate a number of content changes.

3.12.4. The technical work that supports the 2018 AMPs was carried out in advance of the preparation of the 30 Year Infrastructure Strategy (IS), which has allowed stronger linkages between the AMP’s and the IS.

3.12.5. Some of the projections in the AMP’s are prepared in context of the 30 year outlook taken within the Infrastructure Strategy, but others take a 50 year view, while the renewals projections are pushed out to 150 years to properly account for the long life cycle of many of the infrastructural assets.

3.12.6. Population projections, on which infrastructure planning is based, have been updated to align with the adopted corporate population projection WDC Scenario Township Projections 2018-2048.

3.12.7. The 2018 3 waters AMPs have been updated to reflect new higher growth projections, improved asset data, latest condition ratings and new and revised plans and strategies. They include revisions resulting from ongoing improvement to the asset criticality and renewals models. The results and recommendations from this work are presented in a spatial format within the documents.

3.13. 2018 Revision – Roading AMPs


3.13.2. Key roading issues identified through the ILM process included congestion, road safety, and potential impact on maintenance due to changing land use. These have been the primary driver behind the Capital Projects planned for the 2018-28 LTP period.

3.13.3. Scenario testing of future roading rehabilitation and resurfacing options were tested through DTIMS, a modelling programme. The outcomes and recommendations were found to be in line with those proposed by staff. This gives both Council and NZTA confidence that forward works planning is on target and not over or under-committed.

3.13.4. The Road Efficiency Group (REG), a task force set up by government to get more value for money within the roading activity, instigated the One Network
Road Classification, a national hierarchy designed to achieve consistency in customer outcomes across the country, and this hierarchy was incorporated into the AMP.

3.13.5. Key roading projects completed include:
- Southbrook/South Belt Traffic Signals
- Mitre 10/Pak N’ Save Traffic Signals
- High St Upgrade
- Kaiapoi Town Centre
- New Arterial Rd West Kaiapoi

3.13.6. Data improvement continues to be a focus for the next roading AMP, along with improvements to performance monitoring to allow better calibration of actual performance against customer wants and needs

3.14. 2018 Revision – 3 Waters AMPs

3.15. Levels of Service

3.15.1. A review of the levels of service has been carried out for the 2018 AMPs, and minor changes made to align with our ability to measure performance, to reflect external influences, and to clarify some of the wording. The changes are detailed in each of the Overview documents, together with the reasons for the changes

3.15.2. The primary level of service driver for water supplies continues to be meeting the Drinking Water Standards, with all WDC managed schemes expected to be compliant by end of FY 2018/19. However the standards are likely to change within the term of the 2018 AMPs, following the completion of the stage 2 Havelock North enquiry report.

3.15.3. The main wastewater level of service issue is Kaiapoi overflows in wet weather. An update of the hydraulic model is underway, and detailed planning to resolve the issues will be carried out in 2018. “Placeholder” budget provision has been made, pending development of preferred concept solutions.

3.15.4. While improvements have recently been made to the Kaiapoi stormwater drainage system, further assessments are planned for parts of the catchment, as it is thought that levels of service are not being met in some areas

3.15.5. Council is required by the Land and Water Regional Plan to apply for discharge consents for its stormwater network. The ultimate effect, and timeframe and cost to comply is largely unknown at this point. However it is likely that it will quite costly. Some budgetary provision has been included at the end of the 10 year LTP period, for the urban drainage schemes, but this may need to be increased considerably at the next LTP.

3.16. Asset Renewals

3.16.1. Progress has been made on the asset criticality model, which is used to provide an input to the renewals model. Drainage assets have now been included in the reticulation criticality assessment for the first time. Criticality assessments of above ground assets (headworks, pump stations, reservoirs etc) will be able to be carried out for the next AMP reviews.
3.16.2. Renewals estimates are aligned to the most recent infrastructure asset valuation (peer reviewed) completed in August 2017. The renewals model and the linked funding model have been improved and are now able to show the long term level of funding necessary to ensure that each scheme will have sufficient future budget provision to replace assets at the end of their life. The model has been used for drainage reticulation assets in this review.

3.17. Asset Condition

3.17.1. A targeted CCTV programme of pipe inspections for drainage pipes has been implemented, which will provide currently lacking asset condition information, and assist with improved maintenance.

3.17.2. The CCTV programme for sewer pipes is ongoing and will result in pipes being inspected on an approximately 20 year cycle. Pipes are prioritised based on criticality and age.

3.17.3. For water supply, a record of pipe bursts has been used as a proxy for asset condition assessment, but an inspection programme is planned for development during the coming three years.

3.17.4. An asset inspection programme for above ground facilities is also included in the improvement plan for the 2018-2021 period.

3.18. Risk

3.18.1. The suite of risk assessments carried out for the 2015 AMP reviews was not updated for the 2018 AMP reviews. There is considerable overlap between the 2009 Disaster Resilience Assessment and the Operational Risk Assessment, the methodology for which is also in need of a review. A comprehensive review of methodologies, with a view to integrating and updating these assessments is noted as an improvement project.

3.19. Key Projects/Issues

3.19.1. Completion of the Rangiora wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) upgrade. Note a second aeration basin is planned for construction 2026-2028. Similarly new wetland cells are planned for Woodend WWTP in 2026/27.

3.19.2. Continuation of the Rangiora network upgrade (stages 5-9), and detailed planning of a Kaiapoi network upgrade to meet levels of service.

3.19.3. Completing connection of the Woodend and Pegasus water supply schemes

3.19.4. Completion of the remaining water supply source upgrades to ensure compliance with the New Zealand Drinking water standards. There are expected to be financial challenges with the affordability of some of this work for the smaller schemes, Ohoka, Garrymere and Poyntzs Road.

3.19.5. Ongoing flood mitigation works, both the flood response works, and works funded within the district drainage schemes. Kaiapoi being the main focus going forward.

3.19.6. Increased renewals costs. The updated risk based model, together with the latest valuations has resulted in an overall increase in the expected renewals programme, required to ensure continued reliable delivery of levels of service.
Some adjustments have been made in the short term programme to mitigate the effect of these increases.

3.19.7. The unknown long term cost and timing for compliance, of the urban stormwater discharge consents required under the Land and water regional Plan.

3.20. **2018 Revision – Solid Waste**

3.20.1. A waste assessment and review of the Waste Management Plan was undertaken in 2016/17, a draft Waste Management & Minimisation Plan prepared, and consulted upon. It includes proposals for additional kerbside collection services, but it cannot be finalised until the 2018/28 LTP has been completed.

3.20.2. Irrespective of the outcome of the LTP on the final kerbside services to be offered, the collections contract and contract for management of the Southbrook and Oxford Transfer stations are to be put out for tender during 2018, in preparation for a new contract term starting July 2019.

3.21. **Level of Optimisation**

3.22. The Introductory Chapter describes the optimisation process that is used on Utilities and Roading projects. It outlines some of the processes that are used to ensure that expenditure is optimised and discusses the different levels of optimisation that are applied to various projects.

3.23. Differing levels of optimisation are applied to projects, depending on a number of factors, including the relative value (or effect on ratepayers) of a project, the risks, the degree of public interest, and when the works are planned.

3.24. **Management Team Review**

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

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. The level of service component of the Activity Management Plans was consulted upon comprehensively as part of the 2005 review. While a comprehensive public review has not been carried out since then, levels of service are tested with the public regularly in the following ways:

4.1.1. Customer surveys, e.g. stockwater survey

4.1.2. Monitoring service requests

4.1.3. The LTP and Annual Plan process

4.1.4. Specific engagement when significant LOS changes are proposed, e.g. kerbside collection services

4.1.5. In addition to the above, additional engagement was carried out with key stakeholders to seek feedback on key strategic issues affecting the roading network.
4.2. 3 Waters are planning to develop 3 Waters strategies during the first three years of the 2018-28 LTP. This will provide an opportunity for engagement with the community on future levels of service.

4.3. For the 2018 AMPs a staff review of the 3 Waters levels of service has resulted in minor changes to clarify the intent of the performance measures and test the suitability of the targets. Only minor changes have been made as a result of the review, and these are detailed in the Overview documents.

4.4. The community outcomes in Council’s Long Term Plan (LTP) are a significant input into the Activity Management Plans. These were consulted on as part of the Long Term Plan. The major outputs from the Activity Management Plans are via the Long Term Plan as capital works and operational budgets, together with a number of ongoing internal process and data management improvements.

4.5. The Waste Management & Minimisation Plan (WMMP) public consultation was undertaken via a Special Consultative Procedure. The community has a further opportunity to provide feedback on the additional kerbside services proposed in the WMMP via the LTP process.

4.6. After approval by the Council the Activity Management Plans, amended as a result of any changes made during this meeting, and from any changes that arise from the LTP process, will be placed on the Council’s website. Some maps which are currently only in draft form (e.g. serviced area maps) will also be finalised prior to publication on the website.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. Activity Management Plans are a core part of the Council’s business and provide the key financial inputs into the LTP. These documents demonstrate that the Council is managing its assets and activities appropriately.

5.2. The planned update of the Risk Assessment and Disaster Resilience assessment together with the risk based renewals process, will provide a significant improvement to the resilience of the Council’s infrastructure over time.

5.3. The financial implications of the Activity Management Plans have been reflected in the draft budgets put forward for the LTP.

5.4. In some instances activity specific rates for some small schemes will rise quite sharply, driven by work needed to meet legislative standards. For example rates for Garrymere water supply (Drinking Water Standards) and Fernside wastewater (consent conditions).

5.5. In 2016 a Council Working Party comprehensively considered options for changing 3 Waters rating structures across the district. One objective of the study was to consider ways of easing the projected high rates increases for some small schemes. Council resolved to include this issue in the draft 2021/31 LTP. It also requested that staff bring a recommendation to Council in January 2018 to include a $6 per property flood rate in the draft 2018/2028. This has been included in the draft drainage budgets.

5.6. Initial indications from NZTA indicate support for the proposed programme of subsidised work, however the final allocation will not be known until mid-2018.

5.7. An inappropriate level of activity management would have significant financial and risk implications for the Council.
5.8. A peer review of the Activity Management Plans has been programmed. Any recommended improvements to meet statutory, OAG and good practice requirements, will be incorporated in the final version placed on the Council’s website.

6. **CONTEXT**


6.2. Some of the key outcomes that the Utilities and Roading Activity Management Plans contribute to are as follows:

- There is a safe environment for all
- Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable, affordable and sustainable
- There is sufficient clean water to meet the needs of communities and ecosystems
- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable and affordable manner

Gerard Cleary
Manager Utilities and Roading

Simon Collin
Infrastructure Strategy Manager
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to update the Committee on current and future levels of service and their financial impacts relating to a number of the major Community Green Space Asset types.

1.2. In order to ensure that the Council is providing enough greenspace assets that are fit for purpose, meet community expectations, population changes and recreation trends staff have undertaken the development of a number of strategies and a level of service review. In developing these staff have been mindful of the affordability of new and replacement assets over the whole of asset life. Strategies have been created for Community Facilities, Sports Facilities (including sports fields) Public Toilets and Play Spaces while a levels of service review has been carried out for the maintenance of trees. This report does not cover the Community Facilities Strategy, as this information will be presented in a separate report.

1.3. Key changes or recommendations that have been determined through the process of creating the strategies and levels of review are as follows:

1.3.1. Sports Facilities

- No further land purchases are required to cater for projected numbers of users for the next 30 years.
- Four Court indoor venue remains a high priority
- Council should consider a programme of sports field upgrades to increase the usability of fields rather than invest further in artificial turfs.
- A Softball Facility should be developed in Kaiapoi

1.3.2. Public Toilets

- Provision of toilets in Neighbourhood Parks with large catchment areas.
- Unisex and accessible cubicles in new toilets
- Trend towards having toilets closed at night
- Development of a LOS for town centre toilets
- Development of LOS for toilets on or servicing land owned by others
- New Toilets required at 4 locations within district to meet levels of service

1.3.3. Play Spaces
includes a stronger emphasis on the assessment of play value when looking at new or replacement playground development
- Specified age and ability provision linked with park catchment type
- Shade Provision and UV protection to be provided at key play spaces with priority going to high-use long stay sites with particular focus on junior play areas with no natural shade.
- Skate park levels of service created which states that there will be an even distribution across districts key activity centres and that size and scale will be reflective of the population catchment.
- More emphasis on integrating opportunities for inclusive play into play space general design rather than specific equipment provision.

1.3.4. Tree Maintenance

- Asset information is now up to date which has determined that the Council has almost 19,000 trees. This is significantly larger than the amount that was identified in the 2011 Street, Reserve and Cemetery Tree Maintenance Contract.
- This report proposes that current levels of service are changed from maintenance of all trees every three years to a more staggered approach with time frames for maintenance being dependant on location.

1.4. This report identifies the levels of service for each asset type and the financial implications of those levels of service.

1.5. This report is requesting that the Community and Recreation Committee support staff including the recommendations from the strategies and level of service review into the Draft Community Green Space Activity Management Plan. The Activity Management Plan will be used to inform the Long Term Plan in terms of Levels of Service required and financial implications of those levels of service. A separate report will be presented to the Community and Recreation Committee asking the Committee to consider recommending to Council that the Draft Activity Management Plan be approved for consultation as part of the Long Term Plan 2018 / 28.

Attachments:
- Sports Facilities Strategy (Trim: 171114123628)
- Public Toilet Strategy (Trim: 171114123588)
- Play Space Strategy (Trim: 171114123637)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee recommends to Council for its consideration at the 30 January 2018 (LTP) meeting:

(a) Receives report No. 171103119339

(b) Receives the Sports Facilities Strategy (Trim: 171114123628)

(c) Receives the Public Toilet Strategy (Trim: 171114123588)

(d) Receives the Play Space Strategy (Trim: 171114123637)

(e) Approves a new level of service for the maintenance of street reserve and cemetery trees which provides a programmed maintenance visit for all trees based on the below table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Example Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Streets</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Williams St Kaiapoi, Main St Oxford, Good St, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. The Local Government Act 2002 (Amendment 2017) identifies under section 11A core services Council must consider in performing its role. A local authority must have particular regard to the contribution that a number or core services make to the community including libraries, museums, recreational facilities and community amenities.

3.2. The Greenspace Unit has the responsibility of managing the provision replacement and maintenance of assets, which relate to the recreational facilities and community amenities within the Waimakariri district.

3.3. In order to perform this role in line with best practice asset management process and to meet the needs of the community now and into the future the Greenspace Unit has created a number of strategies and levels of service reviews for key asset types. These include strategies for Sports Facilities (including sports fields) Public Toilets and Community Facilities and levels of service reviews for Play Spaces (including playgrounds) and Tree Maintenance.
3.4. These documents identify and explore the influences which effect each asset type now and into the future such as population growth and demographic changes. They also explore other more specific trends in recreation and parks usage as well as customer expectations. This information has been used to create levels of service relating to each asset that meet community expectations but are also affordable. The Levels of Service for each asset type have not changed dramatically from those which were already identified within the 2012 Community Green Space Activity Management Plan.

3.5. Each of the Strategies and Level of Service Reviews is described in more detail below.

3.6. **Sports Facilities Strategy**

3.6.1. The Council provides a range of different sports facilities from live sports fields, artificial turfs to indoor courts. The last time a full study was done to determine the need for sports facilities and review the levels of service was in 2011 as part of the preparation for the 2012 / 2022 Long Term Plan. In addition to this full study which looked at each sport, there has been a feasibility study and functional design brief created for indoor courts in 2014 and 2016 respectively.

3.6.2. Since 2011, there has been significant changes in participation rates and recreation trends which effect the need for certain types of facilities. There has also been a change in the way in which sports field provision is assessed. This has been driven from areas in the Country where space is becoming limited and more detailed analysis of the carrying capacity of a live field rather than a simple population / hectare ratio is required. It is therefore prudent to undertake a strategy to determine what is required now and into the future.

3.6.3. In order to complete the Sports Facilities Strategy staff employed the services of Richard Lindsey from Visitor Solutions. Richard Lindsey is an expert in this field having worked for Sport New Zealand focusing on facility development for a number of years. Richard is also local and has a good understanding of the assets and weather conditions, which affect the region.

3.6.4. The Sports Facilities Strategy was split into two distinct parts. The first focuses on the provision of sports fields. The second focuses on the provision or need for other sporting facilities.

3.6.5. The primary purpose of the strategy is to provide direction to the Council on the prioritisation of investment in the future sports fields and sports facility developments.

3.6.6. As part of the process of developing the strategy various types of research analysis and consultation was undertaken. This including the following:

- Primary research and consultation
  - Sports Club Surveys for Sports Fields – Each club using sports fields within the district was sent a survey. This enabled information to be collected on participation trends and key sports field issues.
  - Site Visits – Site visits were undertaken to a cross section of the sports fields across the district. Those that were identified by the clubs as performing particularly bad were all visited as well as a number of others.
  - Phone Interviews – One-on-one phone interviews were held with a number of sports clubs to understand their sports field and facility needs.
  - Review of existing strategies and feasibility studies – this was more relevant regarding the indoor court feasibility study.
3.6.7. The strategy identified four main challenges that the Waimakariri District faces in relation to the provision of sports facilities in the future. A full description of these is identified in the strategy. Summarised these challenges are as follows:

- Population growth, distribution and changing demographics
- Maintain assets and facility sustainability
- Improving collaborative approaches
- Proximity to Christchurch

3.6.8. The strategy identifies a number of trends in sport and recreation. These trends are primarily national trends which effect the type of infrastructure which is required to meet sport and recreation demand. The trends can be broken down in to two main areas. How people play and what people are playing on and in.

- How people play
  - There is a general trend away from long term commitments in club memberships in favour of shorter pay for play activities
  - Casual play – less competitive sport with more emphasis on activities that can be engaged in at all times that are convenient to the participant
  - Modified or shortened formats of sports – A move away from full length, full court/field to shorter and smaller activities (3-on-3 basketball, Futsal, 20/20 cricket, 7s Rugby etc.

- What people are participating on and in
  - More artificial surfaces – More codes are requiring artificial surfaces
  - International bodies are developing code share artificial surfaces
  - Increasing expectations of levels of service. Higher expectations for highly specified facilities for more and more community sports
  - Multi-use facilities

3.6.9. These trends have an effect on facility provision but also the way in which current facilities are managed in the Waimakariri District. The 4 main impacts of these trends are as follows:

- More indoor court space is required. This is driven by increase in participation of relevant sports but also the move of sports such as netball moving towards an indoor delivery model. Many of the South Island netball centres are now operating indoors including Southland, Dunedin, Nelson and Ashburton.
- Opportunity for more active multi-code facilities to be shared among complementary clubs
- A long term planned programme of sports field upgrades will be required in the district (this will be talked about in more detail further in the report)
- Better quality and dedicated training venues for winter sports codes.

3.6.10. One of the key challenges for the Waimakariri District is the changing population growth, distribution and demographics. Because of the importance of this in determining sports facility location, development and scale the strategy has analysed current projected population data and the affects this will have in relation to sport and recreation. The key findings from this analysis are as follows:

- The population is expected to increase by 36,600 people over the next 25 years
- The highest proportion of growth will be in the east of the district ( for the purposes of this strategy the east includes Rangiora)
- Strong increase in the 65+ age range and only static to slight growth in all other age groups
3.6.11. In addition to population data analysis, it is important to understand trends in participation rates for different sporting codes. Each sports code was provided with a survey, which asked for information regarding participation rates over the last 5 years.

3.6.12. With population trend data and participation data, two separate projections can be made. The first is a population proportion projection. This looks at club membership as a proportion of overall district population. Extrapolating this out based on the same proportion of the population but accounting for population growth, results in a 54% increase in sports participation in the next 30 years. The second method is the recent membership trend rate projection. This method extrapolates the 2016 membership numbers according to the growth rates demonstrated over the last five years. The method results in a participation increase of 8% over the next 30 year period.

3.6.13. As already mentioned in 3.6.2 the methodology in determining the required facilities to meet demand for sports fields has changed over recent years. Historically need was simply determined by extrapolating a population vs hectares ratio. While this method is useful it does not take into account the carry capacity of fields of trends in participation rates for particular sporting codes. Need for sports fields is now more focused on the carrying capacity of the field vs projected participation rates. The change has primarily been driven by increasing land price and availability, which means that better use of existing facilities is in some cases the only option.

3.6.14. A study of the carrying capacity of each sports field in the district has been undertaken. The results of this study are provided in full in the strategy. Overall the quality or carrying capacity of the fields is poor with many areas such as Southbrook Park having a carrying capacity of 4 hours compared to 14 hours which is what a high quality soil field can achieve.

3.6.15. Based on this information combined with the expected participation rates the following has been determined:

- **Rangiora**
  - Most parks in Rangiora are currently at or near capacity
  - Southbrook park rear fields are particularly low quality
  - A programme of upgrades at Maria Andrews and Southbrook Park would provide the additional hours to provide for more than the current and projected hours
  - Dudley Park has the capacity to be used for training for multiple winter codes provided the lighting and the turf are of a sufficient quality
  - Ashgrove Park is available for more training especially if lighting is upgraded
  - Lehmans Road will not be required for Sports fields in the next ten year time frame
  - The proposed fields at Coldstream Road will also not be required in the next 10 years.

- **Kaiapoi**
  - Quality of the drainage of soil fields at Kendal Park is very low
  - The artificial turf can hold more capacity in off-peak times
  - Kaiapoi Park has some more capacity
  - The only real demand in Kaiapoi is from Rugby League and Softball

- **Woodend**
  - Gladstone Park is highlighted to have a surplus in provision. This will increase with the planned sports ground development. The surplus is primarily due to the sand based soil profile making the field’s carrying
capacity very high. Other clubs could use the additional surplus fields if additional lighting was provided.

- Loburn
  - Currently surplus of capacity which could be increased with upgrades to irrigation.
  - Ashley Rugby Club would like to build more fields however these are not required if increase to quality of existing fields is undertaken.
- Oxford / Ohoka
  - Capacity is available at Mandeville Domain
  - Small deficit exists at Pearson Park that could be catered for by increase in the quality of the fields used by Football.

3.6.16. There are a number of possible solutions that can be implemented to increase the quality and therefore carrying capacity of the soil based sports fields. Implementing these solutions will result in significant amounts of more playable hours on each field. It is anticipated that if these field improvements are implemented there will be no need to purchase any additional land for at least the next 10 years. The methods used in increase the quality of the fields include drainage, irrigation and the installation of a sand carpet.

3.6.17. A sand carpet field is not the installation of an actual sand based carpet product but rather a sand layer is installed on top of the soil with drainage underneath. Sand carpet fields cost approximately $220,000 but will increase the playing capacity of a field to up to 24 hours per week. The main limitation of a sand based field is the need to have a good irrigation supply as regular watering is required over summer months to ensure the surface stays alive.

3.6.18. The ultimate method of increasing carrying capacity of fields is to the install artificial turfs. The Council has already invested in two artificial turfs which are both very well used. A third artificial turf is currently identified in the Long Term Plan. There are three considerations that have been explored in the strategy which suggests that the artificial turf should not be installed in favour of an increase to the quality of the current soil fields. These are:

- The high capital cost of artificial turfs. A new artificial turf would cost approximately $2 million.
- Increasing the provision of higher quality soil fields will provide a more evenly district wide spread of quality fields
- Increasing the quality of existing fields will allow more sports to benefit than an artificial turf. Sports such as cricket will be able to use the soil-based turfs where this is not possible with a single artificial turf.

3.6.19. In addition to turf quality improvements, it is sensible to look at options for the investment in training specific fields. These are fields that many codes can book and play on. They generally have good quality lighting installed. This is something, which Dudley Park could be used for with the addition of some more lights. Currently the Council does not pay for or install any lighting. This is something, which is left to the clubs to develop. This report is suggesting that the Council installs lights at Dudley Park however; the use of these lights will not be for one club but instead bookable space for training only.

3.6.20. Based on the priority of improvements required a schedule has been created which has been broken into year 1-3 year 4-6 and year 7-10 of the Long Term Plan 2018-28. The projects listed include a number of irrigation drainage and sand carpet developments most often in a staged approach. The overall estimated costs associated with implementing the schedule is $1,707,000. This is almost $300,000 cheaper than the cost of a single artificial turf.
3.6.21. Staff are proposing that this money is spread evenly over each second year of the Long Term Plan. This equated to $350,000 each second year. The reason for the two year spread is that this allows enough money to be able to complete projects and will also be more achievable for staff to complete without having to rely on additional resources.

3.6.22. The projects identified in the first three years of the Long Term Plan are as follows:

- Pipe drainage of one field at Southbrook Park
- Upgrade lights and implement an all codes booking system for Dudley Park
- Undertake review of irrigation possibilities at Maria Andrews. Install sand carpet if irrigation is possible
- A grant for pipe drainage of one field at Kaiapoi Park
- Investigate further drainage options for Kendal Park and implement if possible
- Implement irrigation solution for Loburn Domain and pipe drainage of one field
- Pipe drainage of one field at Mandeville Domain.

3.6.23. As well as investigating what is required to cater for soil based field sports more than 20 other sporting codes were asked what they think they may need to be able to keep providing opportunity for their sport. A number of projects were identified. Each of the projects was assessed using the following criteria:

- Ability to share facilities
- Current participation/membership
- Projected participation/membership
- Level of strategic alignment
- Appropriate scale of facility
- Sustainability of facility.

The projects were ranked high medium and low priority. The high priority projects are listed below:

- Four court indoor facility – Significant work is already underway regarding this project and information will be presented to the community as part of the Long Term Plan.
- Development of fit for purpose softball diamonds. Currently there is a proposal to install two diamonds within the Kaiapoi Regeneration area.

3.7. **Public Toilets Strategy**

3.7.1. Public toilets within the Waimakariri district provide convenience for residents, workers and visitors of all ages and abilities. They optimise the benefits and opportunities provided by open space for a range of recreation pursuits including active sports and children’s play. They also increase the quality and usability of central business areas. They are a significant asset in terms of meeting the Council’s community outcomes. They are also significant in terms of ongoing investment required by Council.

3.7.2. Section 124-126 of the Local Government Act 2002 requires the Council to carry out an assessment of sanitary services within the district from time to time. The Act defines sanitary Services as having the same meaning as in the Health Act 1956. Section 25 (1) (d) of the Health Act 1956 includes ‘public conveniences for the use of the public’ as a sanitary work.

3.7.3. The Council last undertook an assessment of public toilets in 2005. In order to be able to accurately provide strategic direction for the development and management of the public toilet network for the next ten years and to meet Councils Local Government Act obligations staff have prepared the Waimakariri District Council Public Toilet Strategy 2017.
3.7.4. The strategy is very comprehensive and covers the following topics:

- Vision and Objectives
- Waimakariri District Public Toilet Network
- Public Toilet Usage
- Community Satisfaction and Expectations
- Levels of Service Guidelines
- Promoting Community Awareness
- Design and Sustainability
- Inclusive Access
- Maintenance and Management
- Renewals and Capital Works Programme
- Strategy Action Plan

3.7.5. The purpose of this report is to summarise the strategy by identifying the key trends which effect public toilets, how these effect levels of service and what financial implications these have. The full strategy is included as attachment ii.

3.7.6. The strategy identifies a proposed vision for public toilets as follows:

‘to provide residents and visitors to the district with convenient access to a well maintained, fit for purpose, safe and attractive public toilet network’

Following on from this vision 8 key objectives have been identified:

- Readily available
- Inclusive access
- Easy to find
- Fit for purpose
- Sustainable
- Clean
- Well maintained
- Safe to use

3.7.7. In order to achieve the objectives it is essential that staff have a detailed understanding of the current public toilet network. To assist in gathering this information an external company called Xyst was employed in 2015 to undertake a complete performance audit of public toilets. The following summary provides an overview of the findings of the audit:

- 62 toilets currently provided by Council. This includes public toilets provided in service centres and libraries.
- The Council’s toilet stock is relatively young with 68% being less than 20 years old
- Most toilets are provided on sports grounds and neighbourhood reserves
- Nearly two thirds are open 24/7
- Maintenance, graffiti removal and cleaning standards are observed to be very good
- Generally the toilets are in good overall condition with only 11% being in average condition
- Only 13% of toilets were considered fully accessible (primarily due to ongoing changes in the standards relating to accessibility contained within the Building Code).
- Inconsistent provision of services such as soap and hand dryers.
- Signage was considered poor with no standard design, contact for faults and poor directional signage.

3.7.8. As well as having a good understanding of the current toilet stock, it is necessary to understand the amount of use toilets get as well as customer satisfaction and
expectations. This helps assist with cleaning schedules, replacement programmes and trends in future toilet provision.

3.7.9. The main tools used to gather this data have been the three yearly customer satisfaction survey and the service request system. The 2013 customer satisfaction survey identified that more people used public toilets than any other community facility. They are used on average less than 12 times per year and more people with children use public toilets than any other group. The customer satisfaction survey asked what people’s favourite parks were. All of those mentioned other than Millton Memorial Reserve in Rangiora have a toilet within them. The survey identified that the highest use toilets in the district are predominantly town centre toilets with Victoria Park toilets being by far the most used toilet in the district.

3.7.10. Since 2001 satisfaction with public toilets has steadily increased to 60%. While a steady increase is good respondents to the 2016 customer satisfaction survey were still more dissatisfied with public toilets than any other community facility. Staff believe that much of the dissatisfaction is due to peoples increase in expectations around the quality of services that Council provides. This increased expectation is not just an issue for toilet provision but is a trend throughout all Green Space assets.

3.7.11. The most significant feedback that is received about toilets is the dissatisfaction of the Victoria Park Toilets. This is received through the customer satisfaction surveys and also the service request system where a number of complaints and requests for repairs and replacements have been noted. For this reason the strategy proposes that funding is made available to significantly renovate Victoria Park toilets in the 2018/19 financial year.

3.7.12. Having an understanding of the current toilet stock combined with usage levels, expectations and customer satisfaction staff undertook a review of current levels of service. This review identified that a more comprehensive levels of service was required. The vast majority of the new levels of service are actually describing current practise and redefining existing service levels. The main changes include the following:

- The provision of toilets in neighbourhood parks with large catchments. This is a change from the current service level which states that no toilets will be provided in neighbourhood parks. Due to public expectations toilets, have over the last 5 years, been provided in many neighbourhood parks. These have however primarily been in larger neighbourhood parks that provide a community catchment. The new level of service therefore aligns with current practice.
- Unisex and accessible cubicles in new toilets. It is cheaper and more user friendly to provide unisex toilets as oppose to male and female toilets. This is again aligning with current practice as only unisex toilets have been built over the last 5 years.
- Toilets to be closed at night. As new toilets are built and old toilets renewed they will be fitted with electronic locking systems. This reduces antisocial behaviour and vandalism. All new toilets that have been built over the last five years have these electronic locking systems installed.
- Development of a levels of service category for Town Centres. In the past levels of service have been related to the park type. This has not catered well for town centre areas where public toilets may not be located on a park but rather a road reserve or even private land. The new levels of service for town centre identifies what is usually provided, the standard, design features, location, cleaning schedule and availability.
The development of a levels of service / criteria for assessing the provision of toilets on land owned by others.

3.7.13. Using the proposed levels of service combined with customer feedback staff have undertaken a gap analysis to determine what will be required over the Long Term Plan period. This related to new toilets as well as replacements.

New Toilets

3.7.14. Eight reserves do not currently meet the existing levels of service for the provision of toilets. An assessment has been carried out for each of these reserves using the new Park Toilets Assessment Tool (this is a new tool which has been created as part of this strategy development to assist staff and councillors in assessing whether a new toilet is actually required or not). Of the eight assessed only two scored high enough to warrant including in the Draft Long Term Plan for Council consideration. These are Millton Memorial reserve and West Oxford Reserve.

3.7.15. Requests have been received for three toilets on land owned by others. These include Saltwater creek, Mountain road Coopers Creek and Ashley – Rakahuri Estuary. This strategy has a new levels of service relating to these requests which identifies when Council should consider assisting with funding towards toilets owned by others. While each of the locations identified above have merit staff do not believe enough information has been obtained from the land owners and it is recommended that further discussions are held. No funding has been identified in the Long Term Plan.

3.7.16. The government in early 2017 announced the establishment of the Tourism Infrastructure Fund. The Tourism Infrastructure Fund supports local communities facing pressure from tourism growth and in need of assistance. The purpose of the fund is to provide financial support for local tourism-related infrastructure where tourism growth (domestic and international) is placing pressure on, or potential growth is constrained by, existing infrastructure and the local community is unable to respond in a timely way without assistance. Staff will investigate the opportunities to be able to use this fund to assist with the development of a toilet at both west Oxford Reserve and Saltwater Creek.

3.7.17. The community has made it very clear through customer complaints and requests and the customer satisfaction survey that better quality toilets are expected in the town centre of Rangiora. There are two ways of doing this. The first is to build a new purpose built toilet within the town centre. This would ideally be located within a commercial property and would likely cost in the region of $350,000. The second option is to look at increasing the quality of the Victoria Park Toilets. Staff propose that this is the preferred option for the following reasons:

- The cost of a new toilet is very high
- There is uncertainty around potential location and timing of any potential new public toilet
- Upgrading the existing Victoria Park toilet may meet the communities expectations and will be required regardless of whether a town centre toilet is built
- Additional public toilets can be built into any future upgrade of the library or service centre, which will increase provision in the town centre area.

3.7.18. The Mandeville Sports Club have been requesting a toilet for the Southern side of the reserve for a number of years to cater for the various equestrian and canine clubs who use the reserve. Provision has already been made for power and water to a suitable site. The original plan was to relocate the Pegasus beach temporary toilet however this deteriorated faster than expected. This report proposes that funding is made available to build a toilet in the 2018/19 financial year. The funding
will be a combination of bringing forward $114,000 from the 20/21 year, which has already been identified in the current Long Term Plan and an additional $86,000 being allocated by Council.

3.7.19. In addition to the new toilets identified above it is likely that approximately 10 toilets will be required over the Long Term plan period to cater for growth. Funding for these toilets sits within the Neighbourhood Reserve Development budget which is funded through reserve development contributions.

3.7.20. The below table identifies the new toilets proposed and the year in which funding would be required:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible new toilet blocks to meet levels of service and customer expectations</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville Sports Ground (Equestrian)</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>$200,000 (includes $114,000 bought forward from 20/21 and $86,000 new allocation in 18/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Memorial Park</td>
<td>2023/24</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Oxford Reserve</td>
<td>2027/28</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$500,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Replacement Toilets**

3.7.21. The Council is obligated to progressively upgrade or replace older toilet stock in order to provide and maintain a safe, accessible, good quality, and sustainable network of public toilets. Renewals ensure that Council is providing toilets that meet new upgraded safety standards, customer expectations and support the ever changing way in which the community use public open space.

3.7.22. The last renewals programme was established in 2005. All of the new works identified in the 2005 programme have now been completed. A new programme has been proposed in the new 2017 strategy. This has been created after analysing data related to building age and expected life, overall performance in terms of accessibility, safety, security, hygiene and presentation. It should be noted that while some of the older toilets are still functional and in reasonably good condition they do score very badly when it comes to overall performance, as they were not designed to be accessible or meet Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design standards.

3.7.23. The full list is included in the strategy. Below is the top five proposed priority toilets for replacement over the Long Term Plan period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Toilet</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Park</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kairaki reserve</td>
<td>2021/22</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Picnic Ground</td>
<td>2023/24</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Beach Domain</td>
<td>2015/26</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Andrews Park</td>
<td>2026/27</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,150,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7.24. The current renewals budget contained within the current Long Term Plan budget is $106,000 per annum. This is a total of $1,060,000. With the rise in building costs, a renewals budget of $106,000 per annum is no longer enough to develop one standard toilet block per year. The strategy therefore recommends that other than the first year where only $150,000 is sought, $250,000 is approved every second year. This enables a toilet to be built keeping in mind that the priority toilets are also all large toilets in high use areas. This represents a budget increase to the current budget of $9,000 per annum. This budget is expected to be able to cope with toilet renewal demand for the next 20 years however it will have to be increased after this point. This is explained in more detail in the strategy.

3.7.25. While ensuring that public toilet stock is renewed at an appropriate time and that provision of new toilet blocks keeps up with demand in a growing district is important there are also a number of other things which need to be considered to make sure that toilets are fit for purpose.

3.7.26. The design of toilet blocks needs to be carefully considered to make sure that they are aesthetically pleasing, safe to use, sustainable, accessible and meet Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design principles. To this end, the strategy has a section which focuses on Design and Sustainability. The key things to consider in relation to design and sustainability are as follows:

- Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design
- Making sure materials used are robust, high quality and vandal resistant
- Implementing environmentally sustainable design principles where practicable into the planning, design, procurement and maintenance of public toilets
- Toilets should be built to be accessible and user friendly.
- Toilets should keep up with trends in architecture and user demands
- Toilet should be built to be aesthetically pleasing.

3.7.27. It is extremely important for public toilets that maintenance is undertaken regularly. A lack of maintenance and management can lead to poor image, loss of public confidence, increased vandalism, health issues, and may attract inappropriate use. The cleaning of toilets is included into the District Parks and Reserves Maintenance Contract 16/51. Regular auditing of toilet cleaning is undertaken.

3.7.28. Maintenance audits of toilets are not undertaken as often as they should be and this is something which the strategy is recommending. The toilet cleaners do report obvious maintenance issues however this does not generally apply to parts of the building such as guttering and roof structures. As well as regular audits regular painting and replacement of fixtures and fittings that will have less life that the building structure is required. The strategy suggests that painting of toilets is included into the building cleaning contract when this is next renewed. Currently this work is undertaken on an ad hoc basis.

3.7.29. Once the public toilet network is meeting the needs of the community in relation to appropriate provision and standard it is extremely important to ensure that there is enough information available to the community to let them know where toilets are. People with young families, older people and those with impairment may plan their activities before they leave home and rely on good information being available regarding toilet location and whether they are accessible. There are a number of things which the strategy suggests the Council does in order to improve in this area. Some of these can be done with no financial cost however the benefits are still high. A summary of improvements relating to the promotion of community awareness is as follows:
• Adopt a minimum standard for information to be provided on each toilet and as toilets are renewed implement accordingly
• Ensure that there is street signage available for each toilet
• Provide some additional signage informing the community of the toilet facilities within Dudley Park Aquatic Centre
• Provide information identifying the location of toilets on the Council website and investigate opportunities for this information to be shared with other external websites such as toiletmap.co.nz
• Provide Enterprise North Canterbury $1500 (available within existing budgets) for the development of a district wide map that can be displayed in information boards across the district.

3.8. Play Spaces

3.8.1. Play spaces and the playgrounds and other assets contained within them have huge benefit to the community. Play is an important quality of life. It has a positive influence on health and well-being, developmental learning and social development. Play spaces are areas that are used by a cross section of the community creating social interaction and community participation that can lead to a sense of community ownership and pride. There are many more documented social, mental and physical benefits of providing play space in the community.

3.8.2. The provision of quality play spaces represents a significant investment for the Council. Play space trends are always changing as community demographics change, new technologies are created and people’s lifestyles evolve. To make sure that the Council continues to provide cost effective play spaces that meet the ever changing needs of the communities they serve the Green Space Team has developed the Waimakariri District Play Space Strategy.

3.8.3. The proposed aim of the strategy is to:
• Guide the planning and development and on-going management of the Waimakariri Districts growing play space network.
• Promote best practice principles in play space planning and design
• Ensure quality play opportunities are available to children of all ages and abilities
• Provide a guiding document for subdivision developers involved in the design and development of new play spaces

3.8.4. To achieve this aim four key objectives have been determined:
• Provide a diverse range of play spaces which identified play needs and values.
• Ensure an equitable distribution of local and wider community play spaces based on measurable provision guidelines
• Produce well designed, constructed and maintained play spaces supported by sound administration
• Enable the financial implications of strategic play space provision to be clearly understood and evaluated.

3.8.5. The strategy covers the following topics:
• Aim Scope and Objectives
• Where a play space is provided
• How play space is allocated to meet community need
  o Play space distribution
  o Play space catchments and levels of service
3.8.6. The purpose of this report is to summarise the strategy by identifying the key influences, which effect play spaces, how these effect levels of service and what financial implications these have. The full strategy is included as attachment iii.

3.8.7. Play spaces could theoretically be provided in any park or reserve in the district however they are primarily provided in Neighbourhood Parks and Sport and Recreation Reserves. The distribution of play spaces within the district aims to comply with the following measures:

- Most residential properties within an urban or suburban area will be within reasonable walking distance of a play space. Ideally within 500m or under ten minutes walk.

- Most residential properties in an urban or suburban area will be within a longer walk or reasonable cycling distance of a medium to large community play space. Ideally within a 1km radius or 15 minute walk.

3.8.8. These measure allow play spaces to be accessible for children of all ages. Where local play areas may provide for younger children it is more likely that community play spaces that have the opportunity to have more assets will provide for a broader age range. Older children are generally more able to travel longer distances to reach community parks.

3.8.9. In order to achieve the aim and objectives in the strategy a review of the current Levels of Service regarding play spaces has been undertaken. The majority of the Levels of Service, which were included in the 2012 Activity Management Plan, have remained the same. Some additional service levels have been added to provide direction in relation to the provision of specific asset types. Much of these new service levels reflect existing practise. A summary of the main changes are below:

- A specific age and ability provision has been linked to different park catchments. The larger the catchment the larger the age range and abilities that can be provided for. This allows very small parks to have a focus on the younger age range. It is very difficult to provide for every age and ability range at every park and this is not financially viable. As children are older they are more mobile and able to travel further to a larger community park which can have more facilities.

- Shade sails, structures or large trees will be installed at key play spaces. High use long stay sites will be prioritised particularly junior play areas with no natural shade.

- Skate Parks
  - Provision – even distribution across district key activity centres
  - Size and scale – reflective of the population catchment

- Fencing around playgrounds will not be provided except where an identified hazard cannot otherwise be managed.
• Lighting is not provided at park play spaces, as the use of play areas during the hours of darkness is not encouraged.

• Re-harvested or engineered wood fibre mulch is Councils preference as a standard safety surface.

3.8.10. As part of the strategy development staff undertook an assessment of the levels of service, including those new levels of service described above. The assessment was done to determine what impact the new levels of service would have financially and also to determine if the Council is currently providing the right amount of play spaces in the right areas.

3.8.11. The assessment involved detailed analysis of the play value that each park provides as well as the condition of the assets within the play area. Conditions for all assets are kept on the Tech One system and updated regularly. The evaluation also looked at the distribution of the current play spaces in the district.

3.8.12. The analysis which is described in more detail in the strategy determined that based on the levels of service the Council will be required to develop three new play spaces and one Skate Park in the next ten year period. The locations costs and proposed timing of these developments is identified in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hurunui Reserve</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Memorial Reserve</td>
<td>2019/20</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kippenburger / Elm Green Linkage</td>
<td>2023/24</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Park for the Woodend Pegasus Area</td>
<td>2020/21</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$415,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8.13. In addition to the developments above it is anticipated that an additional 10 neighbourhood reserves will be required to meet population growth demand. This is based on the parks minimum Levels of Service guideline of one hectare per 1000 residents. Current neighbourhood land development funding will be sufficient to develop these neighbourhood reserves. This funding is sourced from Reserve Development Contributions.

3.8.14. In addition to new play space developments required to meet the levels of service the Council is obligated to ensure that current play spaces are replaced in order to meet current play values and provide safe and relevant equipment for use. Council currently allocates $190,000 per annum to replace existing play spaces of which there are 67 in the district. The assessment of play spaces that was undertaken utilising play value and condition information was used to determine a programme of replacements. The table below identifies the proposed programme. The cost of each replacement cannot be determined until public consultation has been undertaken which determines the type of equipment which is installed. Staff believe that the current budget of $190,000 is appropriate and will cover the cost of implementing the programme. The timings identified below are based on the complexity of the replacement and staff resources. The largest effect on this schedule will be the time it takes to complete public consultation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kairaki Reserve</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Domain</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen Stalker Reserve</td>
<td>2019/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach North Oval</td>
<td>2020/21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.8.15. Many of the park renewals will be focused on renewal of the playground equipment however it is also necessary in many instances to take a holistic approach and renovate the entire reserve. This brings the play equipment but also the surrounding infrastructure and landscaping up to an appropriate modern and usable standard. A budget of $220,000 is currently identified to cover this improvement cost.

3.8.16. When looking to design a new or replacement play space there are a number of things which need to be taken into account. The strategy provides direction in relation to a number of these factors to ensure that play spaces are built to an appropriate quality.

- **Play Values** – The strategy has a strong focus on play value. An emphasis on play value can help the designer meet the developmental needs and preferences of target groups. Age levels are commonly used to categorise play values.

- **Universal design and inclusive play** – Not all play spaces can meet everyone’s needs and preferences but collectively the network should provide opportunities for all who wish to participate. This strategy is promoting the concept of inclusive play which encourages people of any age and ability to access and enjoy a play space and its associated facilities. Key aspects of inclusive play include:
  - Cognitive
  - Social
  - Emotional
  - Communicative
  - Sensory
  - Physical
  - Moral

- **Play Choice and Diversity** – The principal that play space should be readily accessible, meet community needs and accommodate key play values is fundamental. Beyond this point the strategy does not prescribe any particular design. This allows greater flexibility when looking to provide appropriate and contemporary play spaces. Community play expectations are always changing due to influences in demographics, lifestyle and population demographics. Research and community consultation is used to determine demand for new forms of play. An example is a strong trend towards the provision of more fitness based equipment which is a direct result of the aging population.

- **Play elements and safety surfaces** – when choosing play elements there are a number of things to consider including:
This also applies to safety surfacing. The strategy identifies a number of different material for safety surfacing that are approved and can be used however engineered wood fibre mulch is the preferred material due to the whole of life cost.

- Contextual play value – The setting and supporting facilities associated with a play space have a significant effect on visitor experience. The type of facilities which should be considered to support a playground include:
  - Public toilet
  - Seating and tables
  - Pathways and surfacing
  - Shade and shelter
  - Artistic elements
  - On-site parking

Other contextual elements that are often asked for but are not desirable include fencing except where a hazard cannot otherwise be managed and lighting. More detail regarding the reasons for not recommending these elements is identified in the strategy.

3.9. Tree Maintenance

3.9.1. The purpose of providing quality and timely maintenance of trees located in parks, reserves and streets is to ensure their proper health, growth and longevity. Maintaining trees properly ensures the public and property are protected from injury or damage.

Quality maintenance includes:

- Scheduled cyclic maintenance of all Council owned amenity trees
- Response to tree related service requests
- Juvenile tree maintenance for a specified number of years after planting
- Proactive pruning to ensure trees do not encroach into power line and street light exclusion zones
- Ongoing recording of maintenance and changes to the tree asset database
- Identification and reporting of specific tree issues and hazards and taking appropriate action
- Storm damage clean up

3.9.2. Trees provide numerous benefits to the District and community. These include:

- Biodiversity: Trees provide habitat, food sources and shelter for a wide range of wildlife as well as providing shade for aquatic animals and a suitable habitat for soil dwelling microorganisms and beneficial fungi.
- Amenity: Trees add a natural element to a built environment, visually soften hard landscaping, provide shade and shelter in summer, absorb sound and provide a constantly changing background to the landscape
- Environmental benefits: Trees provide oxygen, absorb air and soil pollution, reduce the effects of flooding and improve soil quality
3.9.3. In order to ensure that the trees in the district are maintained to provide the above benefits, while being safe for the community, the Council has developed a tree maintenance contract. The current tree maintenance contract was tendered in 2011. The successful tenderer, TreeTech Specialist Tree Services Ltd, commenced provision of services on 1st October, 2011. The contract was initially for a period of five years, however, a one year extension was agreed in order to provide sufficient time to consider appropriate changes to levels of service. The current contract extension terminates on 30 September 2018.

3.9.4. When the contract was originally tendered in 2011 the Council tree asset database identified that the Council had 5311 trees in the district within streets, reserves and cemetery areas. The contract was based on a Level of Service which allowed for each tree to be maintained once every three years on an ongoing basis and budgets set accordingly.

3.9.5. A full validation of Council owned amenity trees was carried out on commencement of the contract so that accurate records could be kept on the make-up and health of Council’s amenity tree forest. This was completed in 2012. The validation revealed that the number of trees was vastly underestimated and there were, in fact, almost 13,900 amenity trees under Council ownership at the time the initial five year contract period had been completed.

3.9.6. Since the completion of the validation in 2012 the total number of trees has increased significantly. This has been for a number of reasons including:

- Initial increase due to full comprehensive validation
- More comprehensive replanting program which ensured all removed trees are replaced the following planting season
- Large number of trees have been vested in Council as part of large and small subdivision including but not limited to Sovereign Palms, Pegasus, Kippenburger.

3.9.7. Currently there are approximately 19,000 Council owned amenity trees in the District maintained under the contract. The current Level of Service regarding tree maintenance is that all trees maintained under the Street, Reserve and Cemetery Tree Maintenance Contract be maintain every three years. However, given the large increase in trees this level of service is no longer affordable within the current allocated budget.

3.9.8. In order to continue to maintain the trees at the current Level of Service a budget of $1,936,000 p.a. would be required. The current allocated budget sits at $558,650 p.a. This includes the separate budgets for cemetery trees and Pegasus trees.

3.9.9. Staff have analysed the make-up of the amenity trees owned by Council and have determined, that as all trees have been maintained at least once within the life of the current contract, that there is an opportunity to adjust maintenance frequencies for certain trees. Staff believe that changing the level of service by adjusting the maintenance frequencies can be done to fit within the current budget allocation while also maintaining safe, healthy high amenity trees.

3.9.10. There are a number of options available to Council in regards to the on-going maintenance of trees. Three options are described in more detail below with option 3 being staffs recommended option.

3.9.11. Option 1

Maintain the status quo - retain the existing Level of Service where every street, reserve and cemetery tree is maintained every three years on a programmed basis. The estimated cost of this would be $1,936,000. This is based on current contract rates. This would require Council allocating an extra $1,377,350 p.a. Staff
believe that while having the trees maintained every three years has its benefits these are outweighed by the large cost involved. Staff are therefore not recommending this option.

3.9.12. **Option 2**

Change the Level of Service - provide a three year maintenance cycle for urban street trees and 6 year maintenance cycle for the majority of the remaining trees. This option entails dividing amenity trees into various categories and maintaining them on a programmed basis as shown in the table below. This option was explored because it would provide some consistency with the current service provided in that the urban street trees would be maintained on a three yearly basis. The three and six year timeframes would provide some consistency with the current level of service. The cost of providing this Level of Service would be $560,000 p.a. This is not the preferred option as it exceeds the current budget allocation of $558,000 and does not provide any significant benefit over that provided by the preferred option 3. While the cost difference between this option and the current budget is minimal it must be noted the cost estimates are based on current contracted rates which may change during the next tender process. It also leaves no room for additional trees which are likely to be added to the total tree stock over the next contract term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Example Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Streets</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Williams St Kaiapoi, Main St Oxford, Good St, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Reserves</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>Arlington Reserve, Corcoran Reserve, Pearson Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Roads</td>
<td>6 yearly</td>
<td>Keetley Place, Libby drive, Mill Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Reserves</td>
<td>6 yearly</td>
<td>View Hill Domain, Whites Road Reserve, West Oxford Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Profile Reserves</td>
<td>annually</td>
<td>Victoria Park, Kaiapoi Domain, Rangiora Service Centre, Trousselot Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young tree Maintenance</td>
<td>annually</td>
<td>WDC planted trees under 8 years old</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.9.13. **Option 3**

Change the Level of Service - provide a four year maintenance cycle for urban street trees and a seven year cycle for the majority of the remaining trees. This option entails dividing amenity trees into various categories and maintaining them on a programmed basis as shown in the table below.

A four-year maintenance cycle is considered appropriate for street trees. This would mean that street trees are visited every four years as oppose to three years which is currently the case. Staff have consulted with other Councils to see what their maintenance timeframes for programmed street tree maintenance is and four years is still a relatively high level of service. The Christchurch City Council has a 5 year programme for their street trees.

Staff have also consulted with Treetech Tree Care Specialist who have confirmed that a four-year cycle would be sufficient to keep trees in a safe and healthy condition. It would also be sufficient to ensure that appropriate sight lines and other street tree risks are managed appropriately.
This option proposes that those trees located in lower risk areas such as rural reserves are maintained on a 7 year cycle. Again, staff have consulted with other Councils and this is relatively consistent. Christchurch manage their parks trees on a 10 year cycle.

Option 3 also identifies the maintenance of high profile reserve on a yearly cycle. The main reason for this is to ensure the aesthetic quality of the trees is maintained and also due to the increased risk, as more people are using these reserves. The estimated cost for option 3 is $477,000. This is the preferred option.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Example Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Streets</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Williams St Kaiapoi, Main St Oxford, Good St, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Reserves</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Arlington Reserve, Corcoran Reserve, Pearson Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Roads</td>
<td>7 yearly</td>
<td>Keetley Place, Libby drive, Mill Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Reserves</td>
<td>7 yearly</td>
<td>View Hill Domain, Whites Road Reserve, West Oxford Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Profile Reserves</td>
<td>annually</td>
<td>Victoria Park, Kaiapoi Domain, Rangiora Service Centre, Trousselot Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young tree Maintenance</td>
<td>annually</td>
<td>WDC planted trees under 8 years old</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.9.14. It should be noted that the cost of tree maintenance is based on the height of the tree. For the purposes of the maintenance contract, trees are divided into height categories and as trees continue to grow it will move from one height category to the next until it reaches maturity. This continual growth has a direct effect on the long term budgetary planning for tree maintenance and in the unlikely event that there is no increase in the number of Council owned trees requiring maintenance costs will still increase until all trees have reached maturity. The proposal to adjust the current Level of Service has been considered with this in mind and costing adjusted accordingly.

3.9.15. As shown in the table in option 3 above it is proposed that Councils amenity trees be divided into several categories. Analysis of the current amenity trees has shown that approximately 60% of trees are within urban areas and 40% rural. Urban trees can be further divided into street trees and reserve trees, with 60% of urban trees in streets and 40% in reserves.

3.9.16. Analysis has identified several risks involved in adjusting the level of service and these are detailed below:

- Public expectations - There is an expectation by the public that all Council owned amenity trees will be in good form and health. As all Council owned trees have been inspected or maintained within the last five years the condition of each tree is known and recorded. Those trees that required formative pruning have been maintained and those in poor health were identified and replaced if required or are monitored on a regular basis if there is the possibility they can be retained with long term remedial work. While public expectation needs to be considered staff do not believe that there will be marked visual difference experienced. Furthermore, in areas where trees are identified for additional pruning reactive budget provision is available of approximately 20% of the total can be used.
• Safety - All amenity trees have been maintained for safety and the condition of all trees recorded. Those identified as possibly developing safety issues in the future have been listed and are inspected on a regular basis, particularly after high level wind events and any corrective action required is undertaken immediately. By utilising the advice and services of qualified and experienced arborists, having accurate information and acting proactively to address possible issues it is possible to appropriately manage hazards and minimise public risk. The Council has consulted with other Councils and arborists with the results suggesting that the proposed timeframes are appropriate to ensure the tree stock will remain up to an appropriate standard. The time frames proposed have been staggered depending on the risks associated with each location. The high profile areas, which are also primarily high use, will be maintained even more than they currently are. Those trees in lower used areas will not as the risk to the public is significantly reduced.

• Biological and environmental risks: While adjustment of the Level of Service will result in a longer period between active tree maintenance for some trees, utilising professional arborists to manage and maintain the amenity tree stock provides Council with up to date information and risk analysis. Contractors have access to up to date information on potential risks and this, together with our up to date database, allows a targeted approach to dealing with specific issues proactively and identify at risk trees for specific monitoring.

• Increased service requests: Analysis of service requests received in previous years indicates that Council receives approximately 220 amenity tree related service requests per annum. Of these less than 25 per year have been identified as being related to hazards created by trees and the majority of these have been of a minor nature. As all trees have been maintained and under the proposed adjustment to the level of service they will continue to be maintained appropriately there is no expectation that there will be additional service requests generated.

3.9.17. It should be noted that there are a number of factors that influence what maintenance a tree may require over its lifetime and these include the use of correct planting techniques, early formative maintenance, and removal of broken branches or deadwood. Experience has shown that proactive early maintenance usually produces a healthy and well-formed tree and significantly reduces risks and costs over the life of the tree. Proactive maintenance will also improve the health and form of a tree and once it has been maintained to a suitable standard it may not require further maintenance for an extended period. Regular maintenance will also significantly reduce hazards such as branch failure or catastrophic failure in high wind events.

3.10. The Management Team/CE has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. Various levels of community consultation have been undertaken in the preparation the strategies and levels of service review, these are listed below:

4.1.1. Sports Facilities – There was a considerable amount of targeted consultation undertaken to gather information about sports participation trends and sports field issues. Each sports code using sports fields as well as more than 20 other sporting codes were sent a survey. If the survey information was not sent back a follow up phone call was made to ensure the relevant data was collected.
4.1.2. Public Toilets – The public toilet strategy relied on information gathered through customer satisfaction surveys and the service request system. Staff did undertake consultation with the cleaning contractor and other internal staff members.

4.1.3. Play Spaces – Consultation was undertaken with each of the Community Boards where the main levels of service changes were identified as well as the programme for play space renewals.

4.1.4. Tree Maintenance – Consultation was undertaken with other local authorities to gather information on levels of service related to time periods between programmed pruning. No other public consultation has been undertaken.

4.2. As well as various types of public consultation, staff delivered a presentation to each of the Community Boards. The presentation identified the key proposed changes in levels of service and the financial impacts of those changes.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. In the preparation of the strategies staff have been mindful of the affordability of new and replacement assets over the whole of asset life. Staff have also been mindful of the growing population in the district and the need to continue to provide new assets to cater for this growth. Staff have tried to create a balance between the trend towards increasing public expectations for higher quality assets and affordability. While this is never easy staff believe the strategies will be affordable while still be able to ensure that the Waimakariri is a great to be.

5.2. The key financial implications are identified below:

5.2.1. Sports Grounds
- Removal of the artificial turf from the current budget
- Addition of $350,000 every second year of the LTP

5.2.2. Public Toilets
- Additional capital funding of $386,000 over the LTP period
- Additional $9,000 each year for the capital replacement budget increasing the LTP total to $1,150,000

5.2.3. Play Spaces
- Additional capital funding of $415,000 over the LTP period
- Capital Replacement Budget to remain the same

5.2.4. Tree Maintenance
- No change in budget

5.3. The table below shows the proposed budget for the assets described in this report. This table also identifies the difference between the proposed budget and the current budget. The 10 year total for the proposed budget is $17,095,000. The 10 year total for the current budget is $16,269,780. This results in a total budget increase over the LTP period of $825,220 which is an average of $82,522 per annum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Type</th>
<th>Proposed Budget</th>
<th>Current Budget</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Ave. Yearly Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sports Grounds</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$205,000</td>
<td>$20,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Toilets</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$205,000</td>
<td>$20,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Spaces</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$205,000</td>
<td>$20,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Maintenance</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$205,000</td>
<td>$20,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>18/19</td>
<td>19/20</td>
<td>20/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Ground renovations</td>
<td></td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville Sports Ground Toilet</td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Memorial Reserve Toilet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Oxford Reserve Toilet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet Capital Replacement Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurunui Reserve Play Space Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Space Renewals Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Memorial Reserve play space Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Park for Woodend Pegasus Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kippenburger / Elm Green Linkage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Space Renewals Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Specific Reserve Enhancement</td>
<td></td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Reserve Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td>$558,000</td>
<td>$558,000</td>
<td>$558,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,103,000</td>
<td>$1,448,000</td>
<td>$2,078,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current combined total (in current LTP)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,249,780</td>
<td>$1,434,000</td>
<td>$1,548,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,146,780</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$530,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. CONTEXT

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

6.2. Legislation
Reserves Act 1977
Local Government Act 2002

6.3. Community Outcomes
This report relates to a number of community outcomes including the following:

- There is a safe environment for all
- There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all
- There are areas of significant vegetation and habitats for indigenous fauna
- The communities cultures, arts and heritage are conserved and celebrated
- People are friendly and caring, creating a strong sense of community in our District
- Public Spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality
- Businesses in the district are diverse adaptable and growing
- The communities need for health and social services are met
- The distinctive character of our takiwā - towns, villages and rural areas is maintained
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of Waimakariri District Council Sports Facility Plan

The purpose of the Waimakariri District Council Sports Facility Plan (the plan) is to provide direction to the Council with the prioritisation of investment in future sports fields and sport facility developments.

The plan will ensure that any future investment is in-line with identified priorities and assist in limiting ad-hoc development.

The plan will also provide recommendations for potential new developments or redevelopments (capital improvements) to existing facilities. Where possible it will also provide indicative costs for the recommended improvements.

Aquatic facilities and facilities used by passive recreation groups, such as chess clubs, drama groups and art clubs are outside of this plan’s scope.

**Key Note:** The report is divided up into two areas of focus: sports fields considerations and other sports facilities considerations.

1.2 Using this Plan

The plan should be seen as a living document and should be reviewed and updated on a regular basis.

Like all high-level plans additional more detailed planning will be required. The plan should not be seen as a replacement for this detailed focused research and analysis. Inclusion of projects in the plan should not be taken as an indication of feasibility. It is recommended that all projects go through a robust feasibility and business case process.

As additional sports codes undertake or update their existing national and regional sports facility plans it is envisaged that this plan will require updating. However, given the plan is trying to examine issues based on available evidence at a network wide level, some specific code aspirations may not align.

1.3 Methodology - Research, Analysis & Consultation

As part of the process to develop the Waimakariri District Council Sports Facility Plan a series of key work components have been undertaken. A summary of the high-level findings is included within this report to provide context to the assessment of potential sports fields and facility projects.

Work Undertaken:
Secondary Data Research and Analysis

This research and analysis component of the plan looked at the following key areas.

• Regional sports membership trends,
• Waimakariri population analysis,
• Growth areas,
• Membership analysis,
• Age projections.

Primary Research and Consultation

Consultation was undertaken as part of the initial phase of the Waimakariri District Council Sports fields and Facility Plan. This included:

Sports Club Survey for Sports Fields
• Waimakariri club responses
• Key sports fields issues identified

Site Visits
• Site visits were undertaken to a cross section of the sports fields across the district.

Sports Club Survey for Facilities
• Waimakariri club responses
• Key sporting facilities issues identified

Phone interviews
• One-on-one phone interviews were also held with many sports clubs to understand their sports fields and facility issues and expand on their survey responses.

Review of Waimakariri Indoor Sports Facility Needs and Feasibility Analysis
• Review of data and reports from need and feasibility studies for indoor court space.
2.0 OUR CHALLENGES

The Waimakariri district sports facilities network faces a number of challenges. These challenges include:

2.1 Population Distribution and Changing Demographics:

The Waimakariri district spans a large geographical area with an unevenly distributed population of around 60,000. There are some localised areas that are projected to experience population growth in coming years. Looking forward, the highest proportion of growth is projected in the eastern part of the Waimakariri district.

The population will also be aging overall, with the highest growth rates being among those aged over 65 years, although all age groups are projected to increase across most areas of the district. The location and types of sport and recreation facilities and services offered will therefore need to adapt over time, so they are not mismatched with community needs.

2.2 Maintaining Assets, Facility Sustainability and Service Levels:

Community sport and recreational assets are provided by a range of entities including, territorial authorities, charitable trusts, the Ministry of Education (via schools), and community groups and clubs. Maintaining aging assets, current service levels and facility sustainability is likely to become increasingly difficult in some geographic locations. Duplication and underutilisation of sports and recreational facilities will become increasingly unaffordable over time.

2.3 Improving Collaborative Approaches:

Historical decision making in respect of new or replacement facilities has often been undertaken on an ad-hoc basis. Population growth in certain areas and the desire to replace or refurbish existing aging facilities (particularly in areas with an aging population) will place demands on capital funding budgets. It will become increasingly important for all stakeholders to work collaboratively to improve delivery of sport and recreational facilities.

This plan provides an opportunity for all stakeholders to work in a collaborative and cohesive manner to address these challenges.

2.4 Proximity to Christchurch

The Waimakariri District Council is located adjacent to the Christchurch City Council (CCC). This proximity allows easy cross-boundary participation in sport and recreation activities. For many sports codes, regular competitions include teams from the CCC area (and others). It is therefore useful to consider regional provision of facilities, particularly specialised assets.
2.5 Current Operating Practice

The current operating practice regarding the provision of sports fields is based around historical guiding principles of providing 1 hectare of sports park per 1,000 of population. This plan is attempting to understand the sports needs in more detail and provide guidance on future provision based on reported supply and demand.
3.0 KEY PRINCIPLES

The key principles underpinning this plan are summarised as (adapted from the New Zealand Sporting Facilities Framework):

3.1 Sustainability

The network of facilities and the individual facilities themselves need to be sustainable to maximise community benefits. Sustainability means well utilised sport and recreation facilities with strong governance and management that can optimise their operational performance (while having robust asset management planning including covering depreciation, renewals and maintenance).

3.2 Partnerships

Working together with partners, both within and outside the Waimakariri District Council area, to develop and operate sports facilities will become increasingly important to optimise our network and maintain its sustainability.

3.3 Holistic lifecycle modelling

Existing and planned sports facilities and sports grounds need to be appropriately maintained throughout their lifespan to ensure they deliver benefit to the community. All new facilities should have lifecycle maintenance models established prior to any development to inform operational plans and building material selection.

3.4 Adaptability / functionality

Sports trends and our demographics are changing. What we need from a facility/sports fields today may not necessarily be what we will need in the future. Given that the lifespan of our typical sports facilities is at least fifty years, it is important that they be as adaptable and functional as possible.

3.5 Multi use

Currently many sports facilities are underutilised for large periods of time. Facilities should be designed to enable multiple uses where ever possible.

3.6 Optimisation of existing assets

Where a proven need exists and a cost benefits analysis (which includes consideration of operational costs) dictates it is warranted, then existing assets should be optimised / refurbished.

1 Sport NZ (2014) The New Zealand Sporting Facilities Framework
4.0 SPORTS TRENDS

It is important to recognise the changing nature of sport and recreation and how these changes impact on sports field and sports facility planning.

4.1 How people participate
- Pay to play – a move away from long term commitments in club memberships to shorter, pay to play activities.
- Casual Play – Less competitive sport with more emphasis on activities that can be engaged in at times that are convenient to the participant.
- Modified or shortened formats of Sports – a move away from full length, full field, full court activities to shorter and smaller activities (e.g. 3-on-3 basketball, 20/20 Cricket, 7s Rugby, Fast 5 Netball etc.).

4.2 What they are participating in and on
- More artificial surfaces – More codes are requiring artificial surfaces for their activities (Hockey, Football and others are moving toward this at varying paces).
- International bodies are developing code share artificial surfaces in recognition of the cost and need to share these facilities
- Increasing expectations of levels of service – A move to higher specified facilities for more and more community sport. Driven by migration from larger centres (within NZ and from overseas)
- Multi-use facilities – sharing administrative functions, sharing facilities to ensure sustainability of clubs

4.3 Waimakariri Context
- More indoor court space being driven by an increase in participation in relevant sports.
- Some sports such as Netball are now moving toward an indoor delivery model. Most South Island Netball Centres are now operating indoors (Southland, Dunedin, Nelson, Ashburton etc.).
- Opportunity for more active multi-code facilities to be shared among complementary clubs.
- A long-term planned programme of sports field upgrades.
- Better quality and dedicated training venues for winter sports codes.
5.0 DEMOGRAPHICS

A review of the Waimakariri District’s current and projected population has been undertaken to understand the potential growth (increase in demand) may have on the network of sports fields and sports facilities. The key population findings are identified below.

5.1 Key Findings and Considerations

- It is projected that the population will increase approximately by another 36,600 over the next 25 years.
- Under the Council’s population projections, the key growth areas are identified as:
  - Rangiora at 7,915
  - Kaiapoi at 3,580
  - Woodend-Pegasus at 7,600
- These projections can be broken down in more detail to identify localised growth areas of:
  - Pegasus at 4,505
  - Lehmans (Rangiora) at 3,755
  - Silverstream (Kaiapoi) at 3,085
  - Kaiapoi North East at 2,395
  - Ravenswood (Woodend) at 2,145
  - Mandeville at 2,015
  - Woodend at 2,035

5.2 Overall Population Projections

This section summarises the Waimakariri Districts population size and growth areas. Reference is also made to age-group projections where these may relate to different levels and types of sports and recreation participation.

The results provided relates to a more localised interpretation of District population which is the ‘higher growth’ Waimakariri District Council scenario. This has been proposed by Council, and is represented by a more customised population projection series, with respective projection figures being considered as being approximately

---

half way between the Statistics New Zealand ‘medium’ and high’ projection series. Table 1 summarises these projections for the overall Waimakariri District population.

**Table 5.1: Anticipated Waimakariri District population growth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2033</th>
<th>2038</th>
<th>2043</th>
<th>change 2013-2043</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri</td>
<td>52,300</td>
<td>62,050</td>
<td>67,850</td>
<td>73,550</td>
<td>78,900</td>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>88,750</td>
<td>36,450</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Projections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main implication of these projections is that the District’s population is expected to increase substantially over the next 30 years. With respect to continuing to provide the most appropriate sport and recreation facilities, the main questions relate to where this growth will occur, and which sectors of the population will change the most. Several socio-demographic features of the population were examined, and of these age-group change was considered to be the most significant likely change factor. Projections for both these population distribution and composition factors are summarised in the remainder of this section.

### 5.3 Key Growth Areas

An initial distinction is clear between the east and the west of the District. Here ‘Waimakariri East’ comprises the related populations located in, around and between the urban areas of Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, Pegasus and Waikuku. ‘Waimakariri West’ covers the more sparsely population areas to the West, with Oxford providing the main urban area.

**Table 5.2: Projected District Population Growth (2013-2043).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2033</th>
<th>2038</th>
<th>2043</th>
<th>change 2013-2043</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri East</td>
<td>44,860</td>
<td>53,970</td>
<td>58,945</td>
<td>63,900</td>
<td>68,630</td>
<td>73,035</td>
<td>77,105</td>
<td>32,245</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri West</td>
<td>8,070</td>
<td>9,250</td>
<td>10,160</td>
<td>11,040</td>
<td>11,920</td>
<td>12,750</td>
<td>13,535</td>
<td>5,465</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All District</td>
<td>52,300</td>
<td>62,050</td>
<td>67,800</td>
<td>73,500</td>
<td>78,950</td>
<td>84,050</td>
<td>88,750</td>
<td>36,450</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These tables show that most growth is projected in Waimakariri East, with anticipated increases of approximately 32,000 more people. By contrast the growth in Waimakariri West is anticipated as approximately 5,500 people.

Looking more specifically at the District’s main towns (current and projected), Table 5.3 shows the respective projections for the Waimakariri East towns of Rangiora, Kaiapoi, and Woodend-Pegasus, and the main Waimakariri West town of Oxford.

**Table 5.3 Projected District Population Growth 2013-2043**

3 The specific area units included in each are listed in Appendix 1, along with those Area Units more directly associated with the larger District towns.
5.4 Age Group projections

A key component of the population projected to show major change is age-group. This has particular relevance to the future demands and patterns for sport and recreation activity participation and facility use. Figures for the overall District give a general picture of the main trends anticipated. Proportions may vary slightly in different areas, but the overall pattern is anticipated to be relatively consistent. Tables 5.4 shows what is projected for Waimakariri District overall. The key features are a strong increase in the 65+ age group, and only static to slight growth in all other age groups.

Table 5.4: Projected Age Group Change 2013-2043

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2033</th>
<th>2038</th>
<th>2043</th>
<th>change 2013-2043</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-14 years</td>
<td>10,600</td>
<td>11,550</td>
<td>11,650</td>
<td>12,100</td>
<td>12,950</td>
<td>13,700</td>
<td>14,200</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-39 years</td>
<td>13,300</td>
<td>16,100</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>19,450</td>
<td>19,900</td>
<td>20,250</td>
<td>20,950</td>
<td>7,650</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-64 years</td>
<td>19,700</td>
<td>22,250</td>
<td>22,800</td>
<td>22,900</td>
<td>23,300</td>
<td>23,900</td>
<td>25,250</td>
<td>5,550</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ years</td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>12,150</td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td>19,100</td>
<td>22,750</td>
<td>26,150</td>
<td>28,350</td>
<td>19,650</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52,300</td>
<td>62,050</td>
<td>67,850</td>
<td>73,550</td>
<td>78,900</td>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>88,750</td>
<td>36,450</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5 Sportsfield Club Memberships and Trends

Based on results reported in the project surveys for clubs using sport fields for their primary activity, Table 5.5 summarises the club membership trends as reported by the responding clubs. These generally show a slight increase in club membership over recent years for most codes.

Table 5.5: Sports Field Club Memberships over the last 5 years (Self-Reported)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUGBY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Note that some working estimates were made for some clubs (indicated by *). These were inserted into the table where data gaps were present in some years from those clubs. In forming these, reference was made to the other data provided from those clubs, and the direction of membership trends over recent years that they also reported along with competition draws where available.

5 Note that the overall membership of all these Sports field clubs combined represented approximately 8.5% of the total District population counted in Census in 2013.

6 Note that these represent only those clubs providing responses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ashley Rugby Football Club*</th>
<th>200</th>
<th>210</th>
<th>220</th>
<th>235</th>
<th>250</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Rugby Club</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Rugby Club</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saracens Rugby Club</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend RFC</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Rugby Club*</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Rugby Clubs reported</td>
<td>2207</td>
<td>2203</td>
<td>2165</td>
<td>2182</td>
<td>2226</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRICKET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Cricket Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Cricket Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Cricket Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sefton Cricket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swannanoa Cricket Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Cricket Clubs reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOOTBALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Football Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri Football Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Football Clubs reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER Sports Field Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Rugby League club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Softball Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Clubs reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL SPORTS FIELD CLUBS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Looking forward for Sports fields club membership numbers overall, Table 5.6 and Figure 1 (overleaf) provide two baseline indications of projected combined Sports fields club membership numbers as extrapolated over the next 30 years for the combined clubs reported. There are two separate projections.

- The first is a current ‘Population Proportion Projection’ based on combined Sports fields club member proportions of the District population in 2016, and their projected numbers as constant proportions of future overall District WDC population projections. These membership projections are based on a working assumption that participation proportions in future populations remain consistent with 2016 levels, with all else being equal among factors affecting sports participation and club membership.

- The second is a ‘Recent Member Numbers Trend Rate’ projection, which extrapolates the 2016 membership numbers according to the average growth rates demonstrated over the last 5 years (see Table 5.5). These membership projections are based on a working assumption that the average yearly membership change will remain consistent per year going forward. This latter projection is closer to the real membership situation currently being experienced by clubs, although it is also otherwise using the same assumptions as the first projection.

Both provide baseline indications based on current assumptions, and are subject to any new factors influencing demand and supply. But as indicated the more currently accurate second projection suggests lower rates of increase in membership numbers over the next 30 years.

Table 5.6: Projected Combined-Sports fields Club Memberships over the next 30 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reported 2016 Club Members</th>
<th>Proj 2018</th>
<th>Proj 2023</th>
<th>Proj 2028</th>
<th>Proj 2033</th>
<th>Proj 2038</th>
<th>Proj 2043</th>
<th>Change 2013-2043</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 Population Proportion Projection</td>
<td>4,118</td>
<td>4,421</td>
<td>4,834</td>
<td>5,240</td>
<td>5,621</td>
<td>5,985</td>
<td>6,323</td>
<td>2,205</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent Membership Trend Rate Projection</td>
<td>4,118</td>
<td>4,150</td>
<td>4,230</td>
<td>4,310</td>
<td>4,390</td>
<td>4,470</td>
<td>4,550</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 The most recent Statistics NZ District population estimate was of 57,800 in 2016. Reported Sports field club membership was 4,118 in that year, representing around 7% of the total District Population. This was a virtually identical proportion to that found in 2013, suggesting no relative “participation rate” increase.
These figures indicate that based simply on the current proportion of projected District population, there will be continued growth in numbers of Sports fields club members overall, amounting to over 2,200 extra members by 2043 (~54% growth). However, this projection is based on 2016 membership proportion and population growth alone. The second projection using recent membership trends to project ahead indicates lower growth overall, amounting to around 400 extra members by 2043 (~10% growth). These results suggest that while positive, current growth in sports field club membership is not matching growth in population.

### 5.6 All Club Memberships and Trends

Looking forward for all reported club membership numbers overall (including the sports field using clubs), Table 5.7 and Figure 2 (overleaf) provides results for All Clubs using the same projection estimations as above as a comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reported 2016 Club Members</th>
<th>Proj 2018</th>
<th>Proj 2023</th>
<th>Proj 2028</th>
<th>Proj 2033</th>
<th>Proj 2038</th>
<th>Proj 2043</th>
<th>Change 2013-2043</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 Population Proportion Projection</td>
<td>11,997</td>
<td>12,879</td>
<td>14,083</td>
<td>15,266</td>
<td>16,377</td>
<td>17,435</td>
<td>18,421</td>
<td>6,424</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent Membership Trend Rate Projection</td>
<td>11,997</td>
<td>13,103</td>
<td>15,868</td>
<td>18,633</td>
<td>21,398</td>
<td>24,163</td>
<td>26,928</td>
<td>14,931</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.2: Projected Combined All Sports Club Memberships over the next 30 years
These figures show that when the membership trends of all clubs are included the projected growth in membership numbers exceeds the population growth rate. This difference here reflects much higher recent membership growth rates in some of the non-sports field sports. As examples, we can look more specifically at responses from two of the larger non-sports field sports codes selected for closer attention (i.e. Netball, Basketball), Table 5.8 shows recent membership trends over the last 5 years.

| Table 5.8: Reported Selected Non-Sports Field Club Memberships over the last 5 years |
|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------|------|
| N. Canterbury Netball Centre      | 1570          | 1680          | 1720          | 1720          | 1760          | 190                     | 12        |
| N. Canterbury Basketball Ass.    | 550           | 650           | 800           | 1250          | 1500          | 950                     | 173       |
## 6.0 SPORTS FIELDS – CURRENT SITUATION

An overview of the current sports fields network is outlined in this section which highlights the network of sports parks and the make-up of the type of fields each host.

### 6.1 Current Network of Sports fields (Winter)

Table 6.1: Current Network of Winter Sports fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Park</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Senior Fields</th>
<th>Junior Fields (incorp. on senior fields, from survey)</th>
<th>Junior Fields (stand alone, from survey)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashgrove Park</td>
<td>Multi-Code</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley Park*</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook Park</td>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Touch</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Andrews Park</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora A&amp;P</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showgrounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri Hockey</td>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>1 (artificial)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Park (Club</td>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>park)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall Park</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>4 (plus, one</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>artificial)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy Park</td>
<td>Rugby League</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wylie Park</td>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone Park</td>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loburn Domain</td>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sefton Domain</td>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Park</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There is currently no marked sports fields or competition games played at Dudley park. It is understood there is some football training occurring here.
6.2 Current Network of Sports fields (Summer)

Table 6.2: Current Network of Summer Sports fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Park</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Senior Fields</th>
<th>Junior Fields (incorp on senior fields, from survey)</th>
<th>Junior Fields (stand alone, from survey)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashgrove Park</td>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley Park</td>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook Park</td>
<td>Touch</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Park</td>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone Park</td>
<td>Touch</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sefton Domain</td>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Recreation Ground</td>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville Domain</td>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Park</td>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swannanoa Domain</td>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3 Neighbourhood Parks

Over recent years when specific sports fields have been closed for junior winter training, Council has utilised a small selection of ‘Neighbourhood Parks’ to meet the short-term capacity issues.

However, implementing this as a long-term solution will not be an appropriate solution. The sports park network has a focus on delivering a wide spectrum on park opportunities for the community from formal sports fields to informal park settings.

Neighbourhood parks play an important role within the network by providing informal recreation opportunities, such as play grounds and open space. Placing regular, active recreation (sports training) within neighbour parks will detract from wider public amenity values.

6.4 Overview of Sports fields

The following table outlines the current allocation of sports fields for both winter and summer codes.
Table 6.3: Overview of Sports fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Football</th>
<th>Rugby</th>
<th>Rugby League</th>
<th>Cricket</th>
<th>Softball</th>
<th>Touch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Sports Parks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Sports Fields (Training)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Sports Fields (Senior)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Sports Fields (Junior–Stand Alone)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5 Sports fields Membership Overview

- A combined total of 3,858 members across all age groups reportedly use the Waimakariri sports field network at the present time.

- Some codes only use their “home ground” sports fields every second weekend. Therefore, actual weekend usage may be lower than reported in some cases.
7.0 SPORTS FIELDS - PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS

An analysis of the current network of sports fields has been undertaken based on a set of key considerations which are outlined below. The key considerations have been identified based on effective practise and planning nationally with regards to sports fields provision.

7.1 Capacity of Current Sports fields

An understanding of current actual use vs the potential use of sports fields is critical to understanding the capacity of the sports fields to either cater for additional use or the need to reduce use.

Sport New Zealand has provided an overview of the projected Winter weekly hours of use for a soil field in the regions of Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch. This has been taken into consideration as part of the assessment of capacity of sports fields for the Waimakariri District.

Table 7.1: Sport New Zealand Sports field Guidance (8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil-based Sports Fields</th>
<th>Low (Weekly hours)</th>
<th>Medium (Weekly hours)</th>
<th>High (Weekly hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the Waimakariri District a modified guideline has been developed to reflect the local conditions and the significant gap in hours of use between a low-quality field (4 hours) and a medium quality field (9 hours) compared to the national guidelines. It is also acknowledged that the climate in North Canterbury is generally conducive to good playing conditions.

Table 7.2: Guidelines for Waimakariri District Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil-based Sports Fields</th>
<th>Low (Weekly hours)</th>
<th>Low - Medium (Weekly hours)</th>
<th>Medium (Weekly hours)</th>
<th>High (Weekly hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri District</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2 Quality of Sports fields - Impact of Surface Type on Capacity

8 Sport NZ: Sport Field Guidance Tool (2013)
A sports field’s ability to provide the maximum hours of use is impacted by the quality. Site inspections, an analysis of cancellations, and code feedback has been undertaken as part of the process to determine the quality of sports fields in the district.

An internal assessment of providing the sports fields with a quality ranking of high (14 hours), medium (9 hours), low-medium (6.5 hours) and low (4 hours) has been undertaken. In exceptional circumstances a field may be assessed as less than four hours use.

7.3 Overview of Waimakariri District’s Sports Field Network

A review and analysis of the sports fields within each area of the district has been undertaken and is highlighted in the following tables.

The areas and related sports fields of Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, Ohoka/Oxford and Lobum/Ashley has been undertaken.

The following tables highlight if there are significant issues of supply and demand.

**Key Note:** When assessing current and future carrying capacity it is important to understand not only the supply and demand of facilities, but also the ability of a sports field surface to cope with a certain number of playing hours. When assessing each park winter playing hours are used as the primary determinant, given the larger number of users and the additional pressure placed on them due to the wetter seasons at that time of year. During the compilation of this report, summer codes reported little condition issues. Smaller numbers have reported the need to expand and the network of fields has the capacity to absorb any short to medium term growth.
7.4 Rangiora

- The population of Rangiora is projected to increase by 7,915 over the next 25 years which will potentially increase demand on sports fields usage.

- Most parks in Rangiora are at or near capacity. This is mainly due to the low-quality assessment given to the main parks (in particular Southbrook and Maria Andrews). User feedback suggests the surface quality and sub-optimal floodlighting inhibits senior players from training on these grounds.

- Southbrook Park is assessed as very low quality, particularly the rear fields. Drainage appears to be a significant issue. Waimakariri District Council has attempted to alleviate drainage issues on the number one sports field. (with gravel banding and infield pipe irrigation that has had some success).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Sport Clubs here</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Full Field Equivalents (senior=1, junior = 0.5)</th>
<th>Hours of Use Weekdays</th>
<th>Hours of Use Weekend</th>
<th>Hours of Use Combined</th>
<th>Quality of Fields in hours (H = 14 M = 9 L/M = 7 L = 2-4)</th>
<th>Current Capacity</th>
<th>Surplus/deficit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashgrove Park</td>
<td>No Clubs - general training only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley Park</td>
<td>Waimakariri Football Club</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook Park</td>
<td>Saracens Rugby Club</td>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Andrews Park</td>
<td>Waimakariri Football Club</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora A&amp;P Showgrounds</td>
<td>Waimakariri Football Club</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• A programme of upgrades of one or two sports fields at both Maria Andrews and Southbrook would provide the additional hours to provide more than the current and projected required hours.

• An opportunity exists to reduce the number of fields that are leased from third parties for winter sport in Rangiora (A&P showgrounds) if capacity at other venues is increased.

• Dudley Park has the capacity to be used for training for multiple winter codes, provided the lighting and turf are of a sufficient quality.

• Ashgrove Park is also available for more overflow training and games, again, provided lighting and turf is of a sufficient quality.

• Lehmans Road was identified in a previous Long-Term Plan as an area where more sports fields could be developed. If the developments proposed within this report are implemented, demand modelling would suggest there will be no requirement for this area to be developed as sports fields in the next ten years.

• Two senior size and two junior size sports fields are identified in the Coldstream Road Master Plan. If the developments proposed within this report are implemented, demand modelling would suggest there will be no requirement for this area to be developed as sports fields in the next ten years.
## 7.5 Kaiapoi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Sport Clubs here</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Artificial</th>
<th>Full Field Equivalents (senior=1, junior = 0.5)</th>
<th>Hours of Use Weekdays (from survey)</th>
<th>Hours of Use Weekend (from survey)</th>
<th>Hours of Use Combined (from survey)</th>
<th>Quality of Fields in hours (H = 14 M = 9 L/M = 7 L = 2-4)</th>
<th>Current Capacity (Hours per week)</th>
<th>Surplus/deficit Hours per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Park</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Rugby Club</td>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wylie Park9</td>
<td>overflow park adjacent to Kaiapoi Rugby Club</td>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall Park (Grass)</td>
<td>Waimakariri Football Club</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall Park (Artificial)</td>
<td>Waimakariri Football Club</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40'10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy Park11</td>
<td>Northern Bulldogs Rugby League Club</td>
<td>Rugby League</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Kaiapoi population is projected to increase by another 3,580 over the next 25 years which will potentially increase demand on sports fields usage. This increase is amplified when considering the growth in other areas in Eastern Waimakariri, including the Woodend and Pegasus areas.

- Kendall Park during the winter months has a reported deficit of -3 hours on the grass sports fields for football. There is poor drainage with an inability to clear water due to its elevation in relation to sea level.

- The artificial turf can conceivably hold more activity in off-peak times (9am-3:30pm, Mon - Fri), however demand in these periods is low given these times are generally when people are at school or work. There is little available peak use time on the artificial. Proactive management of block bookings should be undertaken to ensure the turf usage reflects the number of bookings.

---

9 Overflow from Kaiapoi Park – user feedback hours for Kaiapoi Park are assumed to include Wylie Park – therefore an aggregated calculation of capacity is used.

10 An artificial turf can be used as much as possible, provided lights are available and activities comply with the District Plan. For the purposes of this analysis we have limited use to 40 hours per week (peak times M-F and all-day Sat and Sun)

11 No response to survey. Estimated training and playing hours.
Kaiapoi Park (and Wyllie Park) is a key winter sports field park in Kaiapoi. Given the reasonable condition of Kaiapoi Park there is a surplus capacity that is available for use.

Kaiapoi Park is not a Council owned facility, but is an important part of the wider sports field network.

The Waimakariri Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan (December 2016) has identified areas of red zone land that could have land uses that “could include up to four full-size playing fields and associated facilities”. There is demand for additional fields in Kaiapoi for Rugby League and Softball. Discussions have occurred about moving Rugby League to the Regeneration Zone. New Softball diamonds have also been identified in the Recovery Plan.
## 7.6 Woodend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sports Park Name</th>
<th>Field Sport Clubs here</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Full Field Equivalents (senior=1, junior = 0.5)</th>
<th>Hours of Use Weekdays (from survey)</th>
<th>Hours of Use Weekend (from survey)</th>
<th>Total Hours of Use (from survey)</th>
<th>Quality of Fields in hours (H = 14 M = 9 L/M = 7 L = 2-4)</th>
<th>Current Capacity (Hours per week)</th>
<th>Surplus Hours per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone Park</td>
<td>Woodend Rugby Football Club</td>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Woodend-Pegasus is projected to increase by another 7,600 people over the next 25 years which will potentially increase demand on sports fields in the area.

- Gladstone Park is highlighted to have surplus hours in the provision of sports fields given the ground conditions and the predominance of a sand based sub-soil. This park could be used to cater for excess demand from other areas if and when required.

- Waimakariri District Council has previously identified this park for expansion and work is underway to clear available land for development. A Master Plan has been developed with several projects identified, including “a future ball sports area”. Should the demand warrant further fields in the future, then Gladstone Park could be seen as a preferred site given the projected population growth and the quality of the fields.
### 7.7 Loburn/Ashley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Sport Clubs here</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Full Field Equivalents (senior=1, junior = 0.5)</th>
<th>Hours of Use Weekdays (from survey)</th>
<th>Hours of Use Weekend (from survey)</th>
<th>Hours of Use Combined (from survey)</th>
<th>Quality of Fields in hours (H = 14 M = 9 L/M = 7 L = 2-4)</th>
<th>Current Capacity (Hours per week)</th>
<th>Surplus/deficit Hours/week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loburn Domain</td>
<td>Ashley Rugby Club (Loburn Domain)</td>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>29.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sefton Domain</td>
<td>Ashley Rugby overflow</td>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Loburn/Ashley is projected to increase by 2,500 people over the next 25 years which will potentially increase demand on sports fields in the area.
- The area of Loburn/Ashley is highlighted to have a small surplus of weekly hours in the provision of sports fields for the winter season, given the condition assessment of low/medium.
- It is reported that Ashley Domain lacks the ability for consistent irrigation in the pre-season months, with anecdotal feedback suggesting this has led to impact injuries due to the hard ground.
- An irrigation assessment is currently underway which has the potential to increase the quality of existing fields, therefore increasing capacity.
- Ashley Rugby Club is currently investigating the development of extra fields. Increasing the quality of existing fields (and using Sefton Domain more) should be given priority before establishing new fields.
- Sefton Domain is used as overflow space for Ashley Rugby Club.
7.8 Ohoka / Oxford

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Sport Clubs here</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Full Field Equivalents (senior=1, junior = 0.5)</th>
<th>Hours of Use Weekdays (from survey)</th>
<th>Hours of Use Weekend (from survey)</th>
<th>Hours of Use Combined (from survey)</th>
<th>Quality of Fields in hours (H = 14 M = 9 L/M = 7 L = 2-4)</th>
<th>Current Capacity</th>
<th>Surplus/deficit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville Domain</td>
<td>Ohoka Rugby Club</td>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Park</td>
<td>Oxford Football Club</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>16.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Park</td>
<td>Oxford Rugby Club</td>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Ohoka/Oxford population is projected to increase by 5,500 over the next 25 years which will potentially increase demand on sports fields in the area.
- During the winter months Mandeville Domain has a potential surplus of 18 hours. There is potential to further increase capacity through increasing the quality of the turf that has the lighting infrastructure. It is noted that field configurations were changed this year as the playing conditions became poor in some areas of the park.
- Pearson Park during winter months has a potential small deficit of -3 hours per week for football.
- An increase in quality of one sports field at Pearson Park to a higher quality would provide the additional hours to provide more than the current surplus of hours.
8.0 SPORTS FIELDS - POTENTIAL CONSIDERATIONS

This section highlights a series of considerations that could assist in optimising the future provision of sports fields in the Waimakariri district.

8.1 Capacity of Sportfields

The future demand for additional sports field use created by a growing population in the key areas of Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Woodend-Pegasus will add pressure to the existing sports field network. However even when considering the existing capacity issues, there is potential that the number of sports fields will be sufficient to meet the projected future demand if the following components are implemented.

8.2 Increase Quality of Sports fields

The ability for the existing network of sports fields to cater for an increase of use will be critical to accommodate the projected increase in demand due to the projected population increase.

**Key Note:** The quality of the field has a significant influence on the experience of the sporting participants. A poor-quality field inhibits optimal play and detracts from skill development. A decent quality field provides both junior and senior players with a consistent surface, allowing improved skill development.

Currently many of the existing sports fields have been identified as low-quality sports fields. This means the usage of the sports fields is not being utilised to its full potential due to its poor quality.

Soil fields have the ability to cater for 14 hours of use a week at their optimum. However, most of the sports fields in Waimakariri have been identified to cater for only 4 hours of use per fields per week.

If the quality of a selection of sports fields is increased to either a higher quality soil field or a sand based field this will relate to a direct increase in usable hours of the existing network. A decent quality soil field can accommodate up to 14 hours of use a week and a sand field can accommodate up to 24 hours of use a week.

**Key Note:**

- Increasing the quality to a sand carpet field will require an increase in the need for some form of irrigation during summer months to keep the standard up to required level.

- There will be a requirement to undertake an irrigation assessment to understand the potential implications, solutions and associated cost estimates.

- There is potential to stage a sand carpet field
- Stage 1 undertake the drainage component.
- Stage 2 develop an irrigation solution
- Stage 3 develop new sand carpet

8.3 Training vs Competition

Currently many floodlights on sports fields are owned by the residing sports clubs. While this model generally works it should be noted that floodlighting can attract overuse of some fields.

Any further investment in floodlights should only be considered and supported if the field has the ability to take the additional training load that will occur as a result.

Some regions are seeing the development of dedicated training venues. At this stage the sports park demand in the Waimakariri does not warrant these specialist areas.

8.4 Management of Sports fields

Currently the sports clubs are responsible for the usage of sports fields throughout the district and therefore indirectly have a considerable influence over the quality of the local sports park. Over using sports fields will increase the damage to a sports field which will compound overtime.

The need for Council to consider managing the usage of key priority parks should be reviewed to ensure the quality and potential new investment of these key parks is protected.

If significant capital investment is prioritised into the development of sports fields the need to maximise the return on investment would be critical. The need to oversee the bookings, cancellations and ongoing maintenance priorities for the key parks will be core tasks to maximise its quality and usage.

It should be noted that a move towards a more intensive management system would increase the ongoing costs to Council.

Council could also work with codes and clubs to further educate them on the carrying capacity of sports fields. This may help club’s decision making with regard to when grounds are closed, therefore increasing the length of season that fields can be used.

8.5 Artificial Turf vs Increase in Quality of Existing Sports fields

There are currently two full-size artificial turfs in the Waimakariri District, one hockey turf at Coldstream Road and one multipurpose football and rugby turf at Kendall Park. The utilisation of both turfs is considered strong at peak times, but limited during the off-peak day time periods. The multipurpose football and rugby turf is generally only used by football teams based at the ground.

There has been some initial planning regarding developing a new artificial turf in Waimakariri in the next LTP period. Consideration should be given to upgrading the
existing network of sports fields as opposed to developing a new artificial turf. Some of the key considerations are:

- The large capital cost to develop an artificial turf (approximately $2 million) could be re-distributed to provide approximately eight sand carpet fields.
- The increase in the provision of higher quality grass sports fields will provide a more even spread of quality fields district wide.
- The increase in higher quality grass sports fields will provide more sports to benefit than an artificial turf allows e.g. sports such as softball, cricket will be able to utilise high quality grass turfs, but cannot easily utilise artificial turfs for their sport.

**Key Note:** There are plans to develop two additional water-based hockey turfs at Nga Puna Wai (Canterbury Park area) to service the needs of Hockey. Hockey state they support the “hub and spoke” model of facility provision, referring to a larger venue (Nga Puna Wai) supported by smaller sites.

### 8.6 Other Solutions

There are a range of potential solutions that could be considered and reviewed before new fields are developed. These are:

- **MUGAs (Multi Use Games Areas)** (junior training for all sports) – The North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust has already installed two, smaller multi-use turfs in the Waimakariri (Dudley Park and Kaiapoi High School) that are ideal venues for junior sport.

- School artificial outdoor courts are becoming more common and are also ideal venues for junior training for a wide range of sports. This presents partnership opportunities and ensures turfs usage is high as the school generally uses the turf during the day and the community in the evenings and weekends.

- Other artificial hard courts such as tennis courts are often ideal during the winter months and provide another alternative surface for junior players to develop their skills.

- Before new sports fields are developed improving the current network should be considered an option to meet increased demand. Utilising improved existing parks, such as Dudley and Ashgrove that are below capacity venues, would be a far more cost-effective option than developing new fields.
8.7 **Key Catchment Areas**

A preliminary map has been developed which identifies the approximate catchment area if a 15-minute drive was undertaken from the key areas of Rangiora, Woodend and Kaiapoi.

What the map identifies is that there is a significant area on the eastern side of the district that can be accessed within a 15-minute drive. This should be considered when understanding the oversupply and undersupply of the current sports fields identified within this report.

This is also linked to much of the population growth on the eastern side and the relatively short drive time between the major towns.
Map 8.1: 15 minute drive time analysis (Rangiora, Woodend and Kaiapoi)\(^{12}\)

**Key:** The purple shading reflects drive time from one of Rangiora, Kaiapoi or Woodend. Overlapping drive times are reflected in darker shading. The darker the shading the more overlap.

---

\(^{12}\) Based on 15-minute travel using ArcGIS data and existing roading network in the Waimakariri area.
9.0  **RECOMMENDATIONS – SPORTS FIELDS**

The following section provides an overview of the potential sports fields preliminary projects that should be considered with regards to future sports field investment. The following recommendations are based on taking a network approach to sports fields in the Waimakariri District. **The ten-year goal is for each significant sports park in the area to have at least one high quality playing surface.**

The table below shows the potential key projects identified from the findings of the ‘Sport fields Preliminary Analysis’ section. A preliminary assessment of each project has been undertaken to identify potential options along with an associated estimate of costs which should be seen as a guide only.

These high-level recommendations do not preclude the need for further detailed planning on each site.

The list of preliminary projects has been prioritised into the following years related to the Council’s Long-Term Plan 1 - 3, 4 – 6, and 7 – 10.

For the remaining sports fields not included in the priority projects Table 9.1 outlines additional cost-effective options to improve the performance of sports fields.

Table 9.1: Cost effective options to improve the performance of sports fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Treatment</th>
<th>Benefit to Drainage Performance</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More fertilizer use</td>
<td>Promotes denser turf sward and hence better protection of soil surface</td>
<td>Relatively low cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthworm control</td>
<td>Prevents earthworm casting from “muddying” the surface</td>
<td>Will be very site specific – only required if there is significant earthworm activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional soil compaction relief treatments</td>
<td>Improves rate of water movement through the upper part of the soil profile, away from the surface</td>
<td>Treatments site specific, chosen based on soil type and profile characteristic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 Independent advice from the NZ Sports Turf Institute
### 9.1 Preliminary Sports fields Projects

Table 9.2: Preliminary Sports fields Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Preliminary Estimate of Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ashgrove Park   | Continue to maintain for training overflow – no significant improvements identified | Year 1-3
<p>|                 |                                                                                     | Year 4-6 Year 7-10 Year 10+                           |
| Southbrook Park | Staged upgrade of selected sports fields: 1.Increased drainage 2. Sand Carpet       | Pipe drainage of 1 field $45,000 Sand Carpet of 1 field including in ground irrigation system $175,000 Drainage of additional field(s) $50,000 |
| Dudley Park     | Re-instate fields as multi-purpose venue for winter codes training and Junior play (overflow for excess demand on current fields) | Upgrade lights and implement an all-code booking system $250,000 for lights Increase quality of one field via pipe drainage $45,000 |
| Maria Andrews Park | Technical paper assessing irrigation options and preferred location of two sand carpets at Maria Andrews, or new Coldstream site | Technical Paper $5,000 Sand Carpet Provisional Sum of $220k (depending on findings of Technical Report) Drainage of 2nd field $50,000 |
| Mainpower Oval  | Canterbury Country Cricket has stated it will be necessary to develop a sand based outfield to continue hosting first class cricket. | WDC to liaise with Canterbury Country Cricket to understand where Mainpower Oval fits within the wider |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Preliminary Estimate of Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1 -3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora A&amp;P</td>
<td>Investigate decreased use of outer fields at showgrounds once Maria Andrews upgrades are confirmed</td>
<td>network of First Class grounds available in Canterbury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Park</td>
<td>Staged upgrade of selected sports fields: 1.Increased drainage 2. Sand Carpet</td>
<td>Review the outcome of Maria Andrews technical paper and implementation plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall Park</td>
<td>Investigate options for better drainage solutions for the proposed training field</td>
<td>Review existing partnership agreement before any potential capital investment Pipe drainage of 1 field $45,000 Sand Carpet of 1 field including in ground irrigation system $175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy Park</td>
<td>Re-locate Rugby League to Regeneration Zone</td>
<td>Implementation undertaken for preferred drainage system. Provisional sum $2,000 Implementation of preferred drainage system. Provisional sum $50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Name</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Preliminary Estimate of Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1 -3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fields and re-locate clubrooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(cost to be identified by WDC as part of Regeneration Plan)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone Park</td>
<td>A Master Plan exists for Gladstone park</td>
<td>Clear land for additional sports fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Domain</td>
<td>Implement findings of Irrigation Report – No new fields required</td>
<td>Develop identified irrigation solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provisional sum $55,000</td>
<td>Pipe drainage of 1 field $45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville Domain</td>
<td>Staged upgrade of selected sports fields: 1.Increased drainage 2. Sand Carpet</td>
<td>Pipe drainage of 1 field $45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Park</td>
<td>Staged upgrade of selected sports fields: 1.Increased drainage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10  RECOMMENDATIONS – SPORTS FACILITIES

A preliminary analysis of the club survey and other data has been undertaken to identify the potential sports facility projects within the Waimakariri district. An overview of the potential projects is identified in Section 10.1 and the related table. A detailed analysis for each sports code can be reviewed in the Appendices.

10.1 Preliminary Assessment of Potential Sport Facility Projects for Consideration

The initial identification of potential capital projects was identified through the club and organisation consultation survey process and site visits. The development of the ‘Potential Sport Facility Projects’ list has been completed after an assessment was undertaken for each individual project (details can be found in Appendix One).

It is important to note that this table only includes projects identified by the sports themselves. Section 10.3 identifies priorities for the identified facility projects.

Table 10.1 – Project List as Identified by Sports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Code</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Population and Need Analysis</th>
<th>Reported Code Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aerial / Model Flying Clubs</td>
<td>No significant projects identified</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some growth among youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery</td>
<td>No significant projects identified</td>
<td>Aimtru Archery Club offers district wide service for participants</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>Development of new four court indoor venue in Rangiora</td>
<td>Feasibility study has confirmed the need for this development</td>
<td>Increasing membership, potentially constrained by existing facility network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing competition for court space in Waimakariri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>Develop one full-size court at Kaiapoi High School as a partnership project</td>
<td>School roll and Eastern Waimakariri population increases</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling</td>
<td>No significant projects identified</td>
<td>Venues provide a dispersed network for participants</td>
<td>Membership and participation is not seen to be declining which is contrary to a national trend of decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>Development of a cycling hub to serve all cycling interests</td>
<td>District wide club</td>
<td>Increasing membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Code</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Population and Need Analysis</td>
<td>Reported Code Membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling (BMX)</td>
<td>Development of National Standard BMX track on land adjacent to current site</td>
<td>Check regional plan to understand Hierarchy of BMX tracks in Canterbury</td>
<td>Increasing membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling (MTB / Road)</td>
<td>Continue to partner to grow range of available on-road and off-road cycling trails</td>
<td>District wide club</td>
<td>Increasing membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>Investigate community cricket’s requirements of additional storage space / nets / player amenities at Dudley Park</td>
<td>A move toward modified, shorter versions of game at club level (Undertake in conjunction with Dudley Sports field lighting and surface upgrades)</td>
<td>Increasing membership (particularly among youth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croquet</td>
<td>The Rangiora club is to investigate need for additional space for growing membership</td>
<td>Recent new facilities have assisted to re-ignite club</td>
<td>Increasing membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>No significant projects identified</td>
<td>Venues provide a dispersed network for participants</td>
<td>Varies between clubs; nationally there is a decline in annual memberships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics</td>
<td>New premises will be required for the RGC should the NCSR sell current location in Edwards St – Council to monitor and review</td>
<td>Potential increase in demand and need can be anticipated given population projections.</td>
<td>Varies between clubs; nationally there is an increase in annual memberships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial Arts</td>
<td>No significant projects identified, however a heavy reliance on shorter term leased space</td>
<td>Venues provide a dispersed network for participants</td>
<td>Varies among the clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netball</td>
<td>Development of new four court indoor venue in Rangiora</td>
<td>Previous feasibility study has confirmed the need for this development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netball</td>
<td>Investigate additional hard courts due to reported capacity issues</td>
<td>Dependent on delivery model once indoor courts are developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>Determine future provision for Rowing clubs in Kaiapoi</td>
<td>Dependent on regional projects. Cure Clubrooms due to be upgraded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Code</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Population and Need Analysis</td>
<td>Reported Code Membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby League</td>
<td>As per the Sports Field Strategy recommendations</td>
<td>Note: Relocation to Regeneration Zone will require clubrooms to move</td>
<td>Relatively stable regional membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting</td>
<td>No significant projects identified</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>Development of fit-for-purpose softball Diamond as part of Regeneration Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squash</td>
<td>No significant projects identified</td>
<td>Clubs operational in all major urban areas</td>
<td>Some clubs offering “pay to play” model to counter declining club membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf-Lifesaving</td>
<td>No significant projects identified</td>
<td>Coastal activities could increase given the site's strategic location relative to large nearby subdivision developments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Tennis</td>
<td>No significant projects identified</td>
<td>Could benefit from additional court space in district freeing up smaller venues for Table Tennis</td>
<td>Reported declining membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Development of a district-wide tennis facility</td>
<td>Many smaller tennis court areas in district have reported deferred maintenance issues</td>
<td>Membership currently static or declining at majority of venues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yachting</td>
<td>Potential upgrade of ramp access and associated car parking</td>
<td>Coastal activities could increase given the site’s strategic location relative to large nearby subdivision developments</td>
<td>Increasing membership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 10.2 Assessment Considerations

To assist with the assessment of the potential sport facility projects, the following 'assessment considerations' have been developed to prioritise the sports facility projects in the report.

Table 10.2 – Project Assessment Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Key Guiding Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sharing Facilities</strong></td>
<td>- Level of willingness to operate under a shared facility/multisport arrangement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Is the club seeking genuine partnership with other codes and clubs for the development of this facility?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Participation / Membership</strong></td>
<td>- Total active membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Total junior membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Growth in membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected Participation / Membership</strong></td>
<td>- Does the facility have a catchment which will extend into a known Council growth area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Level to which population / demographic projections support the facilities/ clubs’ membership increasing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Strategic Alignment</strong></td>
<td>- Level of alignment to local, regional and national facility strategies, code development strategies and Council plans and strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How well does the facility contribute to an integrated local facility network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appropriate Scale of Facility</strong></td>
<td>- The spaces and size of the facility is core to the delivery of the sport and appropriately scaled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability of the Facility</strong></td>
<td>- How sustainable is the facility likely to be (considering partnerships, trends, financial issues etc.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Is the club a strong club overall with a strong future?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Will the facility enhance the future delivery and operation of the sport(s)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Funding</strong></td>
<td>- What ability do proponents have to assist with capital funding themselves (i.e. not including public funding)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Are the required funding splits realistic within the project’s development timeframes?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.3 Key Sport Facility Projects

The project priorities identified within this plan are based both on Waimakariri District Council and sports clubs identified and lead projects.

A priority rating of high, medium and low has been identified for each project as well as a preliminary estimate of costs where this is known, or considered appropriate.

Further detailed planning and investigation related to the sports club projects will be required to determine a more detailed cost estimate.

Key note:

- High Priority = 1 – 3 years
- Medium Priority = 4 – 6 years
- Low Priority = 7 – 10 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Key Next Steps</th>
<th>Preliminary Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Priority = High (1-3 years), Medium (4-10 years) and Low (10+ years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>Development of new four court indoor venue in Rangiora</td>
<td>Develop 4 court indoor facility</td>
<td>$26.9m</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>Develop one full-size court at Kaiapoi High School as a partnership project</td>
<td>Formalise partnership, including community access agreement</td>
<td>$1.0m contribution</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>Development of a cycling hub to serve all cycling interests</td>
<td>Investigate detailed requirements, needs and associated costs</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling (BMX)</td>
<td>Development of National Standard BMX track on land adjacent to current site</td>
<td>Two national level facilities exist in Christchurch</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling (MTB/Road)</td>
<td>Continue to partner to grow range of available on-road and off-road cycling trails</td>
<td>Investigate detailed requirements, needs and associated costs</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Name</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Key Next Steps</td>
<td>Preliminary Cost Estimate</td>
<td>Priority = High (1-3 years), Medium (4-10 years) and Low (10+ years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>WDC to liaise with Canterbury Country Cricket to understand where Mainpower Oval fits within the wider network of First Class grounds available in Canterbury.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>Investigate community cricket’s requirements of additional storage space / player amenities at Dudley Park.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croquet</td>
<td>Rangiora Club investigating additional space for growing membership.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics</td>
<td>New premises will be required for the RGC should the NCSRT sell current location in Edwards St.</td>
<td>Review and Monitor Lease arrangement</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial Arts</td>
<td>Monitor Martial Arts lease arrangements</td>
<td>No cost</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netball</td>
<td>Development of new four court indoor venue in Rangiora.</td>
<td>Develop 4 court indoor facility</td>
<td>$26.9m</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netball</td>
<td>Investigate additional hard courts due to reported capacity issues.</td>
<td>Preferred site to be identified (dependent on Indoor Courts development).</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>Determine future provision for rowing clubs in Kaiapoi.</td>
<td>Investigate detailed requirements, needs and associated costs. Closely monitor Christchurch Residential Red Zone planning</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>Development of fit-for-purpose softball Diamonds as part of Regeneration Plan.</td>
<td>Two dirt diamonds identified with artificial turf infield Regeneration Plan. Cost to be identified as part of Regeneration Plan</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Name</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Key Next Steps</td>
<td>Preliminary Cost Estimate</td>
<td>Priority = High (1-3 years), Medium (4-10 years) and Low (10+ years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Tennis clubs have identified the need to develop a district-wide Tennis facility.</td>
<td>Investigate need and appropriate solution (Ten courts and facilities identified in Coldstream Road Master Plan)</td>
<td>Cost to be identified as part of Coldstream Masterplan</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yachting</td>
<td>Potential upgrade of ramp access and associated car parking</td>
<td>Investigate detailed requirements, needs and associated costs</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX ONE - PRELIMINARY OVERVIEW BY SPORT

Aerial/Model Flying Clubs

Introduction

The Waimakariri Sport Facilities Survey identified two aerial clubs and associated facilities, across a range of recreation/open space sites. Limited information was provided regarding the facilities and sites used. The three clubs surveyed have experienced differences in membership trends, from increasing and staying about the same through to a decrease in participation.

Facility Inventory

The facility inventory identified a total of two specific recreation/open space sites (1x open field farm site and 1x sport reserve) in the Waimakariri District. Both clubs have small basic spaces for club activities, although the Waimakariri Flyers shed is storage only.

Table A.1: Aerial/Model Flying club facilities overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Aerial/Model Flying Club</th>
<th>Facilities (summarised)</th>
<th>Proposed Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swannanoa</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Model Aero Club (192, No 10 Road, Swannanoa)</td>
<td>• Flying field in open paddocks off No.10 Road, with storage and office (in containers)</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>Waimakariri Radio Flyers (Kendal Park, Kaiapoi)</td>
<td>• Renovated shed for storage only on park. Owned by WDC.</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peak Use Levels and Demand Issues

Kaiapoi Model Aero Club’s membership stated their membership is increasing. They indicate that around 30% of members/participants come from outside Kaiapoi. No demand or capacity-related issues were reported, although growth was reported among youth. They considered their relatively remote but large open field space allowed more use and users. The plan was on making it more available to other groups.

Membership of the Waimakariri Radio Flyers has been reported as staying the same. They report that over 70% of members/participants come from outside Kaiapoi. Some constraints were reported related to other park activities. They feel a dedicated park for such flying in the District would help.

Overview of Assets

These two clubs used different types of recreation/open space sites and they have little need for any physical, built facilities beyond activity support functions. Kaiapoi Model Aero Club appear to have the facilities with the most growth capacity, and have indicated intentions to operate their facilities in providing more ‘hub-type’ flying opportunities.
Basketball Clubs

Introduction

The Waimakariri Sport Facilities Survey identified one basketball group and associated facilities across numerous indoor venues. This group was the North Canterbury Basketball Association so would represent a pan-club view and a more district and regional-level expression of needs. Facilities were perceived to be constrained due a reliance on multiple smaller venues (usually at schools) in which basketball (or any other sport) use was subject to manager preference and priorities, that make public uses less secure.

Facility Inventory

The facility inventory identified one single primary venue although this only comprised 2 courts, with the use of over 10 venues being required at times to run regular District competitions. The following venues were listed in the regular ‘Friday Night Basketball’ draw.

- Mega 1 Mega 2 (1½x) Mitre 10 Mega Sports Centre
- Ohoka School
- Oxford Area School
- Pegasus Bay School
- Rangiora Borough School
- Rangiora High School
- Rangiora New Life School
- Southbrook School
- Swannanoa (¾x) Swannanoa School Multipurpose Hall
- Woodend Community Centre

Table B.1: Basketball club facilities overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Basketball Club</th>
<th>Facilities (summarised)</th>
<th>Proposed Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>North Canterbury Basketball Association (Mitre 10 Mega Sports Centre, 125 East Belt, Rangiora)</td>
<td>- 1½x indoor courts for basketball and other sports</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Court competition from increasing indoor netball demands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>North Canterbury Basketball Association (miscellaneous other largely school-based facilities)</td>
<td>- A range of mostly secondary, area and primary school gyms/halls.</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wide</td>
<td></td>
<td>- including facilities in Oxford, Pegasus, Rangiora, Southbrook, Swannanoa, Woodend, although little noted in Kaiapoi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peak Use Levels and Demand Issues

The North Canterbury Basketball Association reported their membership has been significantly increasing over recent years, including more females and ethnic groups in particular, and participants from the neighbouring Hurunui District. They report that around 10% of members/participants come from outside of Waimakariri. In their peak regular Friday Night competition, they report 118 teams across 13 courts at 11 different venues.

They also note that pressure on these spaces is increasing due to not only population growth, but also due to increasing competition from other activities (e.g. netball).

Overview of Assets
They note that many of these courts are not full-size, and few are well supported with viewing/seating spaces, storage, or reliable booking security. Their view is that the current facilities are limiting basketball’s potential growth in membership and events. A collaborative sports hub incorporating up to 4 courts was recommended, and reference was made to other feasibility assessments and a desire to consult more directly.

A new court at Kaiapoi High School has been signalled that will see WDC support the Kaiapoi High School to develop a full-size court, allowing community access.

A four-court indoor venue in Rangiora. This would alleviate some of the peak demand pressures, and provide Basketball with a venue that would allow membership to continue to grow.
Biking Clubs

Introduction
The Waimakariri Sport Facilities Survey identified two biking clubs, with one having a very specific site on Council land and the other having interests across a variety of public lands and private forest site and leasehold Council land.

Facility Inventory
The facility inventory identified two biking clubs and associated facilities comprising a specific BMX track and an unspecified number of mountain bike tracks and road riding routes. Neither have their own clubrooms and associated facilities.

Table C.1: Biking club facilities overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Biking Club</th>
<th>Facilities (summarised)</th>
<th>Proposed Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>North Canterbury BMX Club (Milton Ave Picnic Area)</td>
<td>• Use BMX track  • No other facilities.</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>North Canterbury Cycling Club (multiple areas across District and North Canterbury)</td>
<td>• Access public tracks.  • Club membership allows access to many production forests (which is a key driver of much MTB membership)</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peak Use Levels and Demand Issues
More casual riding BMX but not joining club in such numbers

Both clubs report both increasing membership trends, and increasing casual participation trends, particularly by children and families. North Canterbury Cycling Club Membership allows access to a number of production forest track networks for Mountain biking, through group access licences, and noted that such access commonly includes club members voluntarily working on developing, maintaining and promoting some tracks. Such collaborations with land managers are a feature of mountain biking groups, and serve to increase the capacity, diversity and accessibility of opportunities.

Overview of Assets
A Cycling Club ‘hub’ was suggested by the North Canterbury BMX Club as being a development that could benefit all cycling interests in the District. They also noted discussions with WDC about a national standard BMX track on land adjacent to the current site.

The North Canterbury Cycling Club referred to a growing range of mountain biking tracks and networks, and indicated enthusiasm about collaborating with public and private land managers to advance these further, along with any general cycleway developments.
Bowling & Croquet Clubs

Introduction

The Waimakariri Sport Facilities Survey identified two bowling clubs, one indoor bowls club, one croquet club, and associated facilities. Clubs reported that the facilities they use largely met their needs and no major improvements were needed. All also reported either stable or increasing membership.

Facility Inventory

The facility inventory identified a total of two bowling clubs, 1 indoor club and a croquet club along with associated facilities across three outdoor sites and one indoor site. Kaiapoi Riverside Bowling Club has an artificial green, while Woodend has a natural grass green, as does Rangiora Croquet. Rangiora Croquet Club also reported they were carpeting space inside their clubrooms which would allow indoor play, and that their rooms are beside those of an indoor Table Bowls group.

Kaiapoi Riverside Bowls and Rangiora Croquet own their clubrooms and greens on leasehold land, while Woodend Bowls does so on its own land. Clarkville Indoor Bowls rents space in a community hall.

Table D.1: Bowling club facilities overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Bowling Club</th>
<th>Facilities (summarised)</th>
<th>Proposed Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Kaiapoi            | Kaiapoi Riverside Bowling Club (Hinemoa Park, 13 Belcher St, Kaiapoi) | • Club owns building/clubrooms/green on leasehold land.  
• 1x Artificial green  
• Investigating an additional grass green | • Local. |
| Woodend            | Woodend Bowling Club (20 School Rd, Woodend)      | • Club owns building/clubrooms/green on its own land.  
• 1x natural green  
• Investigating an additional grass green | • Local. |
| Rangiora           | Rangiora Croquet Club (River Rd, Rangiora)        | • Club owns building/clubrooms/green on leasehold land.  
• 1x natural green and investigating additional adjacent space  
• Carpeting internally allowing indoor play | • Local. |
| Clarkville (near Kaiapoi) | Clarkville Indoor Bowls Club (Clarkville Hall) | • Club rents community hall space. | • Local. |
| Other              | Several other Waimakariri bowling clubs are listed at Bowls Canterbury, while Woodend also reported playing locally at a Rest Home. | • Cust Bowling Club – 1x natural  
• Kaiapoi Bowling Club – 1x natural  
• Mandeville Bowling Cub – 1x natural  
• Oxford Club Bowls – 1x natural  
• Rangiora Bowling Club – 1x turf, 2x natural | • Local. |

Peak Use Levels and Demand Issues

Kaiapoi Riverside Bowling Club reported largely static, aging and local membership. No demand or capacity-related issues were reported, although they were investigating options for an additional green.
Woodend Bowling Club reported that their membership has been increasing, with a considerable minority from outside Woodend. No demand or capacity-related issues were reported, although they were investigating options for an additional green.

Rangiora Croquet Club reported that their membership was very local and has been increasing, particularly with more men, couples and younger people. They reported they had some playing capacity constraints due to limited space and were investigating adjacent space for more capacity and indoor play at their clubrooms.

Clarkville Indoor Bowling Club reported largely static membership comprising mainly Clarkville locals. No demand or capacity-related issues were reported.

**Overview of Assets**

The outdoor bowling/croquet clubs here all have clubrooms and 1x green spaces, with all investigating options for more capacity. Membership and participation is not declining as is often commonly found with such activities; some activity increases, and related needs are apparent. Current quality is reported as being adequate, with indications of some developing quantity needs.
Cricket Clubs

Introduction

The Waimakariri Sport Facilities Survey identified a total of 6 cricket groups/clubs (including Canterbury Country Cricket) and associated facilities. All had their own 'clubrooms', either standalone or shared. However, what constituted clubrooms varied; ranging from basic functional-only spaces for supporting play (e.g. changing rooms), through to more dedicated clubhouse 'pavilion' facilities with all social capabilities. Most of these were considered inadequate to meet their respective needs, usually due to their sizes and/or limited components constraining the size and range of relevant activities.

Canterbury Country Cricket, and 3 out of the 5 individual clubs in the survey, reported increasing memberships/participation. The Oxford and Seton cubs reported largely stable levels of membership/participation.

Facility Inventory

The facility inventory identified a total of six sites across the District. Apart from Canterbury Country Cricket which has a base at Mainpower Oval, only one of the clubs had its own standalone clubrooms (i.e. Swannanoa). The other four clubs share clubroom utility and/or social spaces with other codes, with some having only off-site 'social' clubrooms.

Table E.1: Cricket club facilities overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Cricket Club</th>
<th>Facilities (summarised)</th>
<th>Proposed Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| District | Canterbury Country Cricket (Mainpower Oval, Rangiora) | • Administration and main District/Area matches based at Mainpower Oval  
• Building meets need but oval needs sand-base for continued 1st class play, and a second oval is sought for age-group play  
• Also, some indoor nets | Regional |
| Mandeville | Ohoka Cricket Club (Mandeville Sports Club) | • Currently share facilities with multiple groups at Mandeville Sports Club  
• Consider they need more clubroom and playing space (including an additional playing block), particularly for juniors  
• Some Junior use at Swannanoa Domain | Sub-Regional (some tournament play possible) |
| Oxford | Oxford Cricket Club (Pearson Park, Oxford) | • Only rented use of changing rooms/fields,  
• Social clubroom uses only at Oxford Working Men's Club  
• Keen to see more shared hub options at site (i.e. changing, play, social) | Local |
| Rangiora | Rangiora Cricket Club (Dudley park, Rangiora) | • Have clubroom space from Canterbury Country Cricket, although small and limited storage, seating etc.  
• Have no nets on-site and use indoor nets at Mainpower Oval. | Local |

Note that specific sports field facilities were covered separately in a corresponding Sports Field Facility Survey.
### Peak Use Levels and Demand Issues

Canterbury Country Cricket report cricket membership/participation is increasing significantly among youth in particular, and also adults. Many of these member increases come from out of District. They also report more adapted cricket versions for kids and youth (i.e. small teams, pay-for-play twilight cricket etc.). A second field is desired at Mainpower Oval for age-group play, as well as pitch development of the surface at the main Oval with a sand base. Discussing this with Council. Open to shared club/community uses of building and ground facilities where appropriate.

The Ohoka Cricket Club stated that their membership is increasing, with around a third coming from outside the immediate area. Also, many additional ‘non-member’ participants coming to pay-for-play twilight cricket. The shared clubroom facilities are considered too small, and more pitches/nets are needed to accommodate junior growth and training needs. They state that the ‘Mandeville Sports Club’ arrangement is meant to provide better shared clubroom opportunities, but has too many groups to accommodate everyone.

The Oxford Cricket Club stated their membership was largely static, with most new members preferring more short-form cricket options. Around half came from outside of Oxford. Only have basic changing facilities to use onsite, and undertake social activity at Working Men’s Club. No demand or capacity-related issues were reported other than inadequacy of clubroom space. Open to shared use options if facility quality and social opportunity better.

The Rangiora Cricket Club indicated their membership numbers are increasing, particularly among juniors and related to modified game versions. All came from Rangiora. Use very basic clubrooms at Dudley Park through Canterbury Country Cricket at no charge, but need increased size, storage, player seating (and nets). Desire to improve their facility mix at Dudley Park, but would consider suitable options if available elsewhere.

Sefton Cricket reported their membership is increasing, particularly with juniors switching to modified versions. Most are coming from outside of Sefton. Social activities are constrained by limited facility space. Open to shared use options if facility quality and social opportunities are better.

The Swannanoa Cricket Club stated that their membership is increasing, with virtually all coming from outside of Swannanoa. There are more diverse ages and ethnicities. The limited clubroom space is constraining activity with this growth, but they are planning to shift clubrooms at the site to create a bigger/better facility.

### Overview of Assets

Cricket appears to mostly have sufficient numbers of grounds for current play, although additional field capacity needs were signalled at Mainpower Oval and Mandeville Sports Grounds. Most other facility needs related to provision, or improvements to practice nets and/or clubroom facilities (i.e.etc.)
quality, size and capability). With clubroom needs, most appeared open to shared facilities where appropriate to their playing needs (i.e. siting). Increasing junior participation, modified shorter-form game versions and casual participation modes were notable features of participation.
**Football Clubs**

**Introduction**

The Waimakariri Sport Facilities Survey identified a total of two football clubs with associated facilities. The Oxford Football Club is a small club currently having no clubrooms (or apparent changing facilities) at its main Burnett Street site on Pearson Park. It reports its membership is currently stable (at around 100), with a lot of interest from young families. Virtually all members come from Oxford. By contrast Waimakariri Football Club is much larger and operates primarily from Kendal Park, but also at Maria Andrews Park, with clubroom facilities at both. It reports a much larger membership of around 900, although this has declined in recent year. Reported participation by women is increasing significantly, although that by juniors has declined (attributed by the club to poor ground conditions). Members come from a variety of towns in the District.

**Facility Inventory**

The facility inventory identified a total of two football clubs with associated facilities. These spanned 3 main park settings, with the much larger Waimakariri Football Club operating from two sites.

Table F.1: Football club facilities overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Facilities (summarised)</th>
<th>Proposed Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>Oxford Football Club (Burnett Street, Pearson Park, Oxford)</td>
<td>• Club based at Pearson Park fields on Burnett Street. There are no, not even basic, clubroom facilities there (changing, toilet etc.)</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of clubroom facilities are seen as increasing parent and kid drop out due to limited engagement potential and inconvenience – counters general growth in this sector.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Need for a home base. Discussed sharing options with potential new softball group in Oxford and would consider sharing with Rugby (if they could). Keen to get surplus Council building relocated at the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi and</td>
<td>Waimakariri Football Club (Kendall Park, Maria Andrews Park, Rangiora</td>
<td>• Club uses Kendall Park and Maria Andrews Park, with clubroom facilities at both, although not ideally located relative to senior pitches at Kendall, and size-constrained given the membership numbers.</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>Showgrounds)</td>
<td>• An artificial pitch at Kendall Park, but higher-grade games are limited due to insufficient changing room standards in the new block. Another artificial pitch desired due to lost games generally through poor drainage at many parks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Poor drainage at Kendal Park and Maria Andrews Park means many cancellations, with variable pitch quality also a problem due to variations in flooding, drying out.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peak Use Levels and Demand Issues

Oxford Football Club reported that their membership has been largely static, despite general junior interest growing. Lack of basic clubroom/ changing/ toilet/ social facilities is a parent turn-off after their initial interest. They are open to sharing facilities if required and have been talking to Council about multi-purpose building options for Pearson Park, as well as to other potential interested groups. They considered they were much better positioned previously for junior football when they had use of Oxford Area School’s grounds, and an adjacent scout den for social aspects, but that it was difficult sometimes fitting in with the school’s priorities. Continued use of the scout den wasn’t considered feasible given the distance from the Burnett St fields.

Waimakariri Football Club reported that their membership has been decreasing. They noted that while more women were participating they were experiencing decline in junior numbers and they had to cap senior member numbers, which they attributed in part to unreliable ground conditions, cancellations and often poor or insufficient supporting facilities (e.g. changing rooms, lights) across many playing and training sites. They reported shifting training lights from Maria Andrews Park to Kendall Park due to insufficient field quality at the former. They also consider use of the Kendall Park artificial field to be constrained particularly for higher grade games due to insufficient standards in the new changing facility block. The existing clubrooms at both main sites were also considered too small for the size of the club. They compared the provision of fields and facilities here, unfavourably to those available in similar types of sites in Christchurch and Selwyn.

Overview of Assets

Poor field standards and cancellations due to drainage problems, appear to be a notable facility constraint for football. In addition, the lack of basic and accessible support facilities (i.e. changing rooms, toilets, showers) appear to be constraints particularly for juniors in Oxford Football Club at Burnett St fields in Pearson Park, and for getting senior higher-grade games using the Kendall Park artificial turf.

From these results it is clear that the findings, conclusions and recommendations in this report should be aligned closely with those from the associated Sports Field Facility Strategy.
Golf Clubs

Introduction

The Waimakariri Sport Facilities Survey identified a total of three golf clubs and associated facilities, and a fourth was also noted separately.

Facility Inventory

The facility inventory identified a total of four golf clubs and associated facilities in the District. Most members were locals from their own area, although some outside members were noted. Many users of the golf courses were non-members from other District towns.

Table G.1: Golf club facilities overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Golf Club</th>
<th>Facilities (summarised)</th>
<th>Proposed Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Kaiapoi         | Kaiapoi Golf Club (373 Williams Street, Kaiapoi) | • 18-hole course and clubrooms on club land.  
• Bar, kitchen, cafe and catering for events and functions | Local.          |
| Rangiora        | Rangiora Golf Club (Golf Links Road, Rangiora) | • 18-hole course and clubrooms predominantly on leasehold land.  
• Bar, kitchen, cafe and catering for events and functions | Local.          |
| Oxford (nearby) | Waimakariri Gorge Golf Club (Thongcaster Road, View Hill, Oxford) | • 18 holes and clubrooms on crown land, highly scenic rural setting  
• Bar, kitchen, cafe | Local.          |
| Pegasus         | Pegasus Golf Club (Malpeham Drive, Pegasus)   | • New 18-hole championship course and clubrooms on club land  
• Modern driving range. Bar, kitchen and cafe for events and functions | Local.          |

Peak Use Levels and Demand Issues

Kaiapoi Golf Club reported their membership has been decreasing. No demand or capacity-related issues were reported.

Rangiora Golf Club stated that their membership is staying about the same. No demand or capacity-related issues were reported.

Waimakariri Gorge Golf Club didn’t indicate their membership or its trend. No demand or capacity-related issues were reported.

Pegasus Golf Club didn’t indicate their membership or its trend. No demand or capacity-related issues were reported.

Overview of Assets

All the golf clubs provide a wide range of golf-related facilities at their premises. The condition of current facilities is reported as being good and that the playing and club needs were being met. No significant facility issues were noted other than general maintenance requirements. Most felt more use could be made of their facilities (e.g. clubrooms etc.) and were open to that.

GymSport Clubs

Introduction

The Waimakariri Sport Facilities Survey identified a total of two gymsport clubs and associated facilities across two venues. In terms of membership trends, Rangiora Gymnastics Club reported declining membership while Woodend Gymnastics Club reported increasing membership. Almost
75% of the Rangiora Club’s membership came from other District towns, while the corresponding figure for Woodend was around 50%.

Table H.1: Gymnastic club facilities overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Hockey Club</th>
<th>Facilities (summarised)</th>
<th>Proposed Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>Rangiora Gymnastics Club (North Canterbury Sports Trust Building)</td>
<td>• Leased space in shared building with Ice Trampolining, including some shared floorspace</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>Woodend Gymnastics Club (Woodend Community Centre)</td>
<td>• Club uses facilities at Rosa Birch Park (2x artificial hockey turfs)</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peak Use Levels and Demand Issues

Rangiora Gymnastics Club reported that their current building space was insufficient size for standard MAG and WAG competition, and some shared space and facilities (e.g. toilets) with Ice Trampolining was cramped. Viewing space and heating were also considered substandard. A fully dedicated space in North Canterbury was desired. Having to seek now space soon as the North Canterbury Sports Trust are planning to sell the building and move out.

Woodend Gymnastics Club reported constraints from not having space to leave gear out and from the heavy booking of the Community Centre space limiting their flexibilities in time and events.

Overview of Assets

The most established facility currently used for Gymsports (North Canterbury Sports Trust Building Rangiora) may be sold and new options are being actively sought. Neither current facility is suitable due to size and access constraints (particularly for Woodend). Gymsports is typically an activity undertaken by children and youth, so that more potential demand and need can be anticipated given population projections.
Martial Arts Clubs

Introduction

The Waimakariri Sport Facilities Survey identified a total of 10 martial arts clubs and associated facilities across 7 sites. Seven clubs indicated they had increasing membership, two suggested their participation numbers were staying about the same and one club reported their membership was declining. The membership trend for one club was not reported. Most had majorities of local town members. Although the proportions of non-local members were notable at around 20-30% overall. Only one club (Waikuku Youth Development Boxing) had a majority of non-local members (70%).

Facility Inventory

The facility inventory identified a total of ten martial arts clubs and associated facilities across seven sites. These sites mostly comprised school gyms/halls, community halls, or other leased spaces. Only one club indicated it owned its facility (Waikuku Boxing).

Table J.1: Martial arts club facilities overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Martial Arts Club</th>
<th>Facilities (summarised)</th>
<th>Proposed Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>Chan's Martial Arts Rangiora (Gym 3 Rangiora High School)</td>
<td>• Leased time in school gym • Limited heating</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>Rangiora Institute of Traditional Karate (Rangiora High School Gym)</td>
<td>• Leased time in school gym • Limited heating</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi / Rangiora</td>
<td>Go-Kan-Ryu Karate (Kaiapoi North School, 48 Seddon Street, Rangiora)</td>
<td>• Leased time in school hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>Oxford Alpine Tae Kwon Do (GP Hall, A&amp;P Showgrounds, Oxford)</td>
<td>• Leased time/space in community hall • Limited storage</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>Rangiora Aikido Dojo (Mairusu Judo dojo, Northbrook Studios, Northbrook Road)</td>
<td>• Lease facility times from Mairusu Judo dojo • Limited times for use and space is tight (waiting list)</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>Rangiora Amateur Wrestling Club (Rangiora Racecourse)</td>
<td>• Lease old Stewards hall at racecourse and use school hall for competitions • Facilities adequate most of the time, but some limited in time and space.</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>Rangiora Boxing Club (433 Johns Road)</td>
<td>• Lease garage space for gym, but would like something more customised</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>Tenshindo Japanese Samurai Sword &amp; Spear Martial arts (1 Knight St, Rangiora)</td>
<td>• Lease space in Oxford Oval Pavilion and Oxford Town Hall, also use pool and fitness areas • Not able to leave out mats; conflicting booking times; heating issues; general facility upgrades</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>Wu-Shin Chi-Dao (1 Knight St, Rangiora)</td>
<td>• Lease space in Oxford Town Hall and used to use Oxford Oval Pavilion</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Peak Use Levels and Demand Issues

Most have timing constraints due to dependence on booking school/community spaces. Also, some of these have heating, space and floor type constraints. Most of these groups are growing and many also indicate desire for more space or new facility options.

### Overview of Assets

The martial arts clubs that participated in the survey used a number of community/school halls and indoor facilities at seven primary sites. Only one of the clubs that participated in the survey had their own dedicated clubrooms/space.

Post survey it has come to our attention that the Rangiora Wrestling Club may be requiring new premises. While unable to confirm this with the club it is recommended WDC monitor this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waiuku</td>
<td>Use boxing gym, but it is too small, so often use outdoor basketball court (weather permitting). Sometimes use Waikuku Beach Hall, but need some permanent gear setup.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Youth Development Boxing Club (Waikuku Boxing Club, Waikuku Beach Domain)</td>
<td>Sometimes have to use rooms with carpet floors; such rooms sometimes small; lack storage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Netball Clubs

Introduction

The Waimakariri Sport Facilities Survey identified several netball clubs that play in the North Canterbury Netball Centre competitions. Most of netball activity occurs at Dudley Park Courts with practises occurring across the district. Facilities were perceived to be of either a good, or reasonably good condition.

Facility Inventory

The facility inventory identified netball facilities across one 12 court Netball Centre venue (Dudley Park) and two schools (for indoor uses). The Rangiora New Life School’s indoor court is large enough for play (although spectator/warmup space is minimal), but it lacks a suitable floor. The Ohoka School Hall’s court is 2.5m short of official size.

Table N.1: Netball club facilities overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Netball Club</th>
<th>Facilities (summarised)</th>
<th>Proposed Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Rangiora | North Canterbury Netball Centre (North Canterbury Netball Centre, Dudley Park) | • The Centre runs the Dudley Park netball courts, and has 12 courts.  
• Courts need repair and replacement, also provide insufficient capacity.  
• No wet weather alternatives  
• Use some school halls for indoor training, but insufficient indoor capacity/options | Local.          |

Peak Use Levels and Demand Issues

The North Canterbury Netball Centre report constraints to current and future growing play due to limited outdoor court numbers, court layout/space and surface condition. There are also senior game constraints from the lack of any suitable indoor play options. The two venues they can currently use for indoor play have issues of inappropriate size (i.e. too small), flooring type and insufficient spectator space. Having at least 1 venue with 2x full size indoor courts, spectator space and storage is desired.

Overview of Assets

The responding netball centre has use of around 12 outdoor courts and 2 substandard indoor courts at 2 separate venues. Current court capacity and the lack of suitable indoor options is limiting further Netball growth. Expansion options at current courts are limited. They indicated willingness to share facilities with others if their needs were met.
Rugby/Rugby League/Touch Rugby Clubs

Introduction

The Waimakariri Sport Facilities Survey received responses from 5 rugby clubs and 1 rugby league club. Three reported growing membership, while three reported stable memberships. Most clubs had large majority memberships from their local towns. The exception was the Northern Rugby League Club in Kaiapoi which had around 50% of its members coming from elsewhere in the District.

Most clubs note increased young junior membership numbers, more girls/women, and more interest in modified game versions. Clubs typically own or lease clubroom spaces on leasehold land, and commonly manage the fields on the associated park themselves.

Facility Inventory

The survey received a total of five rugby clubs and 1 rugby league club spread across the District. Of these, three reported increasing memberships while the remaining three reported stable memberships. Most clubs had large member majorities from their local towns (except Northern Rugby League). All had clubrooms on leasehold lands, with three owning the buildings and the rest leasing or renting space (sometimes shared spaces). All clubs except Kaiapoi Rugby Club felt their needs were not met by their clubrooms, with issues usually due mostly to small sizes and/or qualities of changing rooms. Field quality was a concern, usually drainage.

Table L.1: Rugby/Rugby League/Touch club facilities overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Rugby/Rugby League/Touch Rugby Club</th>
<th>Facilities (summarised)</th>
<th>Proposed Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loburn</td>
<td>Ashley Rugby Football Club (Loburn Pavilion, Lowburn Domain)</td>
<td>• Club has 3x full rugby fields and 2x junior on large domain (with capacity for more)</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintain the fields and facilities, including clubrooms (too small), would like to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>develop more/better fields</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Use Sefton Domain for training, and games if Loburn is out (from poor drainage)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Used to share clubrooms with tennis, but they are gone and open to sharing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Rugby Football Club (Kaiapoi Park)</td>
<td>• Club uses 3x senior and 1x junior fields on Kaiapoi Park, shared with hockey (winter)</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and cricket/softball (summer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Also, 1x senior and junior fields (with changing facilities) on adjacent Wylie Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(and lit training field adjacent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Own their clubrooms and share with Touch.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider they have very good grounds and large clubrooms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>Northern Rugby League Club (Murphy Park, Kaiapoi)</td>
<td>• Club has 2x senior and 1x junior fields and clubrooms on Murphy Park. Have training</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lights, but looking to improve these and open another junior field.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Have clubrooms, but seeking improved changing facilities and are open to sharing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Club Name</td>
<td>Services and Constraints</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>Oxford Rugby Football Club (Pearson Park, Oxford)</td>
<td>Clubrooms and 2x main senior fields on Pearson Park. 3x fields on adjacent A&amp;P Showgrounds. Insufficient club and changing room capacities. Open to new facility and sharing them or doing in a multisport facility.</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>Saracens Rugby Football Club (Southbrook Park, Rangiora)</td>
<td>Shared pavilion and 5x senior, 2x junior fields, although limited by poor field drainage. Shares use of Southbrook Community Sports clubs' facility with Cricket, Touch and Netball, and discussed with other clubs. Need more changing, storage and support space, looking at developing this.</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>Woodend Rugby Football Club (Gladstone Park, Woodend)</td>
<td>Uses 3x senior and 1x junior fields on Gladstone Park. Let cricket and netball use clubrooms. Pavilion and some training lights, but insufficient changing rooms and lights needed on more fields.</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Gaps in responses were identified and follow up calls made to those clubs not responding. These additional responses are recorded in the sports field section of this report.

### Peak Use Levels and Demand Issues

Membership appears stable or increasing for the clubs. Most note high numbers of very young players, but also considerable drop off. Oxford noted a loss of female players in particular. While most noted an increase in modified game versions they also noted increasing participation conflict from other activities. Some noted good uptake in touch. Kaiapoi Rugby Club noted increased interest associated with the development of new subdivisions.

Use pressures appeared to be most apparent in basic changing facilities, with a few also noting social constraints. Field conditions associated with drainage appeared more of a problem than overall field numbers.

### Overview of Assets

Facility numbers appear sufficient overall, subject to periodic and extensive constraints from field drainage issues at many venues. Support facility numbers and quality, particularly as related to basic facilities such as changing rooms, showers and toilets appeared a common constraint. Field quality issues related to drainage were noted particularly in relation to Lobum Domain and Southbrook Park. Club also noted burdens due to ground maintenance responsibilities.

Most described current ground and/or clubroom sharing arrangements. Most also indicated a willingness to do so (or do more).

### Shooting and Archery Clubs

**Introduction**

The Waimakariri Sport Facilities Survey identified 1 shooting and 1 archery club.
Facility Inventory

The North Canterbury Clay Shooting Association had its own clubrooms and range, while the Aimtru Archers only had a range. Most of the Clay Shooting Association members come from around Rangiora, while Aimtru Archers have a dispersed membership across the District.

Table M.1: Shooting and archery clubs facilities overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Shooting and Archery Club</th>
<th>Facilities (summarised)</th>
<th>Proposed Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Femside, Rangiora</td>
<td>North Canterbury Clay Target Association (Boundary Road, Femside)</td>
<td>• Club range and multiple facilities located on its own land in a rural area outside Rangiora  • No particular issues noted</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Aimtru Archers (Mandeville Sports Ground, Ohoka)</td>
<td>• Club maintains a range on the edge of the sports grounds,  • Located far away from any toilet facilities</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peak Use Levels and Demand Issues

Neither group indicated any demand or use issues other than toilet access for Aimtru Archers at Mandeville Sports Ground.

Overview of Assets

Basic activity facilities for the core activities appear suitable. However, some basic needs appear necessary to be addressed for Aimtru Archers.
Softball Clubs

Introduction

The Waimakariri Sport Facilities Survey identified only one softball club in Kaiapoi. Kaiapoi Softball Club indicated increasing membership, most of which was based in Kaiapoi. Membership demand was reported as being very high among children with a lot of T-ball activity due to limited club capacity to deliver more softball.

Facility Inventory

The facility inventory identified one softball club operating on a main site at Kaiapoi Park, with additional use of the adjacent Wylie Park. The club reported it had no purpose-built diamond, or clubroom access (including toilet and changing facilities), at either park.

Table N.1: Baseball/Softball club facilities overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Baseball/Softball Club</th>
<th>Facilities (summarised)</th>
<th>Proposed Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Softball Club</td>
<td>• Use of space at Kaiapoi Park and Wylie Park</td>
<td>• Local.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peak Use Levels and Demand Issues

High demand was reported, especially in junior age-groups, but capacity to meet demand appeared constrained due to lack of access to basic facilities. The group indicated high willingness to share facilities where possible, although it also advocated strongly for options to create better playing options (i.e. a diamond).

Overview of Assets

This code appears to have virtually no facility provision other than grassy field space. However other clubs do have facilities at the two respective sites. What appears to be lacking are any shared use agreements there, or any opportunity to develop more dedicated playing facilities.

The Regeneration Zone planning work has identified the need for two dirt diamonds in the Kaiapoi area.
Squash Clubs

Introduction

The Waimakariri Sport Facilities Survey identified four squash clubs and associated facilities. Two indicated static memberships while a third indicated a decline. All had their own clubrooms on leasehold land, generally associated with other sport and recreation activities or facilities. Membership was predominantly from their local communities. All noted relative lack of junior involvement in recent years, and Rangiora Squash noted increasing pay-for-play activity (rather than member-based).

Facility Inventory

The facility inventory identified four clubs and associated facilities.

Table T.1: Squash-based club facilities overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Squash Club</th>
<th>Facilities (summarised)</th>
<th>Proposed Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Squash Club (Kaiapoi High School)</td>
<td>• Club owns building/clubrooms on leasehold land.</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Court description not given</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>Rangiora Squash. (Dudley Park, Rangiora)</td>
<td>• Club owns building/clubrooms on leasehold land by the Rangiora Aquatic Centre.</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 2x courts (1 glass-back), lounge, changing rooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Mandeville Squash Club (Mandeville Sports Centre)</td>
<td>• 2x glass-back courts, and wider facilities available at the Mandeville Sports Club</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peak Use Levels and Demand Issues

No peak use or demand issues were noted. Pressure on committee members to undertake necessary regular upkeep and maintenance of facilities was noted. Kaiapoi noted its facilities provided basic play only, without any social component.

Overview of Assets

The squash clubs and facilities included here appeared to be relatively low profile. None indicated membership or participation growth, and additional information about the clubs was sparse. No facility problems were apparent, other than basic maintenance needs.
Introduction

The Waimakariri Sport Facilities Survey identified a total of 9 tennis clubs and associated facilities. None of the clubs indicated increasing membership, with the majority reporting only static membership. Decline was reported at several clubs (i.e. Kaiapoi Tennis Club, Swannanoa Tennis Club, North Canterbury Junior Tennis). Most clubs reported their memberships were based in their local towns, apart from North Canterbury Junior Tennis.

Facility Inventory

The facility inventory identified a total of 9 tennis clubs and associated facilities. Many were basic asphalt courts with minimal support facilities in small rural locations, largely functioning as open ‘community courts’. Some are more active clubs with larger memberships and facilities such as in Rangiora and Kaiapoi. But no significant hub facility was apparent.

Table S.1: Tennis clubs facilities overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Tennis/Other Racquet Sports Club</th>
<th>Facilities (summarised)</th>
<th>Proposed Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarkville</td>
<td>Clarkville Tennis Club (Rice Park, Clarkville)</td>
<td>• Community courts</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 2x asphalt courts in park beside local school and community hall.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femside</td>
<td>Femside Tennis Club (Femside Hall and School, Femside)</td>
<td>• Club has 4x asphalt courts associated with school and community hall</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Floodlights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Tennis Club (Damley Square, Kaiapoi)</td>
<td>• Club has clubrooms and courts on leasehold land.</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 6x plexipave court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Floodlights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• By Aquatic Centre and Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>Rangiora Tennis Club (King Street, Rangiora)</td>
<td>• Club owns building and court on its own land.</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 5x asphalt courts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sefton</td>
<td>Sefton Tennis Club (Sefton Domain, Sefton)</td>
<td>• Small pavilion</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 2x asphalt court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>Southbrook Tennis Club (1 Buckleys Road, Rangiora)</td>
<td>• Club owns building and court on own land.</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 4x asphalt courts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swannanoa</td>
<td>Swannanoa Tennis Club (Swannanoa Domain)</td>
<td>• 2x asphalt courts at domain by hall</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>Ohoka Tennis Club (Mandeville Sports Centre)</td>
<td>• 4x asphalt courts</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Access to facilities at Sports Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>North Canterbury Junior Tennis (n/a)</td>
<td>• Association uses various venues individually or in combination when required</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peak Use Levels and Demand Issues

There were no peak use or demand issues raised with general play. It was apparent from membership information that demand was currently static or declining. Most facility concerns related to maintenance and upkeep.

However, with respect to growing tennis and providing more competition and tournament opportunities, many clubs indicated their desire for some sort of District hub facility. North Canterbury Junior tennis noted that current clubrooms and courts are fine to host the fixtures that are currently held there, but that they must be split across several venues to do so. They considered
the District would benefit from having one hub facility, referring to comparable examples of centralised 16-court facilities in Ashburton (Mid Canterbury) and Blenheim (Marlborough). They noted that tennis groups had been discussing options. In that respect, the responses from Rangiora and Southbrook Tennis Clubs indicated that those clubs were actively exploring combining and building a 10 court Plexipave Tennis Centre, with 6 courts having lighting, and a clubroom at a proposed multisport hub on Coldstream Rd, Rangiora.

**Overview of Assets**

It appeared that asset maintenance was variable at the various locations, with considerable decline evident at a number of sites. In some sites the main facilities were simply basic asphalt courts for general free-play ‘community use’ rather than active club use. Some clubs noted that many smaller court venues around the District had courts in poor repair. These were not necessarily representing constraints to tennis, but response from North Canterbury Junior Tennis indicated that a structured hierarchy of facilities capable of supporting greater tennis development and growth in the District was not available. They indicated some tennis hub needs, which were reflected in concepts being developed by the Rangiora and Southbrook Tennis Clubs in particular.

Tennis courts are included in the Coldstream Road Master Plan.
**Water-Based Clubs**

**Introduction**

The Waimakariri Sport Facilities Survey identified two water-based clubs and associated facilities. One was the Waikuku Beach Surf Lifesaving Club and the other was the Waimakariri Sailing and Powerboat Club. Both drew members from across the District. Surf Club membership was reported as declining, while that of the Powerboat Club was increasing.

**Facility Inventory**

The facility inventory identified two water-based clubs and associated facilities at two sites. Both had clubrooms and boat storage and launching facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Water-Based Club</th>
<th>Facilities (summarised)</th>
<th>Proposed Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Waikuku | Waikuku Beach Surf Lifesaving Club.              | • Club owns building/clubrooms on leasehold land at the main public beach in the growing District.  
• Only really undertaking minor maintenance and improvement | Local.          |
| Kaiapoi | Waimakariri Sailing and Power Boat Club          | • Club owns building/clubrooms on its own land near river mouth.                       | Local.          |
|         | (Kairaki Beach, Waimakariri River)               | • Has a public launching ramp, but only shingle surface – wants to get it sealed along with additional space for parking and rigging |                 |

**Peak Use Levels and Demand Issues**

Waikuku Beach Surf Life Saving Club reported that they didn’t report any capacity-related issues such as their building being too small and consequently having insufficient space for storage, education classes and other member-based activities. However, it could be anticipated that public interest will increase given the site’s strategic location relative to large nearby subdivision developments and population projections in the Pegasus Woodend Area.

Waimakariri Sailing and Power Boat Club reported that their membership has been increasing. They reported potential capacity issues related to their boat ramp quality and availability of adjacent parking and rigging areas, plus boat storage. Like the Waikuku Beach Club, it could be anticipated that public interest will increase given the site’s strategic location relative to large nearby subdivision developments and population projections in the eastern Waimakariri Area.

**Overview of Assets**

Both clubs here reported asset development needs, although those at Waikuku Beach were aimed more at general maintenance; while those at the Waimakariri Club reflected anticipation of increased demand pressures. Given nearby population projections and their strategic locations and activities, both could be considered likely to experience increased demand.
Table Tennis Clubs

Introduction

The Waimakariri Sport Facilities Survey identified one Table Tennis group with three ‘clubs’. This was North Canterbury Table Tennis which operated out of three main sites, each with its own associated club. It indicated increasing membership, which was drawn from across the District.

Facility Inventory

The facility inventory identified one Table Tennis group operating out of three main sites, each of which represented a separate ‘club’.

Table N.1: Table tennis club facilities overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Baseball/Softball Club</th>
<th>Facilities (summarised)</th>
<th>Proposed Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>North Canterbury Table Tennis</td>
<td>• Each of these venues had its own associated table tennis club, representing the 3 main clubs in North Canterbury</td>
<td>• Local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Southbrook School Hall, Rangiora)</td>
<td>• Each location required pack in and out of tables for sessions, and related storage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Clarkville Hall, Clarkeville)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Oxford A&amp;P Showgrounds, Oxford)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peak Use Levels and Demand Issues

No demand pressures were noted.

Overview of Assets

There appears to be adequate facility availability for table tennis in its current locations, although there may be some areas where population size, or anticipated growth, may result in potential demand.
## APPENDIX TWO: BACKGROUND DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Top 20 growth areas - Projection based on the Statistics NZ Medium series figures (lower growth)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium series lower projection - Stats NZ</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2033</th>
<th>2038</th>
<th>2043</th>
<th>% change 2013-2043</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>586124 Pegasus</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>3,160</td>
<td>3,930</td>
<td>4,410</td>
<td>4,610</td>
<td>4,770</td>
<td>4,910</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586122 Lehmans</td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>3,420</td>
<td>3,950</td>
<td>4,460</td>
<td>4,960</td>
<td>3,180</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586504 Silverstream (Kaiapoi)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,360</td>
<td>2,320</td>
<td>5800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586409 Kaiapoi North East</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td>2,970</td>
<td>3,170</td>
<td>3,340</td>
<td>3,490</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586128 Ravenswood</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>18200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586603 Mandeville</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td>3,320</td>
<td>3,560</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>4,030</td>
<td>4,240</td>
<td>4,410</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586121 Fernside</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,650</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>3,310</td>
<td>1,410</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586120 Woodend</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>3,040</td>
<td>3,290</td>
<td>3,530</td>
<td>3,760</td>
<td>3,970</td>
<td>4,160</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586606 Eyrewell</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,180</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586303 Rangiora East</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>2,830</td>
<td>3,020</td>
<td>3,190</td>
<td>3,360</td>
<td>3,510</td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586605 West Eyreton</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>1,890</td>
<td>2,020</td>
<td>2,130</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586801 Ashley Gorge</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>2,330</td>
<td>2,420</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585807 Lobum</td>
<td>2,290</td>
<td>2,440</td>
<td>2,590</td>
<td>2,730</td>
<td>2,840</td>
<td>2,920</td>
<td>2,960</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586305 Kingsbury</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td>2,830</td>
<td>2,870</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585808 Ashley</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>1,630</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586802 Oxford</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td>2,270</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>2,410</td>
<td>2,450</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586127 Coldstream</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586126 Woodend Beach</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585806 Okuku</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586112 Waikuku</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Top 20 growth areas - Projection based on the WDC customised figures (higher growth)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customised higher projection - WDC</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2033</th>
<th>2038</th>
<th>2043</th>
<th>change 2013-2043</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>586124 Pegasus</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>3,415</td>
<td>4,320</td>
<td>4,890</td>
<td>5,155</td>
<td>5,395</td>
<td>5,615</td>
<td>4,505</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586122 Lehmans</td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td>2,415</td>
<td>3,040</td>
<td>3,670</td>
<td>4,295</td>
<td>4,915</td>
<td>5,535</td>
<td>3,755</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586504 Silverstream (Kaiapoi)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1,205</td>
<td>1,585</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>2,725</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>3,085</td>
<td>7713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586409 Kaiapoi North East</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>2,725</td>
<td>2,975</td>
<td>3,235</td>
<td>3,495</td>
<td>3,735</td>
<td>3,955</td>
<td>2,395</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586128 Ravenswood</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>2,155</td>
<td>2,145</td>
<td>21450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586603 Mandeville</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td>3,395</td>
<td>3,690</td>
<td>3,985</td>
<td>4,275</td>
<td>4,545</td>
<td>4,785</td>
<td>2,015</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586121 Fernside</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>2,225</td>
<td>2,560</td>
<td>2,895</td>
<td>3,230</td>
<td>3,550</td>
<td>3,840</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586120 Woodend</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>3,140</td>
<td>3,495</td>
<td>3,845</td>
<td>4,195</td>
<td>4,525</td>
<td>4,835</td>
<td>2,035</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586606 Eyrewell</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>1,695</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>2,170</td>
<td>2,415</td>
<td>2,655</td>
<td>2,895</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586303 Rangiora East</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>2,905</td>
<td>3,185</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>3,710</td>
<td>3,965</td>
<td>4,205</td>
<td>1,695</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586605 West Eyreton</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>1,715</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>2,110</td>
<td>2,305</td>
<td>2,485</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586801 Ashley Gorge</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>2,205</td>
<td>2,385</td>
<td>2,555</td>
<td>2,715</td>
<td>2,870</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585807 Lobum</td>
<td>2,290</td>
<td>2,495</td>
<td>2,690</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>3,050</td>
<td>3,190</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586305 Kingsbury</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,585</td>
<td>2,730</td>
<td>2,875</td>
<td>3,015</td>
<td>3,140</td>
<td>3,255</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585808 Ashley</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>1,835</td>
<td>1,955</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586802 Oxford</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>2,165</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>2,515</td>
<td>2,680</td>
<td>2,825</td>
<td>2,960</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586127 Coldstream</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586126 Woodend Beach</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585806 Okuku</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586112 Waikuku</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>1,405</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Summary of recommendations

A review of the district’s public toilet network has identified key issues to address, including the need for:

- standardised signage on public toilets
- better information about where public toilets are located, their accessibility and hours of operation
- a comprehensive set of levels of service for public toilets
- criteria to assess the need for new toilet provision and whether to renew, replace or decommission existing toilets
- guidelines to ensure best practice in the location and design of public toilets
- annual and 10 year programmed maintenance schedules to be developed
- a toilet renewals schedule to be developed
- the renewals budgets to be reorganised and increased in order to maintain LOS in the future
- existing public toilets to be made more accessible and safe where possible
- consideration to be given to the provision of new public toilets in key locations, particularly the Rangiora Town Centre.

Policy and Strategy Unit recommendations for the future management of Waimakariri District Council public toilets are as follows. Those recommendations that are priorities for Green Space staff have been incorporated into an action plan to be achieved over the next ten years.

Objective 1: Readily Available

1.1 Adopt the Assessment Guidelines for Public Toilet Infrastructure as a tool to use to assess and prioritise the need for new toilets and either refurbish, replace or decommission existing toilets.

1.2 Adopt the proposed levels of service for public toilet provision.

1.3 Consider the provision of additional public toilet cubicles during any redevelopment of the Rangiora Public Library and Rangiora Council Service Centre.

1.4 Bring forward $114,000 allocated in the LTP district toilet capital works budget in 2020/21 to 2018/19 to partially fund new toilets at Mandeville Domain.

1.5 Provide an additional $386,000 in the district toilets capital works budget over the next ten years to allow four new toilet blocks to be built to meet shortfalls in LOS and customer expectations.

1.6 Install new public toilets in the following locations:
   - Mandeville Domain
   - Millton Memorial Park, Rangiora
   - West Oxford Reserve, Oxford
   - Silverstream Reserve (East)
   - Sportsground- regeneration land
   - Coldstream Road sports area, Rangiora
   - Murphy Park, Kaiapoi.

1.7 Install new public toilets in new subdivision areas in accordance with the proposed levels of service.

1.8 Encourage developers to provide toilets for their customers within big box retail outlets or a hub of these outlets.

1.9 Seek out opportunities to provide new town centre toilets in partnership with business.

1.10 Hold discussions with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga, DOC and Ecan regarding the provision of toilets at Saltwater Creek, Coopers Creek and the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary.

1.11 Assess the need for an effluent dumping station to be provided in Woodend/Pegasus once the effect of the Woodend bypass is known.

1.12 Decommission the Kaiapoi Memorial Reserve toilet.

1.13 Carry out a toilet users’ survey prior to the refresh of this Strategy, to inform the Strategy about usage, and customer expectations and satisfaction.

1.14 Provide a port-a-loo at Pines Beach over the 2017/18 summer.
Objective 2: Inclusive Access

2.1 Provide for inclusive access in all new public toilets by working closely with the Building Unit and Waimakariri Access Group to ensure design specifications are appropriate.

2.2 Increase the overall accessibility of the public toilet stock by carrying out a joint Building Unit and Waimakariri Access Group audit of toilets with identified accessibility issues to determine minor changes that can be made and instigate a works programme for this.

2.3 Remove the accessibility signage on toilet blocks that do not meet the accessibility criteria, are not able to be easily modified and are not considered by the Waimakariri Access Group to be fully accessible.

2.4 Modify existing public toilets to facilitate inclusive access when renewing these facilities.

2.5 Discuss with the Waimakariri Access Group ways to promote the Dudley Park Aquatic Centre changing places room to potential users.

2.6 Investigate with the Waimakariri Access Group the adequacy of the slings provided for the pool hoist.

2.7 Liaise with the Waimakariri Access Group about improving the instructional signage for the equipment in the Dudley Park Aquatic Centre accessible changing facility.

2.8 Set up a system for pool staff to record the number of people (non-pool users) using the changing places room facility at the Dudley Park Aquatic Centre.

2.9 Consult with the Waimakariri Access Group prior to the renewal of the Victoria Park toilets.

2.10 Consider including improving the accessibility of the Council’s public toilet stock as a KPI in the 2018-28 Long Term Plan.

2.11 Take ease of use for people with mobility issues and young children, hygiene and appearance into account when choosing toilet seat design.

Objective 3: Easy to Find

3.1 Promote the location of public toilets through street and park signage and signage on toilet exteriors.

3.2 Provide an interactive map of the district’s public toilets on the Council’s website and ensure this is kept up to date as new toilets are developed.

3.3 Promote public toilets on digital signage located in Council service centres, libraries, pools and the Woodend Community Centre.

3.4 Design and implement, through natural attrition, a programme of sign replacements and standardisation of signs after consultation with the Waimakariri Access Group.

3.5 Adopt a minimum standard for the range of information to be provided on each toilet block as being:

- Standard gender symbols (including braille)
- International access symbol (where applicable)
- Council contact information
- Hours of operation
- Date toilet was last serviced
- QR code.

3.6 Provide effective, standardised, directional signage on the street for each facility, prioritising directional signage for town centre toilets.

3.7 Establish a QR code for Council public toilets.

3.8 Implement a system for providing up to date information about district toilets to key alternative websites such as toiletmap.co.nz and camping.co.nz and other information providers such as ENC.

3.9 Provide ENC with a grant of $1,500 for the development of a district wide map to be displayed in town information kiosks, depicting the locations of public toilets and other Council facilities.

Objective 4: Fit For Purpose

4.1 Adopt the 100 Year Toilet Renewal Programme and associated budget for inclusion in the Green Space Activity Management Plan and 2018 Infrastructure Strategy.

4.2 Reorganise and increase the toilets renewal budget allocation of approx. $106,000 pa to $150,000 for 2018/19 and then $250,000 every following two years until 2027-28 to allow one existing toilet block to be renewed bi-annually.

4.3 Add optimising the 100 year toilet renewal programme to the Green Space AMP 2017 Improvement Plan.

4.4 Carry out a comprehensive condition audit of all public toilets every 9 years in conjunction with the Long Term Plan and Infrastructure Strategy planning cycle.

Objective 5: Sustainable

5.1 Ensure public toilets are well-designed and built using robust, high quality, vandal-resistant materials and fixtures that reflect the character of their setting.

5.2 Utilise a consistent suite of fittings and fixtures in public toilets that are easy to clean, maintain and replace and difficult to damage.
5.3 Implement Environmentally Sustainable Design principles in planning, design, procurement and maintenance of public toilet facilities.

5.4 Consider changing toilet roll holders to a standardised, robust design.

Objective 6: Clean

6.1 Carry out a contract variation to increase the cleaning frequency of the Woodend Recreation Ground toilet.

6.2 Consider using toilet counters to check cleaning schedules are appropriate for high-use toilets that receive a higher than average number of maintenance-related service requests.

Objectives 7: Well Maintained

7.1 Instigate an annual minor works building maintenance programme, consisting of regular inspections and scheduled maintenance, for items such as electrical inspections, roof moss removal and septic tank cleaning.

7.2 Consider contracting out a programmed maintenance schedule for public toilet painting that provides for a complete repaint of each painted toilet block every 10 years.

7.3 Develop a ten year programme of planned public toilet maintenance to ensure all building elements retain, as a minimum, a ‘good’ condition rating (as per Xyst audit criteria), prioritising the repair work identified for Warren Community Reserve, Sefton Domain and Woodend Beach Domain.

Objectives 8: Safe to Use

8.1 Adopt CPTED principles, including the use of a checklist, for the development and management of public toilet facilities.

8.2 Where practicable, make existing public toilets that have been identified with shortcomings in relation to safety and security, compliant with CPTED principles.

8.3 Consider engaging a colour consultant to prepare a colour scheme/s for standard concrete block toilets.

8.4 Consider carrying out a contract variation to amend the wording of the reporting specifications in Contract No.16/51 District Parks and Reserves Maintenance to specify reporting of damaged privacy latches.

8.5 Limit over time, the availability of public toilets to daylight hours, except for town centre toilets, by installing electronic locking systems on all new and renewed toilet blocks.

8.6 Consider upgrading CCTV and installing lighting to illuminate the rear of the Victoria Park toilets in conjunction with renewing this block.
Executive summary

This Strategy is intended to provide direction to Council for achieving its vision of ‘providing residents and visitors to the district with convenient access to a well maintained, fit for purpose, safe and attractive public toilet network’.

The Strategy covers all of the public toilets provided by the Council, or in partnership with the Council, apart from those that are generally restricted to the users of a community building, for example, most sports pavilions and community halls. The exception to this is the public toilet provided at the Oxford Service Centre which became available after the completion of this Strategy.

The Council acknowledges the significant role some of the businesses located within the district play in providing toilet facilities for their customers and would like to encourage private provision of customer toilets in all of the smaller shopping centres emerging in new subdivision areas and big box retail/business hubs. The Council also seeks opportunities for further private/public partnerships because of the greater safety, security and hygiene these arrangements can offer.

The role of other agencies, such as DOC and Ecan, in providing public toilets in recreation areas within the district is also acknowledged.

Of the 62 public toilets included in the Strategy, 60 are provided directly by Council and two are located within privately-owned buildings. The Council’s toilet stock is relatively young with 68% being less than 20 years old. This is due to Council efforts to significantly upgrade its public toilets after the adoption of the first strategy in 1996 and the addition of 25 toilets to cater for rapid population growth. Most of these toilets are provided in neighbourhood reserves or sport and recreation parks.

Toilet usage as reported in the Council’s customer satisfaction surveys has remained relatively constant between 2001 and 2013 with 63% of those surveyed in 2013 saying they used them. Over this period more survey respondents used public toilets than any other type of Green Space provision.

While satisfaction with public toilet provision has risen by 14% between 2001 and 2016, dissatisfaction has been much more variable. Currently dissatisfaction rates (22%) are at a similar high to that identified in 2001, mainly due to dissatisfaction with the lack of public toilets in the Rangiora town centre and the condition of the Victoria Park toilets. The need for more toilets to be provided in parks to keep up with population growth was also highlighted as an issue.

Comprehensive levels of service have been developed as part of this Strategy for public toilet levels and standards of provision to assist Council to plan for an estimated population increase of 34,812 people within the next thirty years. Assessment criteria for determining and prioritising need have also been developed.

The need for an additional 23 toilet blocks to be built within the next 10 years has been identified to cover shortfalls in existing provision and cater for growth.

A 100 year toilet renewal programme has been developed which has identified the need for the toilet renewals budget to be doubled within 20 years’ time to allow standards to be maintained. A budget increase equivalent to $9,000 pa is being sought for the next 20 years to cover increased building costs.

An independent audit of toilet facilities carried out in 2015 concluded Council toilets were well maintained and in good condition overall, although a number of minor faults were found. An analysis of toilet-related service requests received over the past three years identified 40% were requests for repairs. Implementing a system of programmed maintenance would allow public toilets to be more pro-actively managed.

Other key issues identified in the Strategy are the need to make people more aware of the availability of public toilets and the overall lack of accessibility of the toilet stock. Comprehensive recommendations have been made to address these issues, including asking the Waimakariri Access Group for specialist advice on both the provision of signage and toilet/fixtures design and layout.

Sustainability will become more of an issue going into the future and this is addressed as is the need to make public toilets safer and more user friendly by adopting the use of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles.
**Introduction**

**Key Demographic Trends**

- The district's population has grown rapidly over the past 15 years and is expected to continue to increase until 2048.
- The population is older than New Zealand as a whole and will continue to age.
- People aged 65+ and children younger than 15 years make up a significant proportion of the population. These groups require good access to public toilets.

**Waimakariri District Area**

The Waimakariri District covers approximately 225,000 hectares, extending from Pegasus Bay in the east to the Puketeraki Range in the west and bordered to the north by the Hurunui District. The major urban areas of Rangiora and Kaiapoi are located within commuting distance of Christchurch City. Smaller towns exist at Woodend, Oxford and Pegasus and there are beach settlements at Waikuku, Woodend, The Pines and Kairaki beaches. Waimakariri has retained its rural/small town character with just over one-third of ratepayers living in rural areas and rural villages located at Cust, Sefton, Ohoka and Tuahiwi.

Waimakariri has had an increasing population trend over the last twenty years and this has equated to a population increase of 75% from 33,000 in 1996 to 57,800 in 2016, or an additional 24,800 people. During this period the average growth rate for the district has been 2.7% compared with an overall growth rate for New Zealand of 1.2%.

Over the past fifteen years the district has been one of the fastest growing districts in New Zealand and the Council has adopted a medium population growth scenario for its 2018-2048 infrastructure planning. This assumes a projected population of 96,996 people by 2048.

The district’s population is expected to continue to age with the median age of residents predicted to increase to 48.5 years by 2048. In another ten years’ time, just under a third of the population is expected to be aged 65 and over (29.9%).

Both the increase in population and population demographics are likely to place further demands on the district for public toilet facilities. Visitor numbers are also expected to increase.

**Table 1: Population projections 2018 to 2048**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Est pop 2018</th>
<th>Est pop 2048</th>
<th>Pop increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>18,347</td>
<td>30,063</td>
<td>11,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>10,607</td>
<td>15,132</td>
<td>4,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend/Pegasus</td>
<td>5,593</td>
<td>12,116</td>
<td>6,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>3,693</td>
<td>1,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small towns &amp; beach settlements</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>1,921</td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>24,105</td>
<td>34,071</td>
<td>9,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>62,184</strong></td>
<td><strong>96,996</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,812</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Public toilets defined**

This Strategy confines itself to the consideration of toilet facilities that are provided either directly by Council or in partnership with Council, and which are available for the general public to use when the facilities are open. This includes those located in parks, on streets, in some Council-managed public buildings and in town centres.

**Why Provide Public Toilets?**

Public toilets within the district provide convenience for residents, workers and visitors of all ages and abilities.
People usually need a public toilet when they are away from their home for an hour or more, and where no public toilet facilities are provided as part of another building.

A lack of public toilets is most acutely felt by groups with specific needs such as older people, people living with impairments or health problems, and families with young children. For these groups, a lack of convenient and accessible toilets may impact negatively on their quality of life, mobility, or dignity by restricting freedom of travel to and within the district. Some may avoid or be reluctant to travel or take part in social activities where public facilities are lacking.

The provision of public toilet facilities at parks and open spaces optimises the benefits of open space for a range of recreational pursuits including active sports and children’s play. Public toilets attract more families to use parks and encourage longer visits.

The quality and usability of the district’s central business areas is also enhanced by the provision of public toilets.

The Council promotes healthy lifestyles such as walking, cycling and enjoying natural environments. The vision of the Walking and Cycling Strategy 2017-2022 adopted by Council in 2017 is that:

‘Waimakariri residents choose to walk and cycle.
The environment is friendly, safe and accessible for walkers and cyclists.’

Infrastructure, such as public toilets, is needed to support this vision and a key goal of the Walking and Cycling Strategy is ‘providing and advocating for new and extended on-off road walking and cycling infrastructure’.

Active transport goals can also be supported by the provision of public toilets at key connection points such as park and ride facilities.

Legislation

The main statutes relating to the provision of toilet facilities for the public are as follows:

- Local Government Act 2002
- Health Act 1956
- Resource Management Act 1991
- Health and Safety in Employment Act 1993

Other Acts such as the Reserves Act 1977 and Human Rights Act 1993 are also relevant.

Local Government Act 2002 (LGA)

The LGA 2002 provides a framework and powers that enable local authorities to play a broad role in promoting the well-being of their communities. It requires the Council:

‘to meet the current and future needs of communities 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.’

Sections 124 to 126 require the Council to carry out an assessment of sanitary services within the district from time to time. The Act defines sanitary services as having the same meaning as in the Health Act 1956. Section 25 (1) (d) of the Health Act 1956 includes ‘Public conveniences for the use of the public’ as a sanitary work.

Section 126 states the purpose of the assessment is:

‘to consider from a public health perspective, the adequacy of water and other sanitary services available to communities within a territorial authority’s district, in light of -

(a) the health risks to communities arising from any absence of, or deficiency in, water or other sanitary services; and

(b) the quality of services currently available to communities within the district; and

(c) the current and estimated future demands for such services

Section 17A requires local authorities to review the cost-effectiveness of current arrangements for meeting the needs of local communities for good-quality infrastructure.

Section 101B requires local authorities to prepare an Infrastructure Strategy for a period of at least 30 consecutive financial years. This Council has decided to include Green Space assets in its Infrastructure Strategy.

Health Act 1956

Section 23 of the Health Act 1956 places a duty on every local authority to improve, promote and protect public health within its district. This involves identifying potential health risks and ensuring these are managed within acceptable levels.

Section 25 also requires a local authority to provide public toilets (and other sanitary services) for the benefit of its district.

NZ Building Act 2004

The NZ Building Act 2004 provides the framework for regulatory controls specified in detail in the NZ Building Code 1992 and outlines the process and responsibilities of various parties regarding the design, construction, maintenance and control of buildings.

Reference is made to sanitary services and Council’s ability to require works to be completed or buildings to be closed down if they are considered to be insanitary. A building is considered to be insanitary for the purposes of the Act (Section 123) if it:

(a) is offensive or likely to be injurious to health because-

(i) of how it is situated or constructed; or

-
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(ii) it is in a state of disrepair; or
(b) has insufficient or defective provisions against moisture penetration so as to cause dampness in the building or in any adjoining building; or
(c) does not have a supply of potable water that is adequate for intended use; or
(d) does not have sanitary facilities that are adequate for its intended use.

NZ Building Code 1992
The NZ Building Code 1992 sets out performance standards that buildings must meet. The key areas applicable to public toilets are G1 Personal Hygiene and G 13 Foul Water. Provisions within G1 control the number of units and the layout required to comply with the code and G13 dictates the size of the plumbing systems.

Other relevant sections are B1 Structure, B2 Durability, D1 Access Routes, E2 External Moisture, E3 Internal Moisture, G4 Ventilation, G9 Artificial Light, G9 Electricity, G10 Piped Services and G12 Water Supplies.

New Zealand Standards
Standards are commonly used to determine acceptable solutions along with those detailed in the NZ Building Code Handbook.

NZS 4241: 1999, Public Toilets. This document was created in 1999 to provide a nationwide guide to best practice standards for the provision of all public toilets.

AS/NZS 1158, Category C - lighting of outdoor public areas, other than roads, where the visual requirements of pedestrians are dominant. This document specifies the interior of public toilets will be adequately lit as will the curtilages of after-hours public toilets.


AS/NZS 1730: 1996 - Washbasins
AS/NZS 3982: 1996 – Urinals

Resource Management Act 1991
This Act sets the parameters for sustainable management of the use, development and protection of natural resources in a way, or at a rate which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. It requires the adverse effects of activities to be avoided, mitigated or remedied and compliance with planning documents such as regional and district plans.

Public toilets are considered a utility structure under the Waimakariri District Council District Plan and generally designed to meet the exemption criteria. Special provisions may apply in some areas triggering the need for a resource consent to be obtained, for example, a silent file area. A resource consent is required from the Council for the installation of a septic tank in residential areas. Consent to locate a septic tank in rural areas may be required from Ecan.

Reserves Act 1977
Public toilets are not mandatory in reserves but the Act provides for their development. Like other activities and structures on reserves, the provision of public toilets should be in line with the reserve management plan for the reserve.

Human Rights Act 1993
This Act prohibits discrimination on the grounds of sex, race, disability, sexual orientation and family status, including care of children or other dependants.

Community Outcomes
The Waimakariri District’s Council’s vision is:
‘to make Waimakariri a great place to be, in partnership with our communities guided by our outcomes, through the following roles:

1. As a service provider
2. As a funder of activities by others
3. As an advocate on behalf of our community
4. As a regulator under legislation.

The community outcomes directly and indirectly relevant to the provision of public toilets are as follows:

GOVERNANCE
a. 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

b. 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
Opportunities for collaboration and partnerships are actively pursued. 1,2,3,4

ENVIRONMENT
c. There is a safe environment for all
Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised. 1,2,3,4
d. There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all
Harm to people from natural and man-made hazards is minimised. 1,2,3,4

PLACES AND SPACES

\[\text{g. Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality}\]
There is a wide variety of public places and spaces to meet people’s needs. 1,2,3,4
The accessibility of community and recreation facilities meets the changing needs of our community. 1,2,3,4

\[\text{h. The distinctive character of our takiwā - towns, villages and rural areas is maintained}\]
The centres of our towns are safe, convenient and attractive places to visit and do business. 1,2,3,4

\[\text{i. People are friendly and caring, creating a strong sense of community in our District}\]
There are wide-ranging opportunities for people of different ages, abilities and cultures to participate in community life and recreational activities. 1,2,3

**Context**

The Toilet Strategy is intended to provide strategic direction for the development and management of the Council’s public toilets over the next ten years. The Strategy feeds into the Green Space Activity Management Plan which in turn contributes to the Infrastructure Strategy and 2018-2028 Long Term Plan. It also contributes to the achievement of objectives in other Council strategies such as the Walking and Cycling Strategy 2017-2022 and the Waimakariri Accessibility Strategy 2017.

The following diagram shows the relationship between these documents.
Vision and objectives

Vision

The Waimakariri District Council’s vision for public toilets is: ‘to provide residents and visitors to the district with convenient access to a well maintained, fit for purpose, safe and attractive public toilet network.’

Key Objectives

1. **Readily Available**
Public toilet facilities will be conveniently distributed and open at times to meet likely demand and support community life and visitor activity.

2. **Inclusive Access**
New and upgraded public toilets will promote access to all people, regardless of age, gender and ability.

3. **Easy to find**
The district’s public toilet network will be well promoted to the community and visitors through the provision of current, easily understood and readily available information.

4. **Fit for purpose**
New and upgraded public toilets will be attractive, well designed and built using robust, vandal-resistant materials and fixtures that reflect the character of their setting and ensure they are fit for purpose.

5. **Sustainable**
Toilet design, maintenance and management will take into account principles of ecologically sustainable development, including whole of life costs.

6. **Clean**
Cleaning schedules will be appropriate to the site and usage and will ensure toilets are desirable to use while achieving a balance between affordability and community expectations (as measured by a decrease in dissatisfaction rates in the Council’s tri-annual Customer Satisfaction Survey).

7. **Well maintained**
Toilets will be maintained to a standard that achieves a good balance between affordability and meeting public expectations (as measured by a decrease in dissatisfaction rates in the Council’s tri-annual Customer Satisfaction Survey).

The planned maintenance programme will ensure all building elements retain, as a minimum, a ‘good’ condition rating (as per Xyst audit criteria)

8. **Safe to use**
New public toilet facilities will meet best practice principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED).

Existing public toilets will be managed in a way that ensures they feel as safe and welcoming to users as possible.

High quality bespoke toilet at Pines Oval, Pines Beach
Key Trends

- Toilets are provided in the district by both the private and public sector and future partnerships between the two are encouraged.
- The Council currently provides 60 public toilets, and another two indirectly, throughout the district and 3 effluent dumping stations.
- The Council’s toilet stock is relatively young with 68% being less than 20 years old.
- Most of the toilets are provided either on neighbourhood reserves or sport and recreation parks.
- Nearly two-thirds of the public toilets are open for use 24/7.
- The toilets located on sportsgrounds have the least restricted access.
- Toilets servicing the town centres have the most restricted access with only the toilets in Oxford and Woodend being open after 10pm.

While not included in the Strategy, it is acknowledged that the public toilets provided by the Council in the town centres are supplemented by those provided by retail outlets such as McAlpines Mitre 10, Pak’n’Save, the Warehouse, restaurants and some cafes for their customers. Service stations have also traditionally provided public toilets for travellers.

Public toilets are also provided in natural areas by other agencies. A key public toilet provider within the district is the Department of Conservation (DOC) which provides 14 toilets in or associated with the huts on DOC reserves. Road end toilets are provided at View Hill, Glentui, Wooded Gully and the Grey River. Environment Canterbury also provides public toilet blocks in the Waimakariri River Regional Park at Kaiapoi Island and at McIntoshes, a popular fishing spot.

The Community Green Space Activity Management Plan 2012 defines public toilets as ‘toilets that are open for use to the general public’.

Toilets provided by the Council in sports pavilions and community buildings have therefore not been included in this Strategy unless there is external access to the facilities, as their use tends to be restricted to the building users.

Likewise, toilets in commercial buildings have not been taken into account as they are only available for the public to use during business hours and are generally only provided for the business’s customers. The exception to this is the public toilet provided within the Rangiora New World supermarket which was provided under a public/private partnership arrangement.

The Council also contributed financially to the upgrade of the public toilets in the privately owned North Canterbury Cricket Association Pavilion at Mainpower Oval.

While this Strategy primarily focuses on the public toilet facilities it controls, the Council remains committed to...
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working in partnership and collaboration with other providers to enhance the planning, provision, servicing and promotion of the network for the benefit of all community members.

Although the majority (94%) of the 62 public toilets are managed by the Council’s Green Space Unit, public toilets provided at the Rangiora Public Library and Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre are managed by the Council’s District Library Service. The public toilets in the Council’s Rangiora Service Centre are managed by the Property Unit and the New World toilets are managed by the supermarket.

The Council has been progressively upgrading its public toilet network since the first toilet strategy was prepared in 1996. The original strategy was prepared for reserves and town centre toilets;

“in response to the belief that the public toilets provided in the Waimakariri District are generally of poor quality and that many important locations have no toilet facility at all.”

An additional 25 toilets have been added to the Green Space Unit’s portfolio over the last 20 years to cater for the rapid increase in population. Improvements listed in 2000 and 2005 public toilet strategy revisions have also been carried out resulting in the replacement or refurbishment of many of the old toilet blocks. As a result 42 (68%) of the toilets are less than twenty years old.

Locations of Public Toilets

Distribution

The following table shows the distribution of Waimakariri District Council public toilets across the district. The two main towns have the most toilets as could be expected but provision along the coastal strip is also significant at 11%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of toilets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of District</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaches</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend/Pegasus</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Number of toilets by location

Effluent dumping stations are provided in Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Oxford.

Parks & Reserves

All but one of the public toilets are provided on land managed by the Green Space Unit with 21 (34%) facilities located on neighbourhood reserves and 20 (33%) on sport and recreation parks. Eight (13%) are located on natural parks and 6 (10%) on civic spaces. Provision on other types of parks is negligible.

Graph 3: Toilet provision by park category

Council Service Centres and Libraries

Toilets within the Rangiora District Library and Ruataniwha Civic Centre provide convenient access to well-maintained, safe and secure facilities during library opening hours. There is also a public toilet at the Council’s Rangiora Service Centre. The toilets in these three buildings are very well used by members of the public either visiting the facilities or using the town centres.

Town Centre Toilets

In addition to those listed above and the Rangiora New World toilets, the Rangiora Town Centre is serviced by toilets at Victoria Park, the Rangiora War Memorial Hall and the Rangiora Town Hall. The Kaiapoi Town Centre is serviced by four toilet blocks, one on each side of the Kaiapoi River where it is bisected by the Williams Street Bridge. Locations are the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre, Tom Ayers Reserve, Kaiapoi Memorial Reserve and Trousselot Park. The Woodend Town Centre toilets are the only public toilets located on the street and the Oxford Town Centre toilets occupy the same site as the Oxford Service Centre.
Town centre toilets in the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre
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Operational Hours
Just under two-thirds (60%) of the public toilets are open 24/7. The Woodend and Oxford Town Centre toilets are open 24/7 but the Kaiapoi and Rangiora Town Centre toilets opening hours vary between 5am and 9am and closing hours between 5pm and 10pm.

The opening hours of the other public toilets with restricted access vary between 5am to 6am and the closing hours between 9 and 10 pm. The most common hours of public access are 6am to 9pm.

The following table shows the level of restricted access for toilets located on different types of reserves. Sportsgrounds toilets generally have the less restricted access while toilets serving the town centres, and those located on public gardens and civic spaces, have the most restricted access.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserve category</th>
<th>Number with restricted hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Reserves</td>
<td>8 out of 21 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>3 out of 8 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>4 out of 20 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public gardens</td>
<td>2 out of 2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural heritage</td>
<td>1 out of 2 (50 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation &amp; ecological linkages</td>
<td>1 out of 1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic space</td>
<td>5 out of 6 (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape</td>
<td>0 out of 1 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1 out of 2 (50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Restricted toilet open hours by reserve category

Xyst Public Toilet Assessment 2015
Xyst, an asset management consultancy, was engaged by the Council in 2015 to carry out a complete performance audit of 52 of its public toilets. This audit excluded the town centre toilets provided in the service centres, Rangiora Town Hall and Rangiora Public Library. New toilets built since this date have not been audited.

Key findings from the audit are as follows:

Service Levels
- Maintenance and cleaning standards are very good
- Graffiti management is excellent
- New facilities are well designed
- Standard designs are well utilised
- There is some duplication of toilet locations

Condition
- Overall toilets are well maintained and generally in good condition
- 38% are in excellent condition overall, 51% in very good condition and only 11% (6) are in average condition
- No toilets were in poor condition overall but three had elements (roof, walls or floor) which were in poor condition

Accessibility
- Only seven toilets (13%) were considered to be fully compliant

Services
- Very few baby tables (5)
- Inconsistent provision of services such as soap dispensers (8), sanitary disposal bins (6) and hand drying
- Hand drying not generally provided (38). Electric dryer provided at 10 toilets and paper towels at 4 – no apparent rationale
- Toilet roll holders inconsistent design and light weight construction

Signs
- Generally very poor or non-existent
- No standard design reflecting poorly on Council image
- Generally no contact information for faults
- Poor directional signage (only 25% sign posted from street)
- No standard toilet symbols at 23 % of toilets

Recommendations
- Close Kaiapoi Memorial Reserve toilet now a new facility has been built at Trousselot Park
- Implement a programme of sign replacements and standardisation of signs
- Develop service levels for category of toilets detailing services to be provided at each level
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- Implement a programme of accessibility and safety improvements
- Remove redundant toilet tissue dispensers and standardise roll holder with a more durable metal unit
- Investigate corrosion issues on 'Landmark' toilet steel frames and implement building maintenance/painting programme for Landmark toilets.

These recommendations are supported by this Strategy.
Public toilet usage

Key Trends

- In the 2013 Customer Satisfaction Survey more people used public toilets than any other type of community facility
- Reported usage of public toilets has declined slightly since 2001 but at a lesser rate than for any other type of park or community facility
- Most respondents used public toilets less than 12 times a year
- More people with children used public toilets than any other group
- However, people in all the other age groupings also used public toilets and there was little variation in the numbers doing so
- All of the parks listed by people as their favourite parks have public toilets apart from the Millton Memorial Park
- 24 toilets have been identified as high use toilets. These include all of the town centre toilets
- Most of the district’s visitors are day trippers from Christchurch

Visitors to the District

The impact of visitors to the district on toilet usage and demand is unknown. Data is available from Stats NZ (commercial accommodation monitor) and MBIE (the regional tourism spend) but this is collated on a regional basis. Regional visitor numbers are increasing and it is reasonable to expect a proportion of the increase will be visiting Waimakanini. In addition to the larger commercial accommodation suppliers, over 100 B&B and AirBnB operate in the district.

Most of the district’s visitors are day trippers from Christchurch. It is assumed these people will be using the toilets supplied at their destination points, although some popular visitor destinations, such as Saltwater Creek and West Oxford Reserve, do not have toilets.

There is no obvious comfort stop location for visitors passing through, such as the toilets provided at Cheviot although the development occurring at Ravenswood/Woodend may influence this in the future.

Social Conditions

Social conditions which contribute to increased demand at some locations include homelessness, public drinking and persons refused entry or ejected from bars. These don’t appear to be issues in this district at the moment.

Tri-Annual Customer Satisfaction Surveys

Since 2001 the Council has conducted a tri-annual district-wide customer satisfaction survey of 600 randomly selected households. These surveys provide some information about residents’ use of public toilets but this question was deleted from the 2016 Customer Satisfaction Survey.

In 2013 public toilets were used by more respondents to the survey (62.9%) than community halls/meeting rooms or any type of park. However, they were used less frequently than parks and community facilities, with 43.1 percent of respondents using them less than 12 times a year. These findings indicate that while people do use public toilets, they only tend to use them if they are ‘caught short’.

More households with children responding to the 2013 survey used parks and community facilities, including toilets, than those without children but there was the least variation in levels of toilet use between the three different household composition groupings; 59.5% (all adult households- 60 years plus), 59.2% (all adults under 60 years), 68.9% (households with children). This shows that while families with young children may have more of a specific need for toilets, demand is not particularly age-related, ‘when you need to go, you need to go’.

The reported use of public toilets increased slightly from 65.8 percent in 2001 to 71 percent in 2007 and then declined to a low of 62.9 percent in 2013. While there was an overall decrease in the reported use of public toilets of 2.9 percent between 2010 and 2013, this was the smallest decline in usage across all of the types of parks and community facilities surveyed, and within the statistical margin of error.
Respondents to the 2013 survey were asked to list the public toilets they typically used. Some respondents didn’t specify particular toilets but said they used public toilets located in Rangiora (29) and Kaiapoi (21). Others said they used whatever toilet happened to be in the vicinity when they needed one (19) and a few said they used toilets in parks (5).

A total of 29 different toilet blocks were listed by respondents and these included town centre toilets, toilets in parks and toilets at the beaches. Only eleven of these toilets were listed by more than five respondents.

Seven of the top rating toilets were toilets that served a town centre function reinforcing the popularity of town centre toilets. One toilet block was located on a popular natural park in Rangiora, another on a neighbourhood reserve servicing a community catchment area in Kaiapoi and two were located at the beaches.

A number of respondents who used the toilets at the Rangiora Service Centre and the Rangiora District Library said they did so because they ‘were nicer and cleaner to use’ than the other public toilets available and this could explain the popularity of these toilets to some extent.

People were also asked which parks they typically used. Those listed by more than 30 respondents are shown in the table below. All of these parks have toilets blocks located on them. Responses for other parks were 23 or less.

### Table 4: Top five parks typically used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of park typically used</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook Park (including dog park)</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Park</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant Park</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matawai Park</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Gorge Reserve</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents to the 2016 Customer Satisfaction Survey were asked which their household’s favourite park was. Victoria Park (51) was the only one of the parks listed above that was specifically mentioned. Other favourite parks were Pegasus Lake and parks (18), Pearson Park in Oxford (16) and the Rangiora dog parks (15). Of these, the Millton Memorial Reserve dog park does not have a public toilet and three reserves in Pegasus have public toilets located on them.

### Service Requests

The Council received 178 service requests over two years from 1 July 2015 and 30 June 2017 for 68% (42) of the public toilet blocks. While other factors, such as high levels of vandalism at particular sites, influence the number of service requests received, there is a correlation between levels of use and maintenance requirements.

The following table shows that 11 toilet blocks received more than 5 service requests each during this period. All of the stand-alone blocks servicing the town centres received a higher than average number of service requests as did all but the newest toilet block servicing Pegasus Town.

Dudley Park toilets received the most service requests because of vandalism. Two very popular parks in
Rangiora also received more service requests. The toilet blocks without service requests were predominantly those located on sportsgrounds or on community parks located in rural areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toilet blocks with more than 5 service requests</th>
<th>Number of service requests 1/7/15 to 30/6/17</th>
<th>Cleaning schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dudley Park, Rangiora</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3 x week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Park, Rangiora</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Town Centre</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Town Centre</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Lake</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Bay Beach Carpark</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>daily(summer) 3 x week (off season)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trousselot Park, Kaiapoi</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Ayers Reserve, Kaiapoi</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant Park, Rangiora</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3 x week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matawai Park, Rangiora</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3 x week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanaka Reserve, Pegasus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3 x week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Toilet blocks with the most service requests

Cleaning Schedules

The cleaning schedules are intended to reflect expected levels of use. All of the toilet blocks that are cleaned daily are town centre toilets apart from the Pegasus Lake toilet. The latter is located next to a very popular destination playground and lake and therefore attracts a high level of use. The coastal reserve toilets are cleaned daily in summer and 3 x week off season apart from the Ashley River Mouth toilet which is cleaned 3 x week all year round. The Ashley Gorge Reserve toilet’s cleaning schedule is also organised on a seasonal basis.

The eight other toilets identified as high-use are cleaned 3 x week. While four of these blocks (Dudley Park, Elephant Park, Matawai Park and Wanaka Reserve) received more than an average number of service requests, the majority of these were for vandalism or other repairs.

Green Space Team Observations

The data from the customer satisfaction surveys, service requests and cleaning schedules is consistent with the observations of those managing these assets. In addition to those already identified, toilet blocks Green Space staff regard as high use are as follows:

- Kairaki Beach
- Ashley Picnic Grounds, Rangiora

Fluctuations in Use

Levels of use of the toilets located at the beaches and in natural parks such as Ashley Gorge Reserve can be variable with seasonal fluctuations and periods of high demand. Use of sportsground toilets is also variable with peaks in demand when games or events are on. Use of toilets located on other types of reserves can vary between high (popular playgrounds, town centre toilets) and low levels of use but is likely to be more consistent.

Toilet Counters

No data on actual levels of use for each toilet block has been collected. Levels of use can impact significantly on maintenance and servicing requirements and installing counters in the toilets thought to be receiving a high level of use, such as the town centre toilets, could be useful. This would help the Council to assess the need for additional toilets to be provided and ensure cleaning schedules are appropriate.

While counters could be installed in toilets thought to be underutilised it is unlikely confirmation of this would result in closures as many of these are located in rural areas where reserve users are unlikely to have other alternatives. The results would also be unlikely to impact on cleaning regimes as most of these toilets blocks currently receive minimal servicing.

Counters on toilets located on a particular reserve type could be useful to predict likely demand during any future revision of Council toilet provision levels of service, for example, whether public toilets should be provided in neighbourhood reserves with a local catchment. This information would be indicative only as demand can be very site specific.

High Use Toilets

While public toilets located in sports parks are likely to attract high levels of use when sports are being played and there are fluctuations in use for popular picnic spots, the 24 public toilets that were consistently identified as being high use are shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of high use toilets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Park, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Service Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Public Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora New World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Town Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Town Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Ayers Reserve, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of high use toilets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi War Memorial Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trousselot Park, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coastal Reserves</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kairaki Beach (seasonal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach (seasonal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Beach (seasonal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Beach Car Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Reserves</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Picnic Grounds, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley Park, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant Park, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matawai Park, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook Park (incl. dog park), Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinemoa Park, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Park, Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Gorge Reserve (seasonal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanaka Reserve, Pegasus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: High use toilet blocks
Customer satisfaction & expectations

Key Trends and Issues

- Since 2001 satisfaction with public toilets has steadily increased to 60%
- In 2016 residents were more dissatisfied with public toilets than any other type of community facility provided by the Council
- Dissatisfaction has increased significantly since a low in 2013 and is now at its highest recorded level since 2001
- The standard and cleanliness of public toilets across the district was an issue for people. A key change requested was cleaner, better maintained, more user friendly toilets
- The change people most wanted to see for parks and community facilities was more public toilets to be provided, particularly in Rangiora, including a new toilet block in the town centre
- The standard and cleanliness of the Victoria Park toilets attracted the most criticism
- Upgrades were also requested for the Oxford town centre and Dudley Park toilets and a new toilet was requested at Pines Beach
- The majority of the toilet-related service requests received by the Council over the last three years have been for repairs and maintenance

The main ways the Council finds out about customer expectations around public toilets is through:
- Tri-annual customer satisfaction surveys
- Service requests/complaints
- Contractor feedback
- Requests to Council and/or community boards

Tri-annual Customer Satisfaction Surveys

The Council’s latest Customer Satisfaction Survey was carried out in November 2016. The 486 households participating in the survey represent 1,295 people and are mostly comparable with the 2013 Census data for the District as a whole. Exceptions are one person households which are under represented by 6.3% and the age distribution of some households. Those in the 40-49 age group are under-represented and the 60+ age group are over represented in the survey although these variations were still within the margin of error and therefore not statistically relevant.

Trends in Satisfaction with Public Toilets

Overall satisfaction with public toilets has risen by 14% from when the surveys first started in 2001. This could reflect the significant upgrade of the toilet stock during this period. Dissatisfaction rates have increased significantly since the last survey was carried out in 2013 and are now slightly higher than the highest level recorded more than 15 years ago when the survey first started.

Graph 6: Public toilet satisfaction – Customer Satisfaction Surveys 2001-2016

Overall Satisfaction with Public Toilets 2016

More respondents to the survey commented on satisfaction with public toilets than any other type of facility apart from parks. This indicates people use and are interested in the public toilets provided within the district.

The following graph shows public toilets had the second lowest satisfaction rate (61%) and the highest dissatisfaction rate (22%) of the facilities surveyed.
“Rangiora needs public toilets in the centre and east of the town.”

**Issues with Other Toilet Blocks**

The Victoria Park toilets stood out as being the block which concerned people the most. The following comments are typical of those received.

“Victoria Park toilets are an embarrassment to the community. They are in desperate need of an upgrade and have been for years.”

“Victoria Park toilets are not always that clean and tidy. They are more like a dungeon compared to other public toilets I have visited.”

“Victoria Park toilets are pretty scummy.”

“Victoria Park toilets are usually dirty and smelly so we try not to use them now.”

The need to upgrade the toilet facilities at Dudley Park and in the Oxford Town Centre was also commented on by several respondents.

“The Oxford Main Road toilet need to be smartened up.”

“Oxford toilets could do with a bit of a refit as quite old.”

“The Oxford toilets are usually filthy.”

The toilets at Elephant Park were an issue for people but have been replaced since the survey was carried out. All of these four toilets are considered to be high use toilets (refer to Public Toilet Usage section) and both the Victoria Park and Oxford Town Centre toilets are on a seven day a week cleaning regime.

Issues relating to other facilities mentioned by fewer respondents were:

- The lack of toilet facilities at Pegasus Lake (the new toilets were built at the time of the survey)
- The poor condition of the Kaiapoi Lakes- Old Main Road toilets

**Satisfaction with Cleaning/Maintenance**

Customers dissatisfied with the standard of public toilets described them as being:

“shockingly disgraceful, yuk, poor, quite grubby, usually filthy, often unclean, not very nice etc”.

However, a number of people also commented positively on the upkeep of the facilities describing them as being:

“generally very clean and well maintained.”

Facilities mentioned favourably were the toilets at Woodend, Waikuku, Ohoka Domain and Cust Community Centre.
Changes People Most Wanted to See

People were asked about the changes they would most like to see made to any of the parks and/or community facilities provided by the Council. The change the most people wanted to see was the provision of more public toilets (25).

Specific changes requested by individuals were:
- New toilets in/near High Street, Rangiora
- Better toilets at Victoria Park
- Cleaner, better maintained and more user friendly toilets

The findings of the 2016 Customer satisfaction Survey were consistent with most of those of the 2013 survey which identified the main changes requested for public toilets as being:
- More regular cleaning, particularly the Victoria Park toilets
- Upgrading and/or better maintenance of Rangiora toilets
- Providing additional toilets in Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Pines Beach and Pegasus.

Requests to Council

Three toilet-related requests were received in March 2017 to the Council’s draft Annual Plan 2017/18. These were as follows:
- The Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board said residents and developers had requested a toilet in Silverstream Reserve. The Council agreed that $73,000 could be carried over from the 2016/17 financial year for this purpose.
- The Rangiora Community Board asked for a large modern public toilet facility to be built in the Rangiora town centre. The Council agreed consideration should be given to this in the Toilet Strategy and any financial implications considered as part of the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan process.
- The Pines Kairaki Beaches Association requested new toilets to be provided by the Pines Beach Surf Club. The Council decided this would also be considered as part of the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan process and advised the Association it would be consulted.

Other requests have been made to staff for toilets to be supplied at Saltwater Creek, Coopers Creek, Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary and Mandeville Domain.

For more information about these proposals refer to the Renewals and Capital Works Programme section.

Service Requests/Complaints

In the 2014/15 financial year the Council received 60 toilet-related service requests. This increased to 108 in 2015/16 due to a spike in vandalism-related service requests but dropped back to 70 in 2016/17.

The following graph shows just under three-quarters (71%) of the service requests were for repairs or maintenance. Repairs are defined as a fault with the structure or equipment such as a light not working, broken cistern etc. Maintenance is work required to restore the service such as blocked toilets, cleaning, supply of toilet paper etc.

Requests to Council

Three toilet-related requests were received in March 2017 to the Council’s draft Annual Plan 2017/18. These were as follows:

- The Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board said residents and developers had requested a toilet in Silverstream Reserve. The Council agreed that $73,000 could be carried over from the 2016/17 financial year for this purpose.
- The Rangiora Community Board asked for a large modern public toilet facility to be built in the Rangiora town centre. The Council agreed consideration should be given to this in the Toilet Strategy and any financial implications considered as part of the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan process.
- The Pines Kairaki Beaches Association requested new toilets to be provided by the Pines Beach Surf Club. The Council decided this would also be considered as part of the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan process and advised the Association it would be consulted.

Other requests have been made to staff for toilets to be supplied at Saltwater Creek, Coopers Creek, Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary and Mandeville Domain.

For more information about these proposals refer to the Renewals and Capital Works Programme section.

Service Requests/Complaints

In the 2014/15 financial year the Council received 60 toilet-related service requests. This increased to 108 in
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Levels of service guidelines

Suggested Improvements

- Adopt the Assessment Guidelines for Public Toilet Infrastructure as a tool to use to assess and prioritise the need for new toilets and either refurbish, replace or decommission existing toilets
- Adopt the proposed LOS for public toilets including the following key changes:
  - Provide unisex cubicles in new stand-alone public toilet blocks
  - Increase the accessibility of the public toilet stock
  - Limit the availability of toilets to daylight hours, except for town centre toilets, over time
  - Provide toilets in local neighbourhood reserves servicing a larger than normal catchment
  - Determine toilet location on site by applying CPTED criteria
  - A new LOS for town centre toilets
  - A new LOS for effluent dumping stations
  - Criteria for considering applications for toilets to be located on, or to service sites owned by others
- Carry out a contract variation to increase the cleaning frequency of the Woodend Recreation Ground toilet
- Seek out opportunities to provide new town centre toilets in partnership with business

Existing Levels of Service

A number of factors are taken into account when determining levels of service. These are generally based on:

- Level of provision
- Location
- Standard of structure
- Number of cubicles

- Services provided
- Cleaning frequency
- Availability (hours of access)
- Accessibility
- Community expectations/demand
- Affordability

The Council currently applies a mix of two different sets of levels of service to toilet provision as described below. These are captured in the Community Green Space Activity Management Plan - 2015 revision.

Public Toilets Activity Management Plan and Sanitary Assessment 2005

The Council adopted levels of service (LOS) for public toilets in the above document prepared in 2005. Toilets were determined to be either high use (town centre toilets), medium use (sportsgrounds, community parks, district parks), low use (rural parks, special locations), and seasonal use. No provision was made for toilets to be located in neighbourhood reserves. Comprehensive levels of service were developed for each of these based on level of provision, finishes, additional services, hours of opening, number of cubicles, lighting, cleaning and disabled access.

Typical LOS

‘High use toilets are located in central business districts, will be individually designed for a specific location, finished with tiles, have porcelain pans etc, 24 hour access, up to 4 cubicles, internal/external lighting, daily cleans and disabled access for at least one cubicle.’

Parks Categories and Levels of Service Guidelines 2011

In 2011 the Council adopted a framework for categorising parks and associated levels of service adapted from guidelines produced by the New Zealand Recreation Association (NZRA). Levels of service were based on park category and type of use. These were limited to the types of parks toilets should be provided on
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and the standard of structure. A few guidelines were provided around the location of toilets on site.

Typical LOS

‘Toilets to be provided at natural parks entrance/car park areas or major gathering points, where the park is high use or where stays of more than 1 hour are envisaged.’

Proposed Levels of Service

The existing LOS have been assessed and integrated into one table to make them easier to apply (refer to appendix seven – WDC Proposed Public Toilets Levels of Service). The LOS include expected level of provision, standard of provision, design features/services, location on site, cleaning and availability.

Most of the existing LOS are carried over and improvements have been made as follows:

- A new LOS category developed for ‘town centre’ toilets to recognise the special nature of this provision
- A new LOS category for toilets on sites, or to service sites, owned by others to provide some guidance when requests for funding are received
- LOS categories for reserves broken down into catchment size where applicable (local, community, district and regional) to allow expected levels of use to be taken into account
- The inclusion of LOS for effluent dumping sites within the streetscape category to capture current practice
- The development of assessment tools for determining the need for additional toilets (see appendix three – Assessment Guidelines for Public Toilet Infrastructure). A number of factors usually contribute to demand for new toilets, particularly town centre toilets, and this provides a framework for considering these as a whole. There is also a tool to use to determine whether to upgrade, replace or decommission existing toilets
- The requirement for the New Park Toilet Assessment Form to be used to determine the need for toilets to be provided on local neighbourhood reserves where these reserves trigger the LOS exception guidelines
- The deletion of detailed design specifications such as materials and finishes to be used. This provides more flexibility as new products and standard designs come onto the market
- The existing LOS had significant gaps across all categories and these have been completed

Application

While the LOS allow Green Space staff to plan with some consistency there will be instances where it is more appropriate to provide a different LOS than that recommended. An example of this is the Pegasus Lake toilet which is cleaned daily throughout the year instead of the recommended LOS of daily (summer) 3 x week (off season). The rationale for the additional LOS is the toilet’s location beside a very popular lake and playground, the limited number of other toilets in the town and meeting community expectations, evidenced by a higher level of maintenance-related service requests received before the LOS was changed. To ensure flexibility is retained the LOS are referred to as guidelines.

Expected Level of Provision

Public toilets will be provided in the following circumstances:

- All town centres – New Town Centre Toilet Assessment Form to be used to determine need for additional provision
- All public gardens
- All sports & recreation parks
- All neighbourhood parks (community) except where the reserve primarily serves as a site for a community building or where it is not suitable for a toilet development
- All high use parks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of park</th>
<th>Exceptions to non-provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape</td>
<td>• Serves a town centre function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Significant walkway/cycleway system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Exceptional circumstances apply (urban &amp; suburban residential, rural residential &amp; rural areas)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of park</th>
<th>Exceptions to non-provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage</td>
<td>• High use attracting long stays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Adventure Parks</td>
<td>• High use attracting long stays with no other toilets close by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Parks (local)</td>
<td>• Long stays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Exceeds normal walking distance (500m or 10 minutes’ walk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Park caters for larger than normal geographic area and/or number of residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Parks (district)</td>
<td>• No other toilets close by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Parks (community)</td>
<td>• Moderate use with no other toilets close by and attracting long stays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Parks (district, regional)</td>
<td>• Attracting long stays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation &amp; Ecological Linkages (local)</td>
<td>• Exceptional circumstances only i.e. forms part of a well-used long walkway outside of an urban area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation &amp; Ecological Linkages (community)</td>
<td>• Significant walkway/cycleway systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Significant R &amp; E sites i.e. popular fishing/picnicking spots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation &amp; Ecological Linkages (district)</td>
<td>• Significant walkway/ cycleway systems and R &amp; E sites providing no other toilets are located close by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal toilets</td>
<td>• Special locations with each proposal to be considered on its own merits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets on/ or servicing sites owned by others</td>
<td>• Each proposal considered on its own merits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Priority given to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- popular visitor destinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- benefits to District residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- where location is better than alternative Council-owned site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Exception circumstances for toilet provision

A minor amendment has been made to the LOS for natural parks. Currently exceptions are made for stays of more than 1 hour. This has been changed to ‘long stays’ to be consistent with the LOS for other park categories and is more flexible and practical to apply.

Toilets are not normally provided in neighbourhood parks with a local catchment as they are considered to be ‘walk to’ parks however there are some exceptions. A new exception has been included in this category ‘park caters for larger than normal geographic area and/or number of residents’. This LOS would apply where there is no neighbourhood park (community) in the area and a local neighbourhood park effectively serves this function. An alternative is to categorise the reserve with a community catchment but it will be unlikely to meet the agreed LOS size criteria. This amended LOS reflects current practice.

Allowance has been made in the LOS for the consideration of a changing places toilet space within a town centre toilet. This is discussed in the Inclusive Access section.

A new LOS allows effluent dumping sites to be provided in each of the five main towns providing there is sufficient demand and is intended to cater for waste from freedom campers and self-contained motor homes. Currently these facilities are provided in Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Oxford in response to subsidies provided by the Motor Caravan Association in the early 2000’s. More recently facilities have been provided by the Council at the Waikuku and Woodend Beach Camping Grounds and the Ashley Gorge Holiday Park but these are only available to campground users.

During the preparation of this Strategy, three requests have been received to provide or support the provision of toilet facilities on/or servicing land owned by other agencies. These were from:

- Te Ngäi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga executive for a public toilet to be provided on NZTA land at Saltwater Creek to prevent the popular fishing spot from being contaminated with human waste
- the Department of Conservation for assistance with the provision of a toilet at the end of Mountain Road, Coopers Creek to cater for the high numbers of visitors passing through to DOC land
- a submitter to the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016 Implementation Plan for a port-a loo to be provided in the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary for whitebaiters, to limit the number of vehicle trips in/out of the Estuary

A new category provides some guidance for decision-making when requests of this nature are received with priority given to proposals that involve partnership, have clear benefits for District residents and/or visitors or where the site in question is a better location than the Council-owned site the Council would have provided toilets on.

Standard of Provision

The standard of provision is described as high quality (bespoke), standard (off the shelf design) or basic (prefabricated mould/composting option) and is applied according to type of park and estimated levels of use.

Most of the toilets to be supplied by the Council will be standard. The exceptions are those toilets serving a town centre function or located in public gardens which are expected to be high quality. Basic toilets are an option for recreation and ecological linkages in non-residential locations and which have low or variable levels of use.
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Bespoke toilet at Trousselot Park, Kaiapoi

There are no proposed changes to the current standard of provision apart from for town centre toilets where a preference for private/public partnerships where possible is now indicated. Public toilet users are well used to the standard of personal safety and hygiene provided by mall toilets and have similar expectations for town centre toilets. This is hard to replicate in an unsupervised environment and private/public partnerships can allow for greater security and more frequent cleaning regimes. The public toilet provided in the Rangiora New World supermarket is a good example of this type of provision and is one of the most used toilets in the Rangiora town centre.

Standard toilet at Bayliss Drive Park, Kaiapoi

Design Features

These are linked to the standard of provision and expected levels of use.

Some key design features shown in the following standard of provision table are not currently achieved but will be expected to be incorporated into new toilet blocks and existing blocks when significant structural upgrades are carried out.

Identified areas of improvement are:

- **Unisex toilets.** This is the preferred option for provision as it provides increased flexibility of use during periods of high demand, caters for parents supervising children and supports diversity.

- **Fitting toilets with an electronic locking system.** All new toilets being built are able to be electronically locked and this provides Council with the ability to control hours of access (refer to Availability section).

- **Accessible toilet cubicles.** While approximately 73% of the toilet stock is deemed to be accessible, only 7 toilet blocks are fully compliant. This does not meet best practice guidelines for inclusive access. Some of the older toilets have inaccessible cubicles and the LOS promote the provision of accessible cubicles as the norm in one to two cubicle blocks. Provision in the larger blocks will be as per the requirements of the NZ Building Code 1992.

- **Providing internal and external lighting (high & standard quality only).** CPTED standards require toilets to be well-lit both internally and externally to enhance security and safety around and within the facility. In the toilet audit carried out in 2015 by Xyst, 64% of the 56 toilets surveyed had good to average exterior lighting and 75% interior lighting. The remaining toilets needed improvements to either the interior or exterior lighting or both.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard of provision</th>
<th>Features/services to be provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **High quality**      | • Generally a minimum of 4 unisex cubicles  
|                       | • At least one accessible cubicle per block or more as required by building code  
|                       | • Electronic locking system  
|                       | • Internal and external lighting  
|                       | • Hand driers  
|                       | • Baby changing facilities  
|                       | • Sanitary disposal bins  
|                       | • Mirrors  
|                       | • Cold water supplied to basin  
|                       | • Soap dispensers  
|                       | • Toilet paper  |
| **Standard**          | • Generally between 1 & 4 unisex cubicles depending on levels of use and catchment. Natural parks with a regional catchment often have more  
|                       | • All cubicles to be accessible in new toilet blocks with 1 to 2 cubicles and as per the building code for larger blocks  
|                       | • Electronic locking system  
|                       | • Internal and external lighting  
|                       | • Cold water supplied to basin  
|                       | • Toilet paper  |
Table 8: Standard of provision by services provided

**Location on Site**

The next table identifies the LOS guidelines that currently exist for the location of toilet blocks on some types of reserves and includes proposed additions for streetscapes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of reserve</th>
<th>Proposed LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streetscapes – effluent dumping site</td>
<td>Roadside berm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscapes – Town Centre toilets</td>
<td>Preferably main streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscapes – Walkway/cycleway system</td>
<td>Gathering points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Gardens Cultural Heritage Parks</td>
<td>Park entrances, Car park areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Parks</td>
<td>Park entrances, Car park areas, Park gathering points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation &amp; Ecological Linkages</td>
<td>Park gathering points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Location LOS by reserve category

In addition to this all new toilets are now required to meet best practice Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles to promote safety and security. This means blocks should be close to active spaces rather than isolated and entrances located in full view.

Current LOS require town centre toilets to be located on main streets. While it is still preferable to locate toilets in locations easily seen by visitors, there may be other high foot traffic areas worthy of consideration if no affordable main street options are available. The LOS have been amended to accommodate this.

Locations for effluent dumping sites have also now been specified and reflect current practice.

**Cleaning**

All toilets are required under the Health Act 1956 to not be ‘offensive or injurious to health’. The Building Act 2004 also provides for toilets to be closed if they are ‘insanitary’. This can be difficult to achieve at times as toilets are only as clean as the last user and some blocks are regularly subjected to vandalism.

Affordability and expected levels of use are taken into account when determining cleaning schedules and issues around inappropriate LOS are usually identified by contractor feedback and public complaints to the Council’s service request system. Toilet counters can be helpful in identifying toilets requiring increased cleaning frequencies due to higher than expected levels of use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of park</th>
<th>Cleaning LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre toilets</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Gardens Civic Space</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Parks (district)</td>
<td>Daily (summer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation &amp; Ecological Linkages (district)</td>
<td>Daily (summer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport &amp; Recreation Parks (district)</td>
<td>Between 2 and 5 x week depending on levels of use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport &amp; Recreation Parks (community)</td>
<td>Min 3 x week (urban areas, close to schools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Parks (community)</td>
<td>Min 2 x week (rural areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Parks (local)</td>
<td>Generally 3 x week (urban areas, beach settlements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Parks (district &amp; community)</td>
<td>Min 3 x week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Adventure Parks</td>
<td>Min 3 x week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports &amp; Recreation Parks (region)</td>
<td>Min 3 x week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscapes – Walkway/cycleway system</td>
<td>Min 2 x week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage Parks</td>
<td>Min 2 x week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports &amp; Recreation Parks (region – Rangiora Airfield)</td>
<td>Min 2 x week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation &amp; Ecological Linkages (local &amp; com)</td>
<td>Min 1 x week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Cleaning LOS by reserve category
Public Toilet Strategy

Availability

Until recent years most of the Council’s toilet blocks were open 24/7. The main exceptions to this were toilets located within buildings and some town centre toilets frequently targeted by vandals which had electronic locking systems fitted to them in an attempt to maintain standards.

All park toilets built since 2010 (approx) have had electronic locking systems installed to reduce opportunities for anti-social behaviour in parks and increase public safety. These locks enable the toilets to be closed outside of daylight hours apart from town centre toilets which may be open until 10pm depending on town centre activities.

At the moment 60% (37) toilets are still available 24/7 but over time there will be a significant reduction in availability. This is not currently considered to be an issue as park toilets are not generally thought to be safe environments after dark and encouraging their use is not desirable. The lack of public toilets open after 10pm in the town centres has not currently been raised as an issue and it is assumed businesses cater for the needs of customers still in town after this time.

Community Expectations/demand

While LOS are provided, their application is intended to be sufficiently flexible to cater for differences in community expectations and demand. An example of this working in practice is Arlington Park which should have a toilet due to its categorisation as a neighbourhood reserve (community). However, locals expressed a strong preference for there not to be a toilet and this was taken into account in the park’s development. At the opposite end of the scale, strong community demand resulted in a toilet being provided in Bayliss Drive Park, a local neighbourhood reserve.

Financial Implications of the Proposed Levels of Service

Expected Level of Provision

Including a new LOS exception that allows toilets to be built in local neighbourhood reserves serving a wider catchment area is not expected to increase costs as a toilet would have been provided if a neighbourhood reserve (community) had been located there instead.

An analysis of the new 250m LOS requirement for toilet provision in the town centres identified a shortfall in the northern half of the Woodend business 1 zone. It is not recommended Woodend town centre toilet provision be addressed until there is certainty around the outcomes of projects such as the Woodend town centre redevelopment, Woodend bypass and Ravenswood development.

The inclusion of LOS for the provision of toilets on, or servicing land owned by others could be seen as raising expectations however organisations are currently able to apply for funding via the LTP process. The LOS is intended to provide a framework for decision-making.

In 2003/4 the Council adopted a strategy to provide one effluent dump station in each of the four towns in appropriate locations associated with public toilets or sewer connections. All of these were installed apart from one at Woodend. While the new LOS allows for a new effluent dumping site to be provided in Pegasus/ Woodend, demand would have to be demonstrated in order for it to be considered. These facilities do not have a high capital cost.

The provision of a changing places toilet space within a town centre toilet would have significant additional costs associated with it, including higher on-going maintenance costs, and a cost/benefit analysis would need to be applied to any such proposal.

An analysis of current provision against the LOS has highlighted the following anomalies. This is an existing situation as the proposed LOS for these types of reserves have not changed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of park</th>
<th>Gaps in provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood parks (community)</td>
<td>Arlington Park (37%)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good Street Reserve (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moorcroft Reserve (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Eyreton Domain (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lees Valley School Reserve (41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports &amp; recreation parks (community)</td>
<td>Milton Memorial Park (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Parks (district)</td>
<td>Whites Road Reserve (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation &amp; ecological linkages (community)</td>
<td>West Oxford Reserve (52%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Assessment score

Table 11: LOS gaps in toilet provision

A New Park Toilet Assessment Form has been completed for each of the above reserves and those with scores over 50% are Milton Memorial Park and West Oxford Reserve. This means the cost/benefit of providing a toilet on these two reserves should be further investigated.

Standard of Provision

The financial implications are limited to those implicit in any partnership agreement the Council may reach with regard to the provision of town centre toilets.

Waimakariri District Council
Design Features
All of the suggested improvements in design are standard features of the new toilets installed by the Council. The costs are therefore incorporated into the capital cost of a new build. These are calculated at:

- $80,000 to $100,000 – basic toilet
- $120,000 – 1 cubicle standard toilet
- $150,000 – 2 cubicle standard toilet
- $250,000 – 4 cubicle toilet
- $350,000 – high quality toilet

Location on Site
No financial implications are identified for toilets built on new reserves. There may be some additional costs associated with rebuilding toilets in a new location on existing reserves to meet CPTED criteria, for example connecting utilities services and rerouting pathways.

Cleaning
Under the proposal the cleaning schedules for the toilets at the Woodend Recreation Ground and Kaiapoi Lakes would need to be increased from 2 x week to 3 x week to achieve the required standard. The Woodend Recreation Ground receives enough use to justify the LOS being applied and the additional costs are negligible. Green Space recommend the service level remains the same for both Kaiapoi Lakes toilets until the area gets busier.

Availability
There could be a reduction in vandalism-related maintenance costs if closing most of the toilets overnight leads to reduced incidences.

Community Expectations/demand
Providing a higher LOS in response to community expectations/demand has the most financial implications for the Council.

Managing expectations/demand from developers and residents for toilets to be provided on local neighbourhood reserves is likely to be the most significant LOS issue facing the Council in the future.

While many residents do not like public toilets to be located close to where they live, others see toilets provided on some neighbourhood reserves and expect the same level of provision. Changing the LOS to accommodate the standard provision of toilets on local neighbourhood reserves would have significant financial implications for the Council.
Promoting community awareness

Suggested Improvements

- Promote the location of public toilets through street and park signage and signage on toilet exteriors
- Design and implement a programme of sign replacements and standardisation of signs, through natural attrition, after consultation with the Waimakariri Access Group
- Adopt a minimum standard for the range of information to be provided on each toilet block as being:
  - Standard gender symbols (including braille)
  - International access symbol (where applicable)
  - Council contact information
  - Hours of operation
  - Date toilet was last serviced
  - QR code
- Provide effective, standardised, directional signage on the street for each facility, prioritising directional signage for town centre toilets
- Liaise with the Waimakariri Access Group about improving the instructional signage for the equipment in the Dudley Park Aquatic Centre accessible changing facility
- Provide an interactive map of the district’s public toilets on the Council’s website and ensure this is kept up to date as new toilets are developed
- Promote public toilets on digital signage located in Council service centres, libraries, pools and the Woodend Community Centre
- Establish a QR code for Council public toilets
- Implement a system for providing up to date information about district toilets to key alternative websites such as toiletmap.co.nz and camping.co.nz and other information providers such as ENC
- Provide ENC with a grant of $1,500 for the development of a district wide map to be displayed in town information kiosks, depicting the locations of public toilets and other Council facilities

Promotion and signage of public toilets is essential to ensure residents and visitors know where they are located and makes the best use of existing assets. The more people know about a toilet, the more it will get used and the safer it will feel.

Many people look for public toilets when they need them however other users, such as those with an impairment or health issue, older people and families with young children, may plan their activities before they leave home. Up to date information that can be sourced online is useful for people who need to plan ahead.

Public toilet information should be made widely available in a variety of places and formats including signs, maps, online tools and smart phone applications. Over time the need to continue to provide public information in a paper format is likely to reduce as internet access improves within the district and the uptake of technology becomes the norm across all age groups.

Consistent, easy to read and well located signage on each toilet is also important. The more standardised this is the more customer recognition is improved. This is particularly important for people with impairments who find the use of international symbols and indicators reduces barriers.

The picture below shows signage that clearly indicates the building is a toilet and uses international symbols. This could be improved with the addition of contact information and braille.
Customer Feedback
During consultation carried out for the Waimakariri Accessibility Strategy 2017, the Waimakariri Access Group identified a range of local barriers for people with impairments and suggested the following improvements to improve communication:

- Improve public toilet signage and use the international symbols of access (Department of Building and Housing, dbh.govt.nz)
- Improve signage at the Dudley Park Aquatic Centre regarding the use of the hoist and variable height change table in the accessible changing facility

The need to advertise toilets better by improving signage was also mentioned by respondents to the Customer Satisfaction Survey 2016.

Toilet Websites

Waimakariri.govt.nz
Currently people searching for public toilets in Waimakariri can find a list of public toilets on the Council’s website with a street address. This information needs upgrading with an interactive map that can be printed. Filters would enable people to search on attributes such as location, accessibility and open hours.

People searching ‘freedom camping’ on the Council’s website can download a camping brochure which shows the approximate location of public toilets in the district. This brochure does not come up under a search for public toilets and a two way link should be provided.

Toiletmap.co.nz
The New Zealand Toilet Map is a user friendly website run by Crohn’s and Colitis New Zealand which aims to make life more liveable for people with Inflammatory Bowel Disease (IBS). For patients with Crohn’s disease and colitis, finding the nearest toilet can often be a critical situation. While the website is set up to support people with specific medical conditions it is also a great resource for other people, such as those with young children.

People are able to search the website for a toilet by location in New Zealand and the website is also mobile compatible. The website provides a link to crohnsandcolitis.org.nz for people to update information on current toilets or add new toilets.

Many (32) of the public toilets provided by the Council are listed on this site but there are gaps, particularly in rural areas such as Ohoka, Mandeville and Cust. It is recommended a system is put in place for ensuring this voluntary organisation continues to have up to date GIS information about public toilets located within the district. This will help to promote ‘community awareness’ as identified in this Strategy but also contributes to the Waimakariri Accessibility Strategy 2017 communication goal action of ‘Targeted information for people with impairments and service providers is provided’.

Camping.co.nz
This website promotes responsible camping and the CamperMate app, showing toilet locations across New Zealand, may be downloaded free of charge. The App also allows people to contribute details of new toilets they come across.

It is recommended this organisation is also regularly provided with updated information. Again this serves a dual purpose by promoting ‘community awareness’ and supporting Council’s desire to encourage responsible camping.

QR Code
It is also recommended that Council place a QR code in appropriate places that would direct people to the public toilet map on the Council’s website. While not everyone currently has a phone that is able to read a QR code, this is likely to change over time and the cost of putting this system in place is minor.
Information Kiosk Public Toilet Maps
Public toilets are often publicised on large format information maps in or on the outskirts of town centres. Information display cabinets are located on Percival Street close to the Rangiora Library. Information kiosks are provided on Milton Ave, and Rangiora-Oxford Road, Rangiora, in the Woodend town centre, at Pineacres and in Oxford. Enterprise North Canterbury (ENC) ensures blown-up town street maps showing the locations of public toilets are placed in all of these kiosks apart from the Oxford one.

ENC has identified the need for a large format map showing attractions and facilities across the district to go into these kiosks to assist residents and visitors not using technology to access information. This map would include a range of Council facilities such as public toilets, effluent dump stations, Council Reserves, parking and so on. ENC has found it difficult to source a sponsor for a district-wide map and it is recommended the Council contribute $1,500 towards its production as, apart from directional street signs, this is the main non-technological method of publicising public toilets located outside of the towns.

Street Maps
ENC produces booklets of street maps for Rangiora and Kaiapoi which show locations for parks, public toilets and parking. The production of these maps is sponsored by local businesses and the Rangiora and Kaiapoi maps are being reprinted at the moment. The maps are widely distributed to residents and visitors via Council Service Centres, the Kaiapoi Information Centre, petrol stations and other businesses.

The need for ENC to be provided with up to date toilet information prior to reprints has been highlighted during the consultation carried out for this Strategy. It is recommended a system is put in place to ensure this.

The Oxford Promotions Action Committee Inc has produced a street map for Oxford but only the Pearson Park toilets are shown on this. The town centre toilets are, however, well sign posted from the street.

Public toilet Signage
The signage for all of the toilets included in the Xyst audit was assessed against the following criteria:

- Directional signs to toilets
- Standard symbols
- Council contact information
- Cleaning frequency information

This is the minimum standard generally applied in New Zealand to toilet signage. Some local authorities in Australia also provide other information such as distance to next toilet.

Directional Signage
Prominent, standardised and well located street and park directional signage is essential for people to be able to locate toilets.

The Xyst audit identified poor directional signage with only 25% of the Council’s public toilets sign posted from the street. The directional signage is also not standardised.

New style directional signage to the Rangiora New World public toilet
Most of the sign posted toilets were town centre toilets although some of the most popular toilets located in public buildings were not sign posted from the street. This may be satisfactory for residents who find out about these toilets through word of mouth or when in the building for other purposes but not very helpful for visitors. Town Centre toilets requiring directional signs are those at the Rangiora Service Centre, Rangiora Town Hall, Kaiapoi Service Centre, Trusselot Park and the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre.

Toilet Signage
Xyst assessed aspects of the signage provided on the toilet blocks as generally being very poor or non-existent. Key issues were:

- Non-standardised design reflecting poorly on the Council’s image
- Non-standardised toilet symbols for 23% of the toilets making it more difficult to interpret for people with some types of impairments
• Contact information for faults only provided at six toilet blocks

Contact details to enable people to report urgent maintenance and cleaning requirements, as well as any health and security issues, are essential and should be clearly visible on all toilet blocks. There appears to be no rationale as to why this information is provided on six of the blocks and not the others.

It is recommended that signage on the exterior of toilets include standardised gender symbols, the international access symbol (where toilets are accessible), Council contact information and hours of operation.

Some of the toilet symbol signs in the newer toilets such as Bayliss Drive Park include braille and this is recommended as standard practice. Small changes such as these help to improve the overall accessibility of the toilet stock.

Accessible signage at Bayliss Drive Park, Kaiapoi utilising the international access symbol and braille

No cleaning frequency information was provided at any of the toilets. It is suggested that small whiteboards be provided inside each toilet to allow the cleaner to write the date the toilet was last serviced. This helps customer expectations to be managed, for example, when a toilet is dirty and has only been cleaned that morning, and can promote customer feedback on the levels of service for cleaning frequency.

There is no budget currently available to upgrade all toilet signage as recommended. Green Space staff propose to design and then replace signage over time through natural attrition.
Design and sustainability

Suggested Improvements

- Where practicable, make existing public toilets that have been identified with shortcomings in relation to safety and security, compliant with CPTED principles
- Adopt CPTED principles, including the use of a checklist, for the development and management of public toilet facilities
- Limit, over time, the availability of public toilets to daylight hours, except for town centre toilets, by installing electronic locking systems on all new and renewed toilet blocks
- Ensure public toilets are well-designed and built using robust, high quality, vandal-resistant materials and fixtures that reflect the character of their setting
- Implement Environmentally Sustainable Design principles in planning, design, procurement and maintenance of public toilet facilities
- Utilise a consistent suite of fittings and fixtures in public toilets that are easy to clean, maintain and replace and difficult to damage
- Take ease of use for people with mobility issues and young children, hygiene and appearance into account when choosing toilet seat design
- Consider engaging a colour consultant to prepare a colour scheme/s for standard concrete block toilets
- Consider upgrading CCTV and installing lighting to illuminate the rear of the Victoria Park toilets in conjunction with renewing this block

Current Public Toilet Design Trends

Trends in public toilet design take into account current views about social inclusion, the need for safe, cost effective, gender neutral designs and environmental sustainability.

Typically newer toilets have smaller footprints with fewer but more accessible cubicles that are more likely to be gender neutral and have doorways opening directly onto the street or park space. An important change in toilet design is the removal of internal partitions, external screens, corridors and vestibules to minimise concealment.

In prominent high use areas, public toilets are now often provided in combination with other facilities such as shops, community buildings and information centres.

Some of the high quality town centre or public garden toilets are contemporary architectural designs or ‘art pieces’ that stand out while others in more environmentally sensitive areas are often designed to blend in.

There is a trend towards using prefabricated buildings and semi or fully automated toilets.

Trends for Waimakariri District Toilets

All public toilets are either buildings or part of a building and must comply with the NZ Building Act 2004, the Building Code 1992, the NZ Standard for Public Toilets (NZS 4241:1999) and other relevant standards.

There are a number of different types of public toilet facilities within the district. Traditionally the Council has installed purpose built toilets but there is a high degree of standardisation within this group. Over the last ten years there has been a move away from this to installing prefabricated toilets. Brands that have been used are Landmark, Exeloo, Novaloo and Permaloo. Two portacom toilet blocks have also been installed as temporary toilets.

The Xyst audit concluded that new facilities were well designed and there was good utilisation of standard designs. The following table shows the current mix of stock.
Type of toilet | Number | Percentage of toilet stock
--- | --- | ---
Purpose built | 45 | 73%
Landmark | 10 | 16%
Exeloo | 3 | 6%
Novaloo | 1 | 1%
Permaloo | 1 | 1%
Portacom | 2 | 3%
Total | 62 | 100%

Table 12: Number of toilets by type of design

While the majority of toilets are still purpose built this is likely to change over time as the older blocks are renewed and the stock expands.

While often cheaper to install, some prefabricated toilets do not have the same life span as purpose built ones. Concrete block, for example, has a standard life of 65+ years while the standard life of zincalume is 45 years. The move to using the above types of prefabricated toilets will have implications for the Council’s 100 year renewal programme as some of the toilets will need to be renewed more frequently.

**Design Principles**

The Council is committed to the provision of accessible public toilets that meet best practice Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED). Consideration should also be given to Ecologically Sustainable Design (ESD) principles when developing or upgrading toilets.

Toilet building materials, fittings, fixtures and finishes should be structurally robust, vandal resistant and designed to facilitate safety.

When considering different options, priority should be given to designs that promote economic and environmental sustainability. An example of this, is taking whole of life cost into account rather than basing decisions on the cheapest option to purchase.

**External Appearance**

The external appearance of a building impacts on how safe and inviting it feels to use. The grey and white colour scheme used on some of the older concrete block toilets makes these buildings appear prison-like and unappealing. It is recommended a colour consultant is engaged to devise a fresh colour scheme for these toilets.

**User Friendliness**

Some of the seats used in public toilets are more aesthetically appealing and easy to clean prior to use than others. Some seats are more user friendly for people with mobility issues and small children. It is recommended this is considered when choosing seats.
Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)

CPTED is an approach to crime prevention that takes into account the relationship between the physical environment and the users of that environment. It is accepted in the design and criminology fields as being a useful tool to reduce the likelihood of crime in specific locations. While it is impossible to 'design out' crime, better designed areas have been shown to reduce crime and fear of crime.

The perception of being safe is a key factor when a person decides to use a public toilet. Common problems with public toilet design and management are;

- Poor casual surveillance of facility due to isolation from roads, paths and other activity generators
- Views to the building obscured by vegetation and other buildings/structures
- Dark, maze-like entrances creating uncertainty for users and the potential for entrapment
- Poor public image and perception of lack of personal safety due to failure to remove physical evidence of anti-social behaviour, graffiti and vandalism
- Dark and unpleasant interiors due to lack of natural lighting and ventilation.

The community should be able to feel confident in using public toilet facilities. To maximise the safety of users and lessen or prevent the incidence of crime, the Council should implement, wherever possible, the following best practice CPTED principles when considering the location, orientation, design, and operation of public toilets. This applies to both new toilets and toilet upgrades.

Location and Proximity to Other Buildings

- Public toilets should be sited in locations that are highly visible from the surrounding area, from all or most directions
- They should be located as close as practicable to streets, footpaths and car parking areas
- Located as far as possible in areas with high foot traffic and public surveillance
- Public toilets in or near playgrounds should be clearly visible from the playground
- Where possible, public toilets should be provided within well-used buildings, such as libraries or shopping centres, or co-located with other buildings, as this enhances opportunities for active and passive surveillance
- Other buildings should not obscure the view of a public toilet

Access

- Entrances to public toilets should be clearly visible from the street and other public areas, easily identifiable and easy to locate
- Entrances should face towards areas of maximum pedestrian activity
- Entrances should not be obstructed by vegetation, structures or screens
- Doors should open directly off the street or park into a cubicle
- There should be no vestibules, long shared corridors or entry ways, or shared wash spaces before the entry to cubicles

Landscaping

- Vegetation should not obscure or provide areas of concealment
- Plants should be maintained to a low height
- The perimeter should be free of seats to deter loitering and enhance perceptions of safety and opportunities for passive surveillance

Lighting

- Public toilets should maximise the use of natural light so users feel confident approaching and using the facility
- Sensor lighting should be used to supplement external and internal facility lighting and enhance security and safety around and within the facility
- If the facility is open to the public after dark, good lighting must be provided in and around the facility
Ultra violet light should not be used (as a means to reduce illicit behaviour) because this lighting reduces visibility and safety levels for users.

**Building Appearance, Materials and Fittings**
- Good maintenance generally promotes a good image and discourages vandalism and other unsocial activities.
- Upgrading building façades can improve the general quality and appearance of existing facilities. Facades should be suitably robust and graffiti resistant.
- Internal wall surfaces should be light coloured to reflect light.
- Materials should be used that are easy to keep clean and maintain.
- Surfaces should be of a type that discourages graffiti.
- Dry, non-slip floors.
- Provide hangers for valuables and clothing to be kept off the floor.
- Doors should lock and extend to the floor.
- Provide no touch/automated fixtures and fittings in high use toilets.

**Signage**
- Directional and instructional signage to be provided for public toilets.
- Signage to provide operating hours, servicing schedule and contact details to report a fault or issue.
- Large and clear signage that is obvious upon approach to the toilet, indicating gender.

**Management**
- The management of a facility is important to the perception of safety. This includes people knowing a facility is inspected regularly and being encouraged to report any issues.
- Graffiti should be removed quickly.
- Toilets should be clean and well maintained.
- In problem areas, 24/7 cameras should be installed to monitor entrances.

**Current CPTED Performance**

The 2015 Xyst toilet assessment rated each toilet against a set of safety and security criteria. These included visibility and siting, building design, maintenance management, security and artificial lighting.

Key findings of the assessment were as follows:
- Siting and design of new facilities is generally good.
- Older facilities are generally poor in terms of safety and siting.
- Key issues included:
  - Lack of privacy latches on doors (30% were missing or not working).
  - Many separate gender facilities with entrapment risks and enclosed cubicles (49%).
  - Partitions with incorrect gap (either too big or too little) under partition or door (85%).
  - Entrances not visible to the most active space (38%).

The design of Ashley Gorge Reserve toilets allows good use of natural light.

The District Parks and Reserves Maintenance Contract now requires contractors to report any faults they observe while cleaning toilets. This should ensure privacy latches are repaired promptly.

The following toilets were identified as an entrapment risk due to the design of the building. All of these are older toilet blocks and it is difficult to see how the situation can be improved until the toilets are renewed or decommissioned.
- Ashley Picnic Grounds
- Maria Andrews Park
- Ashgrove Park
- Sefton Domain Pavilion
- Kaiapoi Memorial Reserve
- Kairaki Reserve
- Waikuku Beach –central area
Ashley Rakahuri River Mouth
Warren Community Reserve
Mandeville Sports Ground (high risk)
Mandeville Sports Ground Rugby Pavilion (high risk)
Woodend Beach Domain
Woodend Town Centre
Oxford Town Centre
View Hill Domain
Ashley Gorge Reserve (some risk)
Carleton Domain (high risk)
Cust Domain (high risk)
Cust Community Centre (high risk)

Two relatively new (2013) toilets at Ryder Park and Bayliss Drive Park have no interior or exterior lighting and it is recommended a CPTED checklist is developed for use when planning new toilets or upgrading existing ones.

Toilet blocks that are known hot spots for antisocial behaviour are those located at Hinemoa Park, Victoria Park and the Ashley Picnic Ground. Trousselot Park is also often targeted by vandals and is currently subject to CCTV surveillance.

There is no obvious solution for the toilet block at Hinemoa Park which is subject to high levels of vandalism and has evidence of drug use. Empty alcohol containers are regularly found at the park and there is a known correlation between alcohol consumption and vandalism. The toilet is situated in a highly visible location, all its entrances are visible, the interior and exterior of the building is well lit and the cubicles and park vehicle entrances are locked at night. The surrounding area is not well lit as per CPTED criteria, however, some residents already have an issue with light spill from the park.

The Victoria Park toilets, particularly the two park facing cubicles, are a known meeting area for people using drugs and some drug-related equipment has been found there. CCTV cameras located on the eaves of the building have been broken in the past and the lighting was too poor to view the footage from another camera located in the old fire station. It is recommended lighting the park surrounds at the rear of the building and upgrading the CCTV be considered in conjunction with renewing this block.

The toilet at the Ashley Picnic Ground is of a design identified as an entrapment risk. The toilet also has plenty of vegetation surrounding it and is located well back from the road. This makes it an ideal location for undesirable activity and there have been signs of this occurring. The only real solution is for the toilet to be replaced as soon as possible. In the meantime there may be a need for vegetation to be cut back and police patrols to be increased. For this reason the toilet block has been prioritised to be replaced after the Victoria Park and Kairaki Beach toilet upgrades.

Hours of Operation
To improve user safety and building security, there is a move away from 24/7 access to public toilets generally being closed in parks between sunset and sunrise. The electronic locking systems allow toilets to be programmed to remain open for longer to cater for events. This is discussed further in the Levels of Service Guidelines section.

Environmental Sustainability
With increasing public awareness of the need to protect the environment for future generations, Council must start to give more consideration to the principles of ecologically sustainable development in its infrastructure planning.

Work on developing a Waimakariri District Council Sustainability Strategy is due to be started in early 2018 and once completed could have implications for the public toilet activity.

Key design elements that promote environmental sustainability include:
- Use of solar panels or a combination of solar and power sources to power lighting systems where feasible
- High degrees of natural light and ventilation
- Energy efficient LED lighting on timers or sensors
- 4 star ratings on fittings
- Water collection and reuse from roof structures
- Practical reuse of grey water for flushing
- Automated flow control and sensor taps to reduce water consumption
- Dual flush cisterns
- Internal surfaces and fittings that are easy to maintain, clean and replace, and difficult to damage or stain
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- Internalised durable fittings with few moving parts
- Use of building materials with low environmental impact
- Efficient use of resources in construction and operation
- Use of low environmental impact cleaning products.

It is recommended that consideration be given to incorporating these elements as appropriate into the design of new toilets and when choosing off the shelf products. The use of cleaning products with a low environmental impact can be specified in toilet cleaning contracts.

While incorporating some of these features into new toilets may be more expensive, it is highly likely their use will become standard practice over time and the cost of doing nothing to mitigate environmental effects is likely to be more expensive to the community in the longer term.

Kitset public toilet in Australia with roof water rain collection tank
Inclusive access

Suggested Improvements

- Provide for inclusive access in all new public toilets by working closely with the Building Unit and Waimakariri Access Group to ensure design specifications are appropriate
- Increase the overall accessibility of the public toilet stock by carrying out a joint Building Unit and Waimakariri Access Group audit of toilets with identified accessibility issues to determine minor changes that can be made and instigate a works programme for this
- Remove the accessibility signage on toilet blocks that do not meet the accessibility criteria, are not able to be easily modified and are not considered by the Waimakariri Access Group to be fully accessible
- Modify existing public toilets to facilitate inclusive access when renewing these facilities.
- Discuss with the Waimakariri Access Group ways to promote the Dudley Park Aquatic Centre changing places room to potential users
- Investigate with the Waimakariri Access Group the adequacy of the slings provided for the pool hoist
- Set up a system for pool staff to record the number of people (non-pool users) using the changing places room facility at the Dudley Park Aquatic Centre
- Consult with the Waimakariri Access Group prior to the renewal of the Victoria Park toilets
- Consider including improving the accessibility of the Council’s public toilet stock as a KPI in the Long Term Plan 2018-28

Under the Human Rights Act 1993, the Council has a responsibility to ensure people are not discriminated against on the grounds of disability. This includes providing inclusive access to public toilets.

The Council has an Accessibility Strategy showing how the Council will contribute towards ensuring the local environment and facilities are inclusive for all people.

‘The Waimakariri District is growing steadily and, like the rest of New Zealand, the population is aging. Consequently the proportion of people in our district experiencing impairments is also increasing, particularly because impairments are more common amongst people of older age groups.

As a Council it is important that we minimise the barriers to members of our community as they go about their everyday life. We have a vision of an enabled community where people with impairments can live independently and participate fully in all aspects of life.’

David Ayers, Waimakariri District Council Mayor
Draft Waimakariri Accessibility Strategy 2017

Full compliant public toilet at Pines Oval, Pines Beach

Submissions to the Draft Waimakariri District Council Accessibility Strategy 2017

Two submitters to the above strategy made comments relating to public toilet provision.

One individual asked for family toileting facilities to be provided in playground areas to enable playgrounds to be as inclusive as possible. Other changes requested were changing facilities in community areas with full sized (adult) change beds and hoists with slings available in a range of sizes. This type of infrastructure is very expensive and the likely number of users is unknown.
The Rangiora Community Board supported strategy goal 4 and two associated actions.

Goal 4

‘Everyone, including people with impairments have access to public services, facilities and spaces.’

Actions

Existing council services, facilities and public spaces maximise the opportunities for people to access and participate

Statutory requirements for building and amenities to secure their compliance with the Building Act section 118 relating to design for access and mobility are enforced.

Section 118 requires sanitary facilities to be made available for people with disabilities when a building is being constructed or altered.

The Rangiora Community Board suggested that the Council actively involve people with impairments in auditing facilities to obtain a ‘reality check’ in addition to statutory requirements.

The Board also noted the limited provision of public toilets within the Rangiora town centre and encouraged the active involvement of those with impairments to audit these to ensure any remedial action is appropriate and achieves good outcomes.

This approach is supported by the following action

‘The Waimakariri Access Group is utilised as a disability reference group to ensure appropriate expertise is available for planning, reviewing and implementing services.’

The Waimakariri Access Group requests that they are consulted early on in the planning of projects as it is difficult to make changes in later stages.

It is recommended the Waimakariri Access Group is consulted about the following in particular:

- inclusive toilet signage prior to the implementation of the public toilet signs replacement programme
- ways to promote the Dudley Park Aquatic Centre changing places room to potential users
- the adequacy of the slings provided for the pool hoist
- the renewal of the Victoria Park toilets
- minor modifications required to make existing public toilets more accessible
- inaccessible toilets that should have their accessibility signage removed

Changing Places Toilet

An information kit called ‘Changing Places Transforming Lives – October 2015’ was forwarded to the Council, for its consideration, by the Waimakariri Access Group during the 2017 Accessibility Strategy review. The kit was developed by the Australian Association for Children with a Disability (ACD) which works to improve the lives of children with a disability and their families by influencing public policy and advancing worthy initiatives. ACD stated they had seen families confronted by social isolation for too long due to inadequate toilet facilities that did not meet the needs of their children.

“Some families in desperation to live a life outside of four walls, find themselves with no choice but to change their child on the cold floor of a public toilet. This option is unhygienic, undignified and presents health risks for both recipient and carer. Sitting in soiled clothing is the alternative but is undignified, unhealthy and often leads to urinary infection.”

The concept was successfully introduced in the UK in 2006 with 700 changing places toilets spread across the country allowing people to be far more engaged with their own communities. Introduced in Australia in 2012, ‘changing places’ has evolved into a nationwide initiative aimed at breaking down one of the fundamental barriers to inclusion for people with severe and profound disabilities.

The Waimakariri Access Group is advocating to the Ministry of Health that the national accessibility standard include the requirement for at least one high-low toilet and change facility to be provided in town centres.

Changing places toilets are an improvement on standard accessible toilets with each toilet providing a height adjustable changing bench, a tracking hoist system, enough space and a safe and clean environment.

Some changing places toilets are unlocked but a key system is used for most to ensure the toilets are only used by those who need them and a safe and clean environment is maintained. The cost of one of these toilet cubicles is estimated to be in excess of $150,000 and there are high maintenance costs associated with regular inspection and certification of the hoist.
A changing places room located at the Dudley Park Aquatic Centre is available for people to use free of charge. While it is located within the pool changing room area and users have to ask the receptionist to let them through the barrier, it is a safe environment and the equipment is well maintained.

The Kaiapoi Aquatic Centre has an accessible changing room with a shower and toilet but there is no room for a changing table or hoist.

At this stage it is recommended the Council discuss with the Waimakariri Access Group how the availability of the Dudley Park Aquatic Centre changing places room could be better promoted to potential users.

A record of user numbers could be kept by pool staff to establish the need for an alternative changing places facility to be provided in the future. The LOS established for town centre toilets allows for this possibility.

**Xyst Audit**

The district’s public toilets vary greatly in age and design; both of which impact on accessibility. Currently 45 (73%) of the 62 public toilets are advertised as being accessible.

The following table shows that of the 52 public toilets audited by Xyst in 2015, only 7 met all of the audit criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessibility status</th>
<th>Number of toilets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not audited – reserve toilets installed since Nov 2015,</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service centres, library, town hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not advertised as accessible &amp;</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>therefore not audited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertised as accessible</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet all accessibility criteria</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 13: Number of toilets by accessibility status**

The toilets considered to be fully compliant were those located at:

- Dudley Park
- Kaiapoi Domain
- Maria Andrews Prefab
- Matawai Park
- Northbrook Wetlands
- Pines Oval
- Wanaka Reserve

Common failures included:

- Hand basin too far from toilet (15)
- Inward opening doors (10)
- No internal grab rail to door (9)
- Door grab rail at the wrong height (7)
- Wall grab rail incorrect placement/no rail (6)

- No accessible path to toilet (6)
- Incorrect toilet pan height (5)
- Cubicle too small (5)
- Toilet roll out of reach (3)
- Entrance to cubicle less than 800mm wide (2).
The Building Standards provide some flexibility in the solutions applied to accessible toilet design. This means some of the issues identified in the audit may be due to variations in toilet layouts and different audit criteria should have been applied. The impact of this on audit results will be unknown until the blocks are audited by a building inspector.

Many of the issues, such as hand rails and toilet roll holders being in the wrong position, are easily rectified and could make a significant difference to the overall accessibility of the toilet stock. It is recommended the Council’s Building Unit and the Waimakariri Access Group are asked to carry out a ‘reality check’ of the toilets that failed the accessibility audit (listed in appendix six), as suggested by the Rangiora Community Board, to reach agreement on the improvements that need to be made. From this a minor works programme could be developed.

Given the low level of full compliance, the requirements of the Human Rights Act 1993 and the Council’s desire for an ‘enabled community’, it is recommended that improving the accessibility of the toilet stock be included as a KPI in the Long Term Plan 2018-28.

Waimakariri Access Group Audit 2010

In approximately 2010 the Waimakariri Access Group carried out their own audit of Council provided public toilets. While much of the information is now out of date the audit highlighted the lack of accessible toilets at the district’s beaches. This situation should be improved in the near future with an accessible toilet currently being built at Pegasus Beach and a new one proposed for Kairaki Beach. A fully accessible toilet was built at Pines Beach after the earthquakes and the Waikuku Beach surf club toilet is accessible although it is not advertised as such. The Waikuku Beach-Ashley Rakahuri River toilet block is accessible but not fully compliant. There is no accessible public toilet at Woodend Beach and this would prevent some wheel chair users from being able to stay at this beach too long.

The audit also identified issues with some toilets being promoted as accessible that were unsuitable for wheelchairs such as those at Ohoka Domain and Mandeville Domain.

Signage

The Waimakariri Access Group has identified issues with public toilet signage and the Dudley Park Aquatic Centre hoist and change table signage. This is discussed in the Promoting Community Awareness section. Relevant recommendations in the above section include using standard gender symbols and braille on facility signage, and liaising with the Waimakariri Access Group about improvements to signage in the Dudley Park Aquatic Centre accessible changing facility.
Maintenance management

Suggested Improvements

- Consider carrying out a contract variation to amend wording of the reporting specifications in Contract No.16/51 District Parks and Reserves Maintenance to specify reporting of damaged privacy latches
- Instigate an annual minor works building maintenance programme, consisting of regular inspections and scheduled maintenance, for items such as electrical inspections, roof moss removal and septic tank cleaning
- Carry out a comprehensive condition audit of all public toilets every 9 years in conjunction with the Long Term Plan and Infrastructure Strategy planning cycle
- Consider contracting out a programmed maintenance schedule for public toilet painting that provides for a complete repaint of each painted toilet block every 10 years
- Develop a ten year programme of planned public toilet maintenance to ensure all building elements retain, as a minimum, a ‘good’ condition rating (as per Xyst audit criteria)
- Programme the repair work identified for Warren Community Reserve, Sefton Domain and Woodend Beach Domain
- Consider changing toilet roll holders to a standardised, robust design
- Consider using toilet counters to check cleaning schedules are appropriate for high-use toilets that receive a higher than average number of maintenance-related service requests

Lack of maintenance and management leads to poor image, loss of public confidence and satisfaction, increased vandalism, and may also attract inappropriate use.

High levels of vandalism are an on-going issue for the management of public toilets. Common issues for the Council include graffiti, damage to internal toilet equipment, particularly hand dispensers and urinals, toilet paper being set on fire and excrement being smeared on walls etc. Using standardised and robust fittings helps to minimise damage (see Design and Sustainability section) and keep costs down.

The Xyst audit found that the toilet roll holders were an inconsistent design with many of lightweight construction and recommended that these be changed to a standardised, more robust unit. These are currently provided free of charge by the toilet paper supplier.

Cleaning Contracts

The Council’s toilet cleaning is contracted out and toilets are serviced between one and seven times a week, depending on location and frequency of use.

The main park toilet contractor is currently Delta Utility Services LTD. OSC is contracted to clean the toilets located within buildings such as the service centres and libraries. The Mandeville Sports Club is responsible for the toilet cleaning at Mandeville Domain, the Kairaki Holiday Park cleans the toilets at Kairaki Beach and the Ashley Gorge Reserve toilet is cleaned by the Ashley Gorge Holiday Park.

The bulk of the toilet cleaning is included in Contract No.16/51 District Parks and Reserves Maintenance which commenced in 2017. The contract specifications include:

- Inspection and report problems
- Clean guttering
- Cleaning
- Graffiti removal

Clean, appealing public toilet at Acacia Ave Reserve
Inspection and Report Problems
This requires the contractor upon cleaning the toilet to report faults/damage requiring a tradesperson to the Council as soon as possible after inspection. Minor repairs are to be carried out at the time of inspection. Repairs to be reported include plumbing, lighting, carpentry, internal and external structural maintenance and manual and electronic locking systems.

The 2015 audit identified that 30% of toilet cubicle privacy latches were missing or not working. It is assumed this is no longer an issue with the above reporting requirements in the new District Parks and Reserves Maintenance contract. The contract wording could be amended to include the reporting of ‘damage to privacy latches’ to make this obligation clearer.

Clean Guttering
Toilet gutters are to be inspected and cleared if necessary two times a year.

Cleaning
Specifications are provided for regular cleans and more in-depth once a month cleans. Regular cleans include general cleaning, restocking toilet paper, removing rubbish from the interior and surrounding area, sweeping exterior pathways within a 3 metre radius, removing odours not remedied by cleaning, removing weeds from within a 3 metre radius of the block and reporting any other required garden maintenance.

Monthly cleans include scrubbing all interior surfaces, cleaning inside and outside light covers, checking and replacing light bulbs as necessary, checking and unblocking drains, removing internal and external cob webs, dust and debris from surfaces and weed removal.

Contract Auditing
Council Green Space staff audit the District Parks and Reserves Maintenance Contract on a monthly basis. This means each toilet is inspected approximately once every six months.

Delta provides a monthly report to Council detailing all vandalism.

Graffiti Management
Accumulation of graffiti on and inside public toilets reflects poor maintenance and may give users impressions of poor safety and security. Removing graffiti as quickly as possible can deter reoccurrence.

The District Parks and Reserves Maintenance contract specifications require graffiti on the exterior of toilet blocks to be removed by the contractor. Where the toilets are not covered by the Council’s graffiti removal contract or where the graffiti cannot be immediately removed the contractor is required to advise the Council how and when it will be removed.

Offensive graffiti is expected to be removed within 24 hours of being identified by maintenance staff or reported to Council. Any other graffiti is required to be removed within 3 working days.

Members of the community often assist the Council to combat graffiti by promptly reporting instances to service centres.

Other Toilet Maintenance Arrangements
The Council also runs a preferred contractor system for minor repair works. A firm is engaged to repair electronic locks and alter the programming of these twice a year to accommodate daylight saving. Another firm is engaged to repair electrical faults.

Condition Auditing
A detailed condition audit of 52 of the public toilet facilities was carried out in 2015 by Xyst. It was concluded that overall the toilets were well maintained and generally in good condition. Cleaning standards were considered to be very good and graffiti management was excellent.

Seventy-three outstanding minor maintenance items were identified during the audit involving 44 of the toilet blocks. Common themes were the removal of birds’ nests, missing/broken privacy latches, electrical issues, graffiti removal and tap repairs.

The previous comprehensive audit was carried out in 2005 and the buildings were assessed after the Canterbury earthquakes for structural damage. A comprehensive audit carried out by an independent consultant could cost up to $15,000 and it is recommended one is carried out every 9 years in conjunction with the Long Term Plan and Infrastructure Strategy planning cycle.

The audits allow asset managers to determine how well Council is meeting Toilet Strategy objectives and stated LOS and enable system changes to be made if necessary.

Programmed Maintenance
Painting
Currently Green Space staff identify toilets that need painting while contract auditing, and cleaning contractors also report issues. Toilets are then painted if sufficient funding is available. It is recommended a more systematic approach is taken to toilet painting to ensure all buildings have a complete repaint every ten years to maintain LOS and extend the life of the materials.

Repairs
No toilets were identified by the Xyst audit as being in poor condition overall but three had elements which were in poor condition. These were as follows:

- Warren Community Reserve (corrugated iron roof and interior hardboard walls)
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- Sefton Domain (unfinished concrete floors)
- Woodend Beach Domain (painted concrete floor)

It is recommended these works are programmed for repair in order to prevent further deterioration, particularly as they are not scheduled for renewal until between ten and thirty years’ time.

The Xyst audit identified some corrosion issues with two of the Landmark toilets. One of these toilets was installed at Pegasus Beach in 2011 and at the time of the audit had badly corroding steel framing, hinges and fixings. This toilet has now corroded so badly it has been replaced. Another toilet at Kendall Park installed in 2010 had corrosion on the exterior steel work. The remaining 8 landmark toilets installed between 2003 and 2016 were in very good condition. The Xyst auditor recommended that the corrosion issue be investigated and a building maintenance/painting programme be implemented for Landmark toilets.

While the majority of the toilets were generally in good condition a number had elements that were good rather than very good or excellent. It is recommended the Xyst audit is used as a basis for developing a ten year planned maintenance schedule to ensure all the elements retain, as a minimum, a ‘good’ condition rating.

Toilet Roof Moss Removal

Removing moss off tile roofs should also be programmed to be done annually to prevent damage to tiles.

Septic Tank Cleaning

Cleaning of septic tanks is done on an as required basis. This means sometimes the only way staff know a service is required is when the system has failed and complaints have been received. It is recommended a more systematic approach is taken to reduce potential public health risks.

Public Reporting

The Council operates a 24 hour call centre through which service faults and feedback can be reported.

The following table shows that of the 238 public toilet service requests received between 2014/15 to 2016/17 nearly 40% of them were for repairs (also see Customer Satisfaction and Expectations section).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of request</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repair</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User-related</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>238</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Number of service requests by type 2014-2017

While there was a significant drop in the number of service requests received in the last financial year, a similar pattern emerged for type of request. Maintenance-related requests were 37%, repairs were 36%, vandalism was 14%, user-related was 9% and the rest were negligible.

Better contract reporting as per the new contract specifications and implementing a system of
programmed maintenance may lead to further reductions.

Some toilet blocks stood out as receiving higher numbers of service requests than others. Despite daily cleaning the Oxford Town Centre toilets received the most service requests for maintenance followed by the Pegasus Lake toilets. Two other town centre toilets, Victoria Park and Woodend Town Centre, also received more maintenance-related service requests than other toilets. While this could be due to vandalism, for example, blocked toilets not identified as such on the service request, it may indicate a need to look at the service levels of these popular toilets.

Using counters at these toilets and the Pegasus Beach toilets, which also received a higher level of maintenance-related service requests, could be useful to check cleaning schedules are appropriate for the levels of use.
Programme Purpose
The Council aims to progressively upgrade older toilet stock and install new facilities in order to:

- Provide and maintain a safe, accessible, good quality and sustainable network of public toilets
- Increase the number of public toilets that are accessible for people with disabilities or other mobility issues
- Meet community and visitor expectations of safety and security through application of CPTED principles
- Ensure provision is adequate to support community activities

Funding Sources
New toilets are either funded as capital works or renewals depending on whether the block is a new one on the site or replacing an existing toilet. Capital works are funded either directly by the Council by rates or through reserve development contributions in accordance with sections 197, 199 and 205 of the Local Government Act 2002. Upgrading existing toilets is also funded by rates out of a renewals budget.

Factors to be taken into account when determining the capital works programme are LOS, growth and community expectations/demand. The age, condition and overall performance of an existing facility is considered in the development of the renewals programme.

Previous Renewal and Development Programme
The Public Toilets and Activity Management Plan and Sanitary Assessment 2005 provided a renewal and development programme up until the year 2055. All of the new works identified in the plan were completed apart from the instalment of an effluent dump site in Woodend. Of the nine toilet blocks programmed for replacement before 2017, seven have been replaced, one has been replaced by a temporary port-a-com (Murphy Park) and one has been upgraded (Ashley/Rakahuri River Mouth). Upgrades planned for three other toilet blocks have also been completed.
Current Shortfalls in Levels of Service

Eight reserves do not currently meet the existing LOS guidelines for the provision of toilets (refer to the Levels of Service Guidelines section). An assessment has been carried for each of these reserves using the New Park Toilet Assessment Tool (refer to appendix three – Assessment Guidelines for Public Toilet Infrastructure) and two have a high enough score to warrant further investigation. These are Million Memorial Park (63%) and West Oxford Reserve (52%). There is an opportunity for Council to apply to the Tourism Infrastructure Fund for funding for the West Oxford Reserve toilet because of its popularity as a visitor destination.

There is a proposal for a dog park to be provided in the Oaks Reserve in Oxford. If this goes ahead the reserve, which is currently leased, will need to be categorised as a sport and recreation park, triggering a LOS requirement for a public toilet. Other contributing factors are the proposed park’s function as a drive to park, the lack of other nearby toilets and the length of time people are likely to stay. The provision of a toilet at this location would be subject to the timing of the proposed development and availability of funds.

There is no effluent dumping station provided in Wooden/Pegasus (refer to Level of Service Guidelines section).

Community Expectations and Demand

Toilets Servicing/on Land Owned by Others

Requests have recently been received for new toilets to be provided in the following locations either by the Council or in partnership with the Council (refer to the Level of Service Guidelines section):

- Saltwater Creek, NZRA land
- Mountain Road, Coopers Creek
- Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary (seasonal toilet)

While it is recommended that further discussions are held with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga, DOC and Ecan regarding the merits of these requests, no funding source has been identified in this strategy for the above toilets. The Saltwater Creek toilet may also be eligible for partial funding from the Tourism Infrastructure Fund.

Walking and Cycling Strategy 2017

A key priority of the Walking and Cycling Strategy adopted by Council in 2017 was ‘providing and advocating for new and extended on-off road walking and cycling infrastructure’, including public toilets. The Green Space Unit undertook to review the adequacy of service levels in its Greenspace Activity Management Plan 2017 for the provision of infrastructure along walking and cycling routes. The provision of toilets in recreation and ecological linkages (reserves most commonly used for walking and cycling purposes), the Passendale Walkway and the Rangiora-Woodend Walkway, and the park & rides at White Street and Silverstream has been considered as part of developing this strategy and no shortfalls have been identified.

Rangiora Town Centre Toilet

In late 2016 there was public debate in local newspapers about the lack of toilets provided in the new Farmers building, the poor state of the Victoria Park toilets and the need for new public toilets in High Street. Two of the town centre toilets are closed early in the evening and during the weekend and one is only open some of Saturday and Sunday. Queues are often seen at the Rangiora New World supermarket and Rangiora Public Library and many consider the Victoria Park toilets to be substandard. The Rangiora Community Board made a request to the Council’s 2017/18 Annual Plan for a large modern toilet facility to be provided in the Rangiora Town Centre to support the development of the town centre and its’ overall modern and vibrant image.

The New Town Centre Toilet Assessment Form completed for the provision of a new toilet in Rangiora provides a score of 72%, justifying the potential need for a new facility.

The possibility of providing new town centre toilets within a proposed car park building in Blake Street, as a private/public partnership, has been identified. However, a 250 m assessment of town centre toilet provision has identified a gap in the east of the town and there may be a better location, both from a distribution and CPTED perspective.

Green Space have advised the Victoria Park toilets will be upgraded to a town centre standard next year and no budget provision will be made for a new town centre toilet in the 2018-2028 Ten Year Plan. In addition to this upgrade it is recommended the provision of more public cubicles be considered during any redevelopment of the Rangiora Public Library and Council Service Centre as these sites are secure and high standards are able to be maintained.

The NZ Building Code 1992 does not require retailers, other than ‘dining places’ to provide toilets for their customers. Some of the larger retail outlets such as supermarkets and large format warehouse styled retailers can attract large numbers of customers, many of whom can be present for extended periods of more than one hour. Some of these shops do prioritise customer needs and provide toilet facilities but there is an inconsistent approach to this. A good example of public toilets being provided at a shopping hub through the goodwill of retailers can be seen at the Northwood Supa Centre.

When a hub of retailers is established and no public toilet provision is made, members of the public can expect Council to fill the gap. It is recommended developers are encouraged to provide toilets for their customers within big box retail outlets or a hub of these outlets.
Big box retail hub in Rangiora

Changing Places Toilet

The Waimakariri Access Group requested the Council consider developing a changing places toilet during pre-consultation for the 2017 Accessibility Strategy review (refer to the Inclusive Access section).

Silverstream Reserve (East) Toilet

The Kaiapoi Community Board also made a request to the Council’s 2017/18 Annual Plan for a toilet block to be provided in Silverstream Reserve as non-residential visitors utilising the walking tracks and playground were regularly asking if they could use non-public facilities. The reserve is categorised as a natural park with a district catchment and the LOS allow for toilets to be provided where this type of reserve receives high use or attracts long stays. This request was approved by Council and a toilet will be installed this financial year.

Mandeville Sports Centre

The Christchurch Western Riding Association (CWRA) has requested for a number of years that a toilet block be provided on Mandeville Domain to cater for the equestrian area. At the moment those participating in equestrian events have to walk some distance to the toilets at the Mandeville Squash Club, through the CWRA grounds and those used by the dog club. When a number of activities are on at the same time these toilets do not cope with the level of use and the club advises port-a-loo toilets hired in for events are not pleasant to use after several days of high-use. The CWRA advises some people go to the toilet in the trees and by an old hay shed which is not desirable in terms of public health and safety.

The New Park Toilet Assessment Form completed for this proposal has provided a score of 52% justifying the consideration of a new toilet in this location.

Pines Beach Surf Club Picnic/Car Park Area

The Pines Kairaki Beaches Association requested funding to be allocated in the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan for new toilets, including dressing rooms, to be located in a car park/picnic area by the Pines Beach Surf Club.

The Association said the need for toilets at the beach was supported by Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust. In the interim the installation of port-a-loos in the surf club car park was requested to support the increased use of the area and the increased number of horse riders they predict will use the horse access track promoted in the Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw 2016.

The New Park Toilet Assessment Form completed for this proposal has provided a score (37%) below the 50% trigger. It is recommended that a port-a-loo be provided at the beach over the 2017/18 summer at a cost of approximately $1,200 to help assess demand.

Capital Works - Existing Demand

New toilets not provided in conjunction with a subdivision are rates funded either through individual project budgets or the Green Space Unit’s district toilet capital works budget. New toilet blocks proposed by Green Space staff to be provided within the next ten years from the latter budget are identified in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible new toilet blocks 2018-28</th>
<th>Year &amp; budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding source-district toilet capital works budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville Sports Ground (equestrian centre toilet)</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000 (includes $114,000 bought forward from 20/21 and $86,000 provided in 18/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millton Memorial Park</td>
<td>2023/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Oxford Reserve</td>
<td>2027/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$114,170 was allocated to the district toilet capital works budget in the 2017/18 financial year and could fund the provision of a toilet at Mandeville Domain in the 2018/19 financial year, provided another $86,000 is added to this in 2018/19.

It is recommended that $150,000 be provided in the district toilets capital works budget in the 2023/24 financial year for toilets at Millton Memorial Park. Another $150,000 is identified in 2027/28 for new toilets at West Oxford Reserve providing the feasibility and desirability of locating a block there is clearly established.

The above programme would require an additional $386,000 to be provided in the district toilet capital works budget between 2018/19 and 2027/28.
Other possible new toilets to be developed within the next ten years and funded by individual project budgets are identified in the next table. The scope and budgets for these toilets are yet to be identified.

Possible new toilet blocks 2018-28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible new toilet blocks 2018-28</th>
<th>Funding source</th>
<th>Year &amp; budget</th>
<th>Year &amp; budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silverstream Reserve (East)</td>
<td>Silverstream Reserve budget</td>
<td>2017/18 $73,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New sportsground on regeneration land, Kaiapoi</td>
<td>Regeneration budget</td>
<td>Scope yet to be determined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldstream Road Sports area, Rangiora</td>
<td>Indoor court facility budget</td>
<td>Scope yet to be determined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy Park, Kaiapoi</td>
<td>Murphy Park redevelopment budget</td>
<td>Scope yet to be determined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaks Reserve, Oxford</td>
<td>Dog Park development budget</td>
<td>Proposal only at this stage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16: Proposed new toilet blocks – reserve budgets

Capital works - Providing for Growth

The Green Space Unit has identified the probable need for toilet provision in new subdivision areas over the next ten years. Toilets in new reserves provided to cater for growth are funded from reserve development contributions and this Strategy assumes the existing neighbourhood reserve development budget provision of approximately $350,000 pa is sufficient to build the number of toilets shown in the next table.

Subdivision area | Type of reserve | No of toilets & cost
--- | --- | ---
Confirmed development
Beach Grove (Kaiapoi) | Neighbourhood Reserve (com) | 1 unit 2 cubicles $150,000
Silverstream Estates-West (Kaiapoi) | Neighbourhood Reserve (com) | 1 unit 1 pan $120,000
Silverstream Estates-East (Kaiapoi) | Neighbourhood Reserve (local) Exception to be made because of size of catchment, high density housing | 1 unit 1 pan $120,000
Townsend Fields-Pentecost Road (Rangiora) | Neighbourhood Reserve (local) Exception to be made because of size of catchment | 1 unit 1 pan $120,000
Windsor Park-Brick Klin Road (Rangiora) | Neighbourhood Reserve (local) Exception to be made because of size of catchment | 1 unit 1 pan $120,000
Ravenswood (Woodend) | Neighbourhood Reserve (local) Exception to be made because located in business centre | 3 units 1 pan x 2 2 pan x 1 $390,000

Unconfirmed development
East Rangiora (Highgate, Elm Green, Kippenberger) | Neighbourhood Reserve (com) | 1 unit 1 pan $120,000
East Woodend | Neighbourhood Reserve (local) Exception to be made because of size of catchment | 1 unit 1 pan $120,000

Total 10 Units $1,260,000

Table 17: Proposed new toilet blocks – new subdivision areas
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Renewals

Determining Priorities

A toilet renewal is where an existing toilet block is either replaced or upgraded. A refurbish or replace assessment tool (refer to appendix three, Assessment Guidelines for Public Toilet Infrastructure) has been developed to help determine the best option for investigating further. This gives priority to refurbishing rather than replacing blocks as long as there is a cost-benefit in doing so and once upgraded they are able to meet CPTED, accessibility and performance requirements.

Building age and expected life span of the external building materials are used to determine the initial renewals list. This list is then refined to take into account overall performance in terms of accessibility, safety and security, hygiene and presentation. While still in good condition many of the older toilets have a lower overall performance rating as they were not designed to be accessible or to meet CPTED standards.

The shortlisted toilets are then prioritised by Green Space staff in accordance with levels of use and community expectations/demand. This means other higher use toilets, such as those at the Ashley Picnic Ground may be recommended for replacement before older lower use toilets.

2018-2028 Renewals Programme

With the rise in building costs, a renewals budget of just over $106,000 per annum is no longer enough to develop one standard toilet block per year. It is recommended that $150,000 be allocated in the district toilet renewals budget in the 2018/19 financial year and then $250,000 bi-annually until 2027/28 to allow one toilet block to be upgraded or replaced every two years. This represents a budget increase of approximately $18,000 over a two year period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toilet block to be replaced/upgraded</th>
<th>Year due for replacement &amp; condition</th>
<th>Year &amp; budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Park</td>
<td>RY- 2068 92% condition 76% overall performance</td>
<td>2018/19 $150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kairaki Reserve</td>
<td>RY-2031 60% condition 63% overall performance</td>
<td>2021/22 $250,000 4 cubicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Picnic Grounds</td>
<td>RY-2029 80% condition 58% overall performance</td>
<td>2023/24 $250,000 4 cubicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Beach Domain</td>
<td>RY-2053 66% condition 54% overall performance</td>
<td>2025/26 $250,000 4 cubicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Andrews Park</td>
<td>RY-2045 80% condition 51% overall performance</td>
<td>2027/28 $250,000 4 cubicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,150,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: Proposed toilet renewals 2018-2028

Upgrading the Victoria Park toilets to a town centre LOS is the top renewal priority for a number of reasons. At the moment these are the primary Rangiora town centre toilets and will continue to be so unless a new town centre block is built. Dissatisfaction with the lack of toilets in the Rangiora town centre, and the standard of the Victoria Park toilets were the two top community facilities issues identified in the Customer Satisfaction Survey 2016. The Victoria Park toilets also serve park users and this park is consistently ranked the most favourite park in the district in Council surveys. The combined park/town centre use makes the Victoria Park toilets one of the most heavily used blocks in the district.

A recent inspection shows wall and floor surfaces have deteriorated since the Xyst condition survey was carried out in 2015 making the building difficult to clean. Ventilation and pans also need an upgrade.

The Xyst auditor recommended that the Kaiapoi Memorial Reserve toilets be decommissioned (removed and not replaced) now that new toilets have been built at Trousselot Park. Although the condition rating for the
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A public toilet was good at 78%, it had an overall performance ranking of 58% and is considered to be an entrapment risk.

100 Year Renewals Programme

It was recommended in the Public Toilets Activity Management Plan and Sanitary Assessment 2005 that the renewals requirement be smoothed to reduce peaks in expenditure, like those that occurred between 2000 and 2006. This approach was adopted by Council and enabled most of the work identified up until 2017 to be completed.

The following 100 year toilet renewals graph, based on age of building, shows a replacement peak in 46 years’ time for a period of 19 years, requiring between $300,000 and $700,000+ per annum to service. It is recommended the renewals are smoothed over time by bringing some forward and delaying others to avoid these large peaks in expenditure.

Graph 9: 100 year replacement cost for public toilets

The 100 year programme was first based on continuing to replace/upgrade toilet blocks every two years in order to stay in the vicinity of existing budget levels. This was found to be unworkable for the following reasons:

- Not all the existing toilets needing to be replaced were able to be scheduled within the 100 year period
- There was no capacity for toilets built after 2018 to be renewed within 100 years
- There was no capacity for toilets with a lifespan of less than 70 years to be replaced more than once within the 100 year period
- Some of the newer toilets were not able to be programmed to be replaced until they were at least 40 years past their due replacement date.

Delivering replacement dates for some of the older toilets made out of concrete block has not been such a problem in the past but will be more problematic for newer toilets built out of materials with a shorter life span, such as zincalume.

The 100 Year Toilet Renewals Programme (refer to appendix four) provides for one toilet block to be renewed or upgraded every two years for the first 20 years and one every year after that. This has been identified as a minimum requirement for keeping the toilet stock in good condition and does not take into account changes in building costs and statutory regulations, or a significant increase in the number of toilet blocks managed by the Council.

While a timeframe for each block to be renewed has been identified in the schedule, this is primarily indicative of the financial commitment required. Some toilets may not need replacing at the time scheduled or others may be a higher priority. It is recommended that the need to rationalise toilet lifecycle profiles and optimise the renewals works programme be included in the Green Space Activity Management Plan 2017 Improvement Plan. There is also the potential to look at future alternative service delivery mechanisms.

The 100 Year Toilet Renewals Programme relies on a $1,250,000 renewal budget to be provided every 10 years ($250,000 every 2 years) for the first 20 years and $2.5 million every 10 years from 2040 until 2117 ($250,000 every year). This is an increase from approximately $1,060,000 currently provided for toilet renewals over a ten year period. The exception to this is the $150,000 provided in 2018/19 for an upgrade of the Victoria Park toilets. Renewal costs are lower for this project as an internal fit-out is required, rather than structural alterations, to meet public expectations.
# Strategy action plan

The Strategy Action Plan outlined in the table below is a work plan for the Council to achieve the Strategy’s recommendations. Some of these are operational and can be implemented without additional resources. Others will be subject to the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Short Term (1-4 yrs)</th>
<th>Medium Term (5 - 9 yrs)</th>
<th>Long Term (10 + yrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1: Readily Available</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public toilet facilities will be conveniently distributed and open at times to meet likely demand and support community life and visitor activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the provision of additional public toilet cubicles during any redevelopment of the Rangiora Public Library and Rangiora Council Service Centre</td>
<td>Property Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install new public toilets in the following locations:</td>
<td>Green Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mandeville Domain</td>
<td>Mandeville Domain</td>
<td></td>
<td>Milton Memorial Park</td>
<td>West Oxford Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Millton Memorial Park, Rangiora</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td></td>
<td>2023/24</td>
<td>2027/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• West Oxford Reserve, Oxford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install new public toilets in the following locations:</td>
<td>Green Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Silverstream Reserve (East)</td>
<td>Silverstream Reserve (East)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sportsground- regeneration land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coldstream Road sports area, Rangiora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Murphy Park, Kaiapoi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage developers to provide public toilets for their customers within big box retail outlets or a hub of these outlets</td>
<td>Property Manager, Business &amp; Centres Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek out opportunities to provide new town centre toilets in partnership with business</td>
<td>Property Manager, Business &amp; Centres Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold discussions with Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga, DOC and Ecan regarding the provision of toilets at Saltwater Creek, Coopers Creek and the Ashley-Rakahuri Estuary</td>
<td>Green Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess the need for an effluent dumping station to be provided in Woodend/Pegasus once the effect of the Woodend bypass is known</td>
<td>Green Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolish the Kaiapoi Memorial Reserve toilet block</td>
<td>Green Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objective 2: Inclusive Access

New public toilets will promote access to all people, regardless of age, gender and ability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Short Term (1-4 yrs)</th>
<th>Medium Term (5 - 9 yrs)</th>
<th>Long Term (10 + yrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carry out a toilet users survey prior to the refresh of this Strategy, to inform the Strategy about usage, and customer expectations and satisfaction</td>
<td>Green Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a port-a-loo at Pines Beach over the 2017/18 summer</td>
<td>Green Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work closely with the Building Unit and Waimakariri Access Group prior to installing new toilets to ensure design specifications are appropriate</strong></td>
<td>Green Space, Building Unit, WAG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry out a joint audit of toilets with identified accessibility issues to identify minor changes that can be made and instigate a works programme for this</td>
<td>Building Unit, WAG (audit), Green Space (works prog)</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss with the Waimakariri Access Group ways to promote the Dudley Park Aquatic Centre changing places room to potential users</td>
<td>Aquatic Centre Manager, Com &amp; Engage Team, WAG</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate the adequacy of the slings provided for the pool hoist</td>
<td>Aquatic Centre Manager, WAG</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider ways of improving the instructional signage for the equipment in the Dudley Park Aquatic Centre accessible changing facility</td>
<td>Aquatic Centre Manager, WAG</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set up a system for pool staff to record the number of people (non-pool users) using the changing places room facility at the Dudley Park Aquatic Centre</td>
<td>Aquatic Centre Manager, WAG</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult with the Waimakariri Access Group prior to the renewal of the Victoria Park toilets</td>
<td>Green Space, WAG</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective 3: Easy to Find

The district’s public toilet network will be well promoted to the community and visitors through the provision of current, easily understood and readily available information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Short Term (1-4 yrs)</th>
<th>Medium Term (5 - 9 yrs)</th>
<th>Long Term (10 + yrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide an interactive map of the district’s public toilets on the Council’s website and ensure this is kept up to date as new toilets are developed</td>
<td>Com &amp; Engage Team</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Public Toilet Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Short Term (1-4 yrs)</th>
<th>Medium Term (5 - 9 yrs)</th>
<th>Long Term (10 + yrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promote public toilets on digital signage located in Council service centres, libraries, pools and the Woodend Community Centre</td>
<td>Com &amp; Engage Team</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and develop and implement, through natural attrition, a public toilet signs replacement programme</td>
<td>Green Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a QR code for Council public toilets</td>
<td>Com &amp; Engage Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide up to date public toilet information to toiletmap.co.nz, camping.co.nz and ENC</td>
<td>GIS Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide ENC with a grant of $1,500 to develop a district wide map showing public toilets and other Council facilities</td>
<td>Green Space</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective 4: Fit for purpose

New and upgraded public toilets will be attractive, well designed and built using robust, vandal-resistant materials and fixtures that reflect the character of their setting and ensure they are fit for purpose.

- Add optimising the 100 year toilet renewal programme to the Green Space AMP 2017 Improvement Plan
  
- Carry out a comprehensive condition audit of all public toilets every 9 years in conjunction with the Long Term Plan and Infrastructure Strategy planning cycle

### Objective 5: Sustainable

Toilet design, maintenance and management will take into account principles of ecologically sustainable development including whole of life costs.

### Objective 6: Clean

Cleaning schedules will be appropriate to the site and usage and will ensure toilets are desirable to use while achieving a balance between affordability and community expectations (as measured by a decrease in dissatisfaction rates in the Council’s tri-annual Customer Satisfaction Survey).

- Carry out a contract variation to increase the cleaning frequency of the Woodend Recreation Ground toilet
  
- Consider installing toilet counters to check cleaning schedules are appropriate for high-use toilets that receive a higher than average number of maintenance-related service requests
### Objectives 7: Well maintained

Toilets will be maintained to a standard that achieves a good balance between affordability and meeting public expectations (as measured by a decrease in dissatisfaction rates in the Council’s tri-annual Customer Satisfaction Survey).

The planned maintenance programme will ensure all building elements retain, as a minimum, a ‘good’ condition rating (as per Xyst audit criteria).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Short Term (1-4 yrs)</th>
<th>Medium Term (5 - 9 yrs)</th>
<th>Long Term (10 + yrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instigate regular building maintenance inspections to identify and programme work such as electrical repairs, roof moss removal and septic tank cleaning</td>
<td>Green Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider preparing a contract variation to include toilet block painting in the programmed maintenance schedule for painting community facilities</td>
<td>Green Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a ten year programme of planned public toilet building maintenance, prioritising the repair work identified for Warren Community Reserve, Sefton Domain and Woodend Beach Domain</td>
<td>Green Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objectives 8: Safe to use

New public toilet facilities will meet best practice principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED).

Existing public toilets will be managed in a way that ensures they feel as safe and welcoming to users as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Short Term (1-4 yrs)</th>
<th>Medium Term (5 - 9 yrs)</th>
<th>Long Term (10 + yrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where practicable, make existing public toilets that have been identified with shortcomings in relation to safety and security, compliant with CPTED principles</td>
<td>Green Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider upgrading CCTV and installing lighting to illuminate the rear of the Victoria Park toilets in conjunction with renewing this block.</td>
<td>Green Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix One – Map of Waimakariri District Council Public Toilets
## Appendix Two – Table of Waimakariri District Council Public Toilets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; Location</th>
<th>Asset Number</th>
<th>Park Category</th>
<th>Cleaning Schedule</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Opening Hours</th>
<th>Structure &amp; No. of Cubicles</th>
<th>Accessible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Acacia Ave Reserve</td>
<td>BD000405</td>
<td>N COM</td>
<td>3 x week Delta</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>24/7</td>
<td>Exceloo Timber &amp; preformed concrete 1U</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ashgrove Park</td>
<td>BD000188</td>
<td>SR COM</td>
<td>3 x week Delta</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>24/7</td>
<td>Purpose built Concrete block 1M, 2F &amp; 2UC</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ashley Gorge Reserve</td>
<td>BD000190</td>
<td>NAT REG</td>
<td>Up to 2 x day summer, 2 x week off season Camp caretaker</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>24/7</td>
<td>Purpose built Concrete block 5M &amp; 7F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ashley Picnic Grounds</td>
<td>BD000201</td>
<td>NAT DIS</td>
<td>3 x week Delta</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>6 am to 9pm</td>
<td>Purpose built Concrete block 1M, 1F &amp; 3UC</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Baker Park</td>
<td>BC170281</td>
<td>N COM</td>
<td>TBC- not open yet</td>
<td>Being built 2017</td>
<td>5am-9pm when opened</td>
<td>Permaloo 1U Concrete walls</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bayliss Drive Park</td>
<td>BD000378</td>
<td>N LOC</td>
<td>3 x week Delta</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6am to 9pm</td>
<td>Landmark Colour steel 2U</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name &amp; Location</td>
<td>Asset Number</td>
<td>Park Category</td>
<td>Cleaning Schedule</td>
<td>Year Built</td>
<td>Opening Hours</td>
<td>Structure &amp; No. of Cubicles</td>
<td>Accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Carleton Domain</td>
<td>BD000204</td>
<td>N COM</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>1960 (leased)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purpose built Concrete block 1M, 2F &amp; 1UC</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pony Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key Access Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as part of lease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Cust Community Centre</td>
<td>BD000408</td>
<td>N COM</td>
<td>DCS</td>
<td>1970’s 24/7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Purpose built Plaster over timber 1M &amp; 1F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cust Domain</td>
<td>BD000211</td>
<td>SR COM</td>
<td>2 x week Delta</td>
<td>1978 24/7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Purpose built Concrete block 1M, 1F &amp; 2UC</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dudley Park</td>
<td>BD000216</td>
<td>SR DIS</td>
<td>3 x week Delta</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>6am to 9 pm</td>
<td>Purpose built Concrete block 2U</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Elephant Park</td>
<td>BD000223 BC161598</td>
<td>N LOC</td>
<td>3 x week Delta</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>6am to 9 pm</td>
<td>Permaloo 2U Concrete walls</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Gladstone Park</td>
<td>BD000225</td>
<td>SR DIS</td>
<td>2 x week Delta</td>
<td>2004 24/7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Purpose built Concrete block 2U</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Grange View Reserve</td>
<td>BD000415</td>
<td>N COM</td>
<td>3 x week Delta</td>
<td>2014 6am to 9pm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exeloo Preformed concrete 1U</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name &amp; Location</td>
<td>Asset Number</td>
<td>Park Category</td>
<td>Cleaning Schedule</td>
<td>Year Built</td>
<td>Opening Hours</td>
<td>Structure &amp; No. of Cubicles</td>
<td>Accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinemoa Park</td>
<td>BD000230</td>
<td>N COM</td>
<td>3 x week</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>6am to 9pm</td>
<td>Purpose built</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete block 1M &amp; 1F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Cemetery</td>
<td>BD000219</td>
<td>CH</td>
<td>2 x week</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Landmark Corrugated iron</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Domain</td>
<td>BD000231</td>
<td>N COM</td>
<td>3 x week</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Purpose built</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete block 2U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Lakes Reserve (East)</td>
<td>BD000232</td>
<td>N LOC</td>
<td>2 x week</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Exeloo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Lakes Old Main Road</td>
<td>BD000232</td>
<td>NAT DIS</td>
<td>2 x week</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Landmark Corrugated iron</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Colour steel 1U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Memorial Reserve</td>
<td>BD000249</td>
<td>CH Daily</td>
<td>5am to 9:30 pm</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>5am to 9:30 pm</td>
<td>Purpose built</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preformed concrete 1M, 2F &amp; 2UC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kairaki Reserve</td>
<td>BD000419</td>
<td>NAT REG</td>
<td>Daily by Holiday</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Purpose built</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete block 4M, 6F &amp; 4UC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name &amp; Location</td>
<td>Asset Number</td>
<td>Park Category</td>
<td>Cleaning Schedule</td>
<td>Year Built</td>
<td>Opening Hours</td>
<td>Structure &amp; No. of Cubicles</td>
<td>Accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall Park</td>
<td>BC000234</td>
<td>SR DIS</td>
<td>3 x week Delta</td>
<td>2010 24/7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Landmark Corrugated iron, timber 2U</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loburn Domain</td>
<td>BD000235</td>
<td>SR DIS</td>
<td>2 x week Delta</td>
<td>1945 24/7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Purpose built Preformed concrete 1M, 2F &amp; 3UC</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainpower Oval</td>
<td>BD000409</td>
<td>SR REG</td>
<td>3 x week Delta</td>
<td>2008 24/7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Purpose built Concrete block 1M &amp; 1F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville Sports Ground - Rugby Pavilion</td>
<td>BD000410</td>
<td>SR DIS</td>
<td>Daily during week days Mandeville Sports Club Cleaner</td>
<td>1981 24/7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Purpose built Concrete/plaster 1M, 2F &amp; 4UC</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Andrews Park Prefab</td>
<td>BD00046</td>
<td>SR DIS</td>
<td>3 x week Delta</td>
<td>2015 24/7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Portacom Rudnef Panel 3U</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Andrews Park</td>
<td>BD000244</td>
<td>SR DIS</td>
<td>3 x week Delta</td>
<td>1982 24/7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Purpose built Preformed concrete 1M, 1F &amp; 2UC</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Public Toilet Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; Location</th>
<th>Asset Number</th>
<th>Park Category</th>
<th>Cleaning Schedule</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Opening Hours</th>
<th>Structure &amp; No. of Cubicles</th>
<th>Accessible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matawai Park</td>
<td>BD0000248</td>
<td>NAT DIS</td>
<td>3 x week Delta</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>6am to 9pm</td>
<td>Purpose built Concrete block 2U</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy Park port-a com</td>
<td>BD000418</td>
<td>SR DIS</td>
<td>3 x week Delta</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Managed by Rugby Club</td>
<td>Portacom</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbrook Wetlands</td>
<td>BD000312</td>
<td>NAT DIS</td>
<td>3 x week Delta</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>6am to 9pm</td>
<td>Landmark Corrugated iron 2U</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakwood Park</td>
<td>BD000313</td>
<td>N COM</td>
<td>3 x week Delta</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>24/7</td>
<td>Landmark Corrugated iron 2U</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Domain</td>
<td>BN000412</td>
<td>N COM</td>
<td>2 x week Delta</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>24/7</td>
<td>Purpose built Concrete block 2U</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Town Centre</td>
<td>BD000311</td>
<td>CS Daily</td>
<td>1 x week Delta</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>24/7</td>
<td>Purpose built Concrete block 1M, 2F &amp; 2UC</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Park</td>
<td>BD000373</td>
<td>SR DIS</td>
<td>3 x week Delta</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8am to 9pm</td>
<td>Purpose built Concrete block 2U</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name &amp; Location</td>
<td>Asset Number</td>
<td>Park Category</td>
<td>Cleaning Schedule</td>
<td>Year Built</td>
<td>Opening Hours</td>
<td>Structure &amp; No. of Cubicles</td>
<td>Accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Pegasus Beach Carpark</td>
<td>BD000416</td>
<td>NAT REG</td>
<td>Daily summer 3 x week 3 x week off season</td>
<td>Being built 2017</td>
<td>24/7 Landmark</td>
<td>Corrugated iron 2U 2 changing rooms</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Pegasus Lake</td>
<td>BD004407</td>
<td>N DIS</td>
<td>Daily Delta</td>
<td>2015 6am to 10pm</td>
<td>Purpose built 2U – concrete walls</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Pines Oval</td>
<td>BD003847</td>
<td>N COM</td>
<td>3 x week Delta</td>
<td>2012 Dawn till dusk year round</td>
<td>Purpose built Concrete block 2U</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Rangiora Airfield</td>
<td>BD000385</td>
<td>SR REG</td>
<td>2 x week Delta</td>
<td>1997 Limited hours</td>
<td>Purpose built Concrete block 2U</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Rangiora Airfield West</td>
<td>BD000426</td>
<td>SR REG</td>
<td>2 x week Delta</td>
<td>2013 24/7 7</td>
<td>Purpose built 1U concrete walls</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Rangiora New World</td>
<td>BD000413</td>
<td>PB NW cleaner</td>
<td>Extension to building 2007</td>
<td>8:00 am to 9:00 pm</td>
<td>Purpose built Internal toilet 1U</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name &amp; Location</td>
<td>Asset Number</td>
<td>Park Category</td>
<td>Cleaning Schedule</td>
<td>Year Built</td>
<td>Opening Hours</td>
<td>Structure &amp; No. of Cubicles</td>
<td>Accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Rangiora Public Library</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>CS Daily OCS</td>
<td>Daily OCS</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Mon-Thur 9am to 5pm Fri 9am to 7pm Sat 10am to 2pm Sun 1pm to 4pm</td>
<td>Purpose built Internal toilet</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Rangiora Service Centre</td>
<td>CS Daily OCS</td>
<td>Daily OCS</td>
<td>Daily OCS</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>8.30am to 5pm Mon to Fri</td>
<td>Purpose built Internal toilet</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Rangiora Town Hall</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>CS Daily OCS</td>
<td>7 x week OCS</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>10am-10pm</td>
<td>Purpose built Internal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Rangiora War Memorial Hall</td>
<td>BD000421</td>
<td>CS Daily OCS</td>
<td>Daily OCS</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>9am to 5pm</td>
<td>Purpose built Internal toilet</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre</td>
<td>CS Daily OCS</td>
<td>Daily OCS</td>
<td>Daily OCS</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>9am to 5pm</td>
<td>Purpose built Internal toilet</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Ryder Park</td>
<td>N LOC</td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>3x week OCS</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Landmark Colour steel 2U</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Sefton Domain Pavilion</td>
<td>SR DIS</td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>2x week OCS</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Purpose built Concrete block 1M, 4F &amp; 2UC</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name &amp; Location</td>
<td>Asset Number</td>
<td>Park Category</td>
<td>Cleaning Schedule</td>
<td>Year Built</td>
<td>Opening Hours</td>
<td>Structure &amp; No. of Cubicles</td>
<td>Accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Southbrook Park</td>
<td>BD000259</td>
<td>SR DIS</td>
<td>3 x week Delta</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>24/7</td>
<td>Purpose built Concrete block 2U</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Swannanoa Domain</td>
<td>BD000264</td>
<td>SR COM</td>
<td>2 x week Delta</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>24/7</td>
<td>Landmark Corrugated Iron 1U</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Tom Ayers Reserve</td>
<td>BD000202</td>
<td>R&amp;E DIS</td>
<td>Daily Delta</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5:00 am to 9:30 pm</td>
<td>Purpose built Concrete block 2U</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Trousselot Park</td>
<td>0000999</td>
<td>PG DIS</td>
<td>Daily Delta</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>6:00 am to 9:30 pm</td>
<td>Purpose built Colour steel 4U</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Tuahiwi Sport &amp; Rec Centre</td>
<td>BD000314</td>
<td>SR COM</td>
<td>3 x week Delta</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>24/7</td>
<td>Landmark Corrugated Iron 2U</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Victoria Park</td>
<td>BD000268</td>
<td>PG DIS</td>
<td>Daily Delta</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>5:00 am to 9:30 pm</td>
<td>Purpose built Preformed concrete 2U</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. View Hill Domain</td>
<td>BD000387</td>
<td>N COM</td>
<td>2 x week Delta</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>24/7</td>
<td>Purpose built Concrete block 1M &amp; 2F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Waikuku Beach Ashley – Rakahuri River Mouth</td>
<td>BD000269</td>
<td>NAT REG</td>
<td>3 x week Delta</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>24/7</td>
<td>Purpose built Concrete block 1M, 5F &amp; 8UC</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name &amp; Location</td>
<td>Asset Number</td>
<td>Park Category</td>
<td>Cleaning Schedule</td>
<td>Year Built</td>
<td>Opening Hours</td>
<td>Structure &amp; No. of Cubicles</td>
<td>Accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Waikuku Beach</td>
<td>BD000292</td>
<td>N DIS</td>
<td>Daily summer 3x week off season Delta</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Purpose built Concrete block 1M, 2F &amp; 2UC</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Oval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Waikuku Beach Surf Club</td>
<td>BD000293</td>
<td>N DIS</td>
<td>Daily summer 3 x week off season</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Purpose built Concrete block 2U</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Wanaka Reserve</td>
<td>BD000317</td>
<td>N LOC</td>
<td>3 x week Delta</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Novaloo Stainless steel 1U</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Warren Community Reserve</td>
<td>BD000295</td>
<td>N COM</td>
<td>1 x week Delta</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Purpose built Timber 1U</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Woodend Beach Domain</td>
<td>BD000270</td>
<td>N REG</td>
<td>Daily summer 3 x week off season Delta</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Purpose built Concrete block 3M, 7F &amp; 4UC</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Woodend Recreation Ground</td>
<td>BD000273</td>
<td>SR COM</td>
<td>2 x week Delta</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Purpose built Concrete block 2U</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Woodend Town Centre School</td>
<td>BD000315</td>
<td>SS Daily</td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Purpose built Concrete block 1M, 1F &amp; 2UC</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix Three – Assessment Guidelines for Public Toilet Infrastructure

### Renewal (refurbish) or Upgrade (replace)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 SITING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does toilet siting meet CPTED requirements?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Refurbish if cost-benefit is less than replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Replace and relocate to new site meeting CPTED guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 DISABLED ACCESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does toilet meet current disabled access regulations?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Refurbish if cost-benefit is less than replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>If the toilet can be made compliant, refurbish if cost-benefit is less than replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>If the toilet cannot be made compliant, replace if there is no other compliant toilet within the distance required to meet the LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 BUILDING STRUCTURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does current public toilet achieve a reasonable performance score in terms of function and amenity?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>If can be made compliant with siting and disabled access, refurbish if cost-benefit is less than replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Replace is the preferred option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 BUILDING OF HISTORIC VALUE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the building of historic value?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Refurbish if can be made compliant with siting (CPTED) and disabled access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Cost-benefit analysis should be undertaken to determine best option if current building is capable of being made compliant with siting (CPTED) and disabled access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Remove (decommission & not replace)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 OPTIONAL TOILET</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there another toilet within 250 metres (town centre) or 500 metre (neighbourhood reserves) that is easily accessed, compliant with siting (CPTED) and disabled access and achieves a reasonable performance score?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Decommission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Do not consider decommissioning unless usage is very low and infrequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 RISK TO USERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Users are at risk due to poor siting (CPTED) and/or anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Decommission if use is low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No need to decommission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## New Park Toilet Assessment Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Location:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 1 IS NEW TOILET WARRANTED

**Does the proposed toilet meet one or more of the following criteria?**

- **Yes to one or more**
  - Consider new toilet
  - (Score ‘1’ for each criteria satisfied. Priority given to those with the higher score)
- **No to all**
  - Do not consider new toilet

**Criteria - Maximum score of 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2 ESTABLISHING PRIORITY FOR NEW TOILET – Use & Demand

**What is the expected use of the toilet and what is driving demand?**

Use the use and demand assessment chart to provide a score for the toilet. (The highest total score should be considered as highest priority)

**Criteria - Maximum score of 20**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Score - Maximum score of 27. More than 50% consider providing a new toilet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## New Town Centre Toilet Assessment Form

### Name: Location:

### 1 IS NEW TOILET WARRANTED

Does the proposed toilet meet one or more of the following criteria?

**Yes to one or more**
Consider new toilet
(Score ‘1’ for each criteria satisfied. Priority given to those with the higher score)

**No to all**
Do not consider new toilet

### Criteria - Maximum score of 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supported by Toilet Strategy or contributes to another Council strategy or plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is community demand/expectations for a new toilet to be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demand is likely to be generated by development occurring now or planned for the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Distance to nearest toilet is unreasonable (more than 250 metres) and/or access is difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Nearest toilet is not compliant with CPTED requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Nearest toilet is not compliant with disability standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Nearest toilet does not comply with LOS amenity standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of public toilet poses risk to health and safety of people through unsociable behaviour e.g. urinating in public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It is a high pedestrian movement and/or high activity area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It is close to a late night entertainment precinct or small venues without toilet facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Food and beverage is sold in that location</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sub Total

| % |  
|---|---

---

*Waimakariri District Council*
## Public Toilet Strategy

### 2 ESTABLISHING PRIORITY FOR NEW TOILET – Use & Demand

What is the expected use of the toilet and what is driving demand?

Use the use and demand assessment chart to provide a score for the toilet. (The highest total score should be considered as highest priority).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria - Maximum score of 20</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the anticipated use pattern?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the anticipated number of users?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What type of users are expected?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the expected future demand generators?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub Total

Total Score - Maximum score of 32. More than 50% consider providing a new toilet.

---

### Toilet Demand Assessment Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use Pattern</strong></td>
<td>Light use only during week and over month</td>
<td>Low intermittent use. Some days without use</td>
<td>Heavy peak use occasionally some days</td>
<td>Light regular use throughout day</td>
<td>Heavy regular use throughout day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Users</strong></td>
<td>Overall use averaging 2 or less per hour /8 hrs/ days open (1 every 30 min)</td>
<td>Overall use averaging 4 per hour /8 hrs/ days open (1 every 15 min)</td>
<td>Overall use averaging 6 per hour /8 hrs/ days open (1 every 10 min)</td>
<td>Overall use averaging 12 per hour /8 hrs/ days open (1 every 5 min)</td>
<td>Overall use averaging &gt;30 per hour /8 hrs/ days open (1 every 2 min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Users</strong></td>
<td>Short visit only to use toilet</td>
<td>Generally local use with shorter stays</td>
<td>Mixed local/community use with longer stays</td>
<td>Specific user requiring access to facilities – aged, young family, special needs etc</td>
<td>Residents from throughout the district. There may also be tourists and other visitors of all abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future Demand</strong></td>
<td>There are no known proposals that will increase demand; or demand is expected to decrease</td>
<td>There are long term plans that may increase demand beyond 10 years</td>
<td>There are plans, strategies, development plans that will be actioned and increase demand within the next 6 to 10 years</td>
<td>There are plans, strategies, development plans that will be actioned and increase demand within the next 2 to 5 years</td>
<td>There are imminent proposals that will increase demand within the next two years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix Four – 100 Year Renewals Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toilet Name</th>
<th>Year Materials Due For Replacement</th>
<th>Xyst Condition Rating</th>
<th>Xyst Overall Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programed for replacement/upgrading 2018-28</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Park</td>
<td>2068</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kairaki Reserve</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Picnic Grounds</td>
<td>2029</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Beach Domain</td>
<td>2053</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Andrews Park</td>
<td>2047</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programed for replacement/upgrading 2029-39</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Town Centre</td>
<td>2037</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View Hill Domain</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Community Reserve</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach- Ashley Rakahuri Rivermouth</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Town Centre</td>
<td>2033</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programed for replacement/upgrading 2040-50</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sefton Domain Pavilion</td>
<td>2042</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashgrove Park</td>
<td>2037</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loburn Domain</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust Community Centre</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust Domain</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton Domain*</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Airfield</td>
<td>2062</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville Sportsground Rugby Pavilion</td>
<td>2063</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville Sportsground Squash Courts</td>
<td>2059</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Domain</td>
<td>2065</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programed for replacement/upgrading 2051-61</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matawai Park</td>
<td>2061</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach Central Oval</td>
<td>2055</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinemoa Park</td>
<td>2064</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Lakes - old main road</td>
<td>2058</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Domain</td>
<td>2064</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach Surf Club</td>
<td>2060</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbrook Wetlands</td>
<td>2065</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley Park</td>
<td>2066</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainpower Oval</td>
<td>2073</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi Sport &amp; Recreation Centre</td>
<td>2070</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programed for replacement/upgrading 2062-72</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swannanoa Domain</td>
<td>2065</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Cemetery</td>
<td>2066</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Recreation Ground</td>
<td>2069</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Park</td>
<td>2068</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone Park</td>
<td>2069</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook Park</td>
<td>2069</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Public Toilet Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toilet Name</th>
<th>Year Materials Due For Replacement</th>
<th>Xyst Condition Rating</th>
<th>Xyst Overall Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakwood Park</td>
<td>2068</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall Park</td>
<td>2070</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Gorge Reserve</td>
<td>2070</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryder Reserve</td>
<td>2068</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Programed for replacement/upgrading 2073-2083**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toilet Name</th>
<th>Year Materials Due For Replacement</th>
<th>Xyst Condition Rating</th>
<th>Xyst Overall Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wanaka Reserve</td>
<td>2063</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Ayers Reserve</td>
<td>2074</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Lake</td>
<td>2075</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Beach car park</td>
<td>2075</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Park</td>
<td>2075</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pines Oval</td>
<td>2077</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayliss Drive Park</td>
<td>2078</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Airfield West</td>
<td>2078</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acacia Ave Reserve</td>
<td>2079</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grange View Reserve</td>
<td>2079</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Programed for replacement/upgrading 2084 -2117**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toilet Name</th>
<th>Year Materials Due For Replacement</th>
<th>Xyst Condition Rating</th>
<th>Xyst Overall Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trousselot Park</td>
<td>2080</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Lakes East</td>
<td>2082</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant Park</td>
<td>2082</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100 (est)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Park</td>
<td>2082</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100 (est)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other toilets built after 2018 due to be replaced/upgraded

Other toilets replaced/upgraded in the first 40 years of this schedule which have reached the end of their lifespan

This schedule does not include toilets in town centre buildings such as the Rangiora war Memorial Hall, Rangiora Public Library, Rangiora Service Centre and Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre as any replacements/upgrades would be included in the planning for these buildings.

*Carleton Domain Toilets have been included in the schedule but the reserve is leased to a group and future responsibility for any toilet replacement is unknown.
Appendix Five – Waimakariri District Council Public Toilet Survey Proposal

Purpose
To inform the WDC Toilet Strategy.

Methodology
To be available on Survey Monkey and as a hard copy upon request.

To be advertised via the news media, Council website, Facebook, community boards, letter of notification to owners of privately owned public toilet facilities and Waimakariri Access Group.

To be advertised to toilet users via a poster on toilet walls, with QR code to on-line survey.

Timeframe – to be available online from beginning December to end of January

Survey Questions

1. Where do you live? (please indicate subdivision area and town or rural area, for example, The Oaks, Rangiora or West Eyreton)

2. Age range

3. Gender

4. Have you used any public toilets in the District within the last twelve months? (If no go to question 11)

5. How often have you used the public toilets in the District within the last twelve months? (daily, weekly, fortnightly, monthly, less than monthly)

6. If these public toilets were located in Rangiora please choose the location of the toilet from the drop down box. (If not, go to question 7)

7. If these public toilets were located in Kaiapoi/Pines/Kairaki please choose the location of the toilet from the drop down box. (if not, go to question 8)

8. If these public toilets were located in Oxford please choose the location of the toilet from the drop down box. (if not, go to question 9)

9. If these public toilets were located in Woodend/Pegasus please choose the location of the toilet from the drop down box. (if not, go to question 10)

10. If these public toilets were located elsewhere in the District please choose the location of the toilet from the drop down box.

11. If you haven’t used any public toilets in the District within the last twelve months, does anything stop you from doing so?

12. What do you like the most about the public toilets in the District?

13. What do you dislike the most about public toilets in the District?

14. Do you take into account the availability and condition of public toilets when choosing which reserve or town centre to visit?
15 How far are you prepared to walk to get to a public toilet? (less than 1 minute, between 1 and 5 minutes, between 5 and 10 minutes, more than 10 minutes) Please comment if you wish.

16 How important are the following toilet features to you? (very important, quite important, not very important, not at all important)

- The location of the public toilet is well sign-posted
- The toilets are conveniently located in places people visit often
- The toilets can be used in the evenings
- The toilets can be used in the weekends
- The toilet can be easily used by people with a disability
- The toilets feel safe to use
- The toilets are well maintained
- The toilets are free of graffiti or damage
- The toilets are clean
- Single sex cubicles are available
- The toilets are unisex
- The toilets have baby change facilities
- The toilets have a hot water tap
- The toilets have soap dispensers
- The toilets have hand drying facilities
- The toilets have sanitary disposal boxes
- The Council’s contact details are displayed on the toilets
- Contact details for urgent cleaning and maintenance are displayed on the toilets

17 Please list any locations within the District where you think public toilets or additional public toilets should be provided.

18 Have you any suggestions for improving the public toilets in the District to best meet residents’ and visitor’s needs.

19 Do you want to tell us anything else about public toilets in the District?
### Appendix Six – Public Toilet Accessibility Audit

<p>| Name of toilet                  | Year built | Is the facility advertised as accessible? | Is the route from the parking area to toilet free of obstructions and at least 800mm wide? | Does the entrance path to the cubicle wider than 760mm and free of obstructions? | Does the door have an internal grab rail of 30-40mm OD 900mm above floor level? | Does the door exceed 1800mm long by 1600mm wide? | Does the cubicle exceed 1900mm long by 1600mm wide? | Is the handbasin within 1050mm of rear of toilet wall? | Is the handbasin a maximum of 400mm deep? | Is the grab rail 30-40mm OD and 700mm off floor and of 760 x 750 size? | Is toilet roll holder accessible from toilet? | Is toilet pan max of 700-750mm from front of pan to back of pan and 460mm above floor level and centre of pan 490mm from wall? |
|--------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Acacia Ave Reserve            | 2014       | Yes                                       | yes drop down kerb at car park                                                        | 800mm                                                                                       | male 1530mm/ female 1540mm                                                                 | 800mm                                                                                       | 470mm above floor                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                                                                             |
| Ashgrove Park                 | 1972       | No                                        |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                                                                             |
| Ashley Gorge Reserve          | 2005       | Yes                                       |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            | no drop down kerb at car park                                                                                        |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| Ashley Picnic Grounds         | 1964       | Yes                                       |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            | no                                                                                                                  |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| Baker Park                    | 2017       | Yes                                       |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| Bayfield Drive Park           | 2013       | Yes                                       |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            | 900mm                                                                                                           |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| Carlisle Domain               | 1960       | No                                        |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| Cust Community Centre         | 1979       | No                                        |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| Cust Domain                   | 1978       | No                                        |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| Dudley Park                   | 2002       | Yes                                       |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| Elephant Park - updated       | 2017       | Yes                                       |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| Gladstone Park                | 2004       | Yes                                       |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| Grange View Reserve           | 2014       | Yes                                       | not ideal as bar in pathway                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| Hinemoa Park                  | 1999       | Yes                                       |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| Kaiapoi Cemetery              | 2006       | Yes                                       |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| Kaiapoi Domain                | 1999       | Yes                                       |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| Kaiapoi Lakes Reserve (east)  | 2017       | Yes                                       |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| Kaiapoi Lakes Old main road   | 2003       | Yes                                       |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| Kaiapoi Memorial Reserve      | 1985       | No                                        |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| Karitiki Reserve              | 1966       | No                                        |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| Kendall Park                  | 2010       | Yes                                       |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| Loburn Domain                 | 1945       | No                                        |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| Mainpower Oval                | 2008       | Yes                                       |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| Mandeville Sports Ground - Rugby Pavilion | 1981 | No |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| Mandeville Sports Grounds squash | 2009 | Yes |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| Maria Andrews Park prefab     | 2015       | Yes                                       |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| Maria Andrews Park (2)        | 1982       | Yes                                       |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| Matatani Park                 | 1996       | Yes                                       |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| Murphy Park port-a-com        | 2013       | Yes                                       |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| Northbrook Wetlands           | 2010       | Yes                                       |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| Oakwood Park                  | 2013       | Yes                                       |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |
| Ohoka Domain                  | 2000       | Yes                                       |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |                                                                                            |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of toilet</th>
<th>Year built</th>
<th>Is the facility advertised as accessible?</th>
<th>Is the route from the parking area to toilet free of obstructions and at least 800mm wide?</th>
<th>Is the entrance path to the cubicle wider than 760mm and free of obstructions?</th>
<th>Does the door have an internal grab rail of 30-40mm OD 900mm above floor level?</th>
<th>Does the door open outwards?</th>
<th>Does the cubicule exceed 1900mm long by 1600mm wide?</th>
<th>Is the handbasin within 1050mm of rear of toilet wall?</th>
<th>Is the handbasin a maximum of 400mm deep?</th>
<th>Is the grab rail 30-40mm OD and 700mm off floor and of 750 x 750 size?</th>
<th>Is toilet roll holder accessible from toilet?</th>
<th>Is toilet pan max of 700-750mm from front of pan to back of pan and 460mm above floor level and centre of pan 450mm from wall?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Town Centre</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Park</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Bay Beach Car Park</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Lakes</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pines Oval</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Airfield</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Airfield West</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora New World</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Public library</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Service Centre</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora War Memorial Hall</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic centre</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryder Park</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selkirk Domain Pavilion</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook Park</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swannanoa Domain</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No direct access</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Ayres Reserve</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No rail</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trousselot Park</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No rail</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi Sport &amp; Rec Centre</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No rail</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Park</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Between 900 and 940</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View Hill Domain</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach - Ashley-Kakahi</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>access is soft, sand</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach - Central Area Reserve</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach Central Area - Surf Club</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanaka Reserve</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Community Reserve</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Beach Domain</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Recreation Ground</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Town Centre School Road</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix Seven WDC Proposed Public Toilets Levels of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Category</th>
<th>Expected Level of Use</th>
<th>Expected Toilet Provision</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Design Features</th>
<th>Location on Site</th>
<th>Cleaning</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Name of Toilet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town Centre</strong></td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Quality</td>
<td>Generally bespoke to fit the character of the setting</td>
<td>In accordance with CPTED criteria</td>
<td>High standard of cleanliness to be achieved</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Memorial Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum of 4 unisex cubicles in stand-alone toilet blocks</td>
<td>Preference for private/public partnerships to provide greater supervision</td>
<td>High of daily, 7 days per week, including public holidays</td>
<td>Open during daylight hours or during working hours if located in a building</td>
<td>Tom Ayers Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At least one accessible cubicle per block or more as required by building code</td>
<td>Can be located within privately owned/public buildings</td>
<td>Possibly 2 x daily if required to maintain standards and a minimum of 5 x week for toilets located within buildings only open during the week</td>
<td>May be open until 10pm depending on town centre activities</td>
<td>Trousselot Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Electronic locking system on stand-alone toilet blocks as toilets are built or upgraded</td>
<td>Internal and external lighting</td>
<td>Minimum of 5 x week for toilets located within buildings only open during the week</td>
<td>Township toilets open 24/7 or daylight hours if fitting with an electronic locking device</td>
<td>Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baby changing facilities</td>
<td>Sanitary disposal bins</td>
<td>Cleaning schedule to be linked to user numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora Service Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sanitary disposal bins</td>
<td>Mistors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora Public Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cold water supplied to basin</td>
<td>Soap dispensers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora Town Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cold water supplied to basin</td>
<td>Toiletpaper</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora New World</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cold water supplied to basin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora War Memorial Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cold water supplied to basin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cold water supplied to basin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Woodend Town Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civic Space</strong></td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Quality</td>
<td>Generally bespoke to fit the character of the setting</td>
<td>In accordance with CPTED criteria</td>
<td>High standard of cleanliness to be achieved</td>
<td>Oxford Town Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(all toilets currently provided on civic spaces serve as town centre toilets)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See above if serving a town centre function</td>
<td>Can be located within privately owned/public buildings</td>
<td>High of daily, 7 days per week, including public holidays</td>
<td>See above if serving a town centre function</td>
<td>Rangiora Service Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum of 5 x week for toilets located within buildings only open during the week</td>
<td>See above if serving a town centre function</td>
<td>Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora Public Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora War Memorial Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Woodend Town Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Streetscapes</strong></td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Quality</td>
<td>Generally bespoke to fit the character of the setting</td>
<td>In accordance with CPTED criteria</td>
<td>High standard of cleanliness to be achieved</td>
<td>Oxford Town Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(the only toilet currently provided on a streetscape serves as a town centre toilet)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See town centre design features</td>
<td>Can be located within privately owned/public buildings</td>
<td>Minimum of 5 x week for toilets located within buildings only open during the week</td>
<td>See above if serving a town centre function</td>
<td>Rangiora Service Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora Public Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora War Memorial Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Only if providing a town centre function</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Quality</td>
<td>Generally bespoke to fit the character of the setting</td>
<td>In accordance with CPTED criteria</td>
<td>High standard of cleanliness to be achieved</td>
<td>Oxford Town Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General low but could be high if events are on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See town centre design features</td>
<td>Can be located within privately owned/public buildings</td>
<td>Minimum of 5 x week for toilets located within buildings only open during the week</td>
<td>See above if serving a town centre function</td>
<td>Rangiora Service Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora Public Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora War Memorial Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Woodend Town Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Category</td>
<td>Expected Level of Use</td>
<td>Expected Toilet Provision</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Design Features</td>
<td>Location on Site</td>
<td>Cleaning</td>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Name of Toilet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Gardens (district)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>All reserves</td>
<td>High Quality</td>
<td>Generally bespoke to fit the character of the setting</td>
<td>- Roadside berm</td>
<td>- Effluent goes directly into sewer system</td>
<td>24/7</td>
<td>Rangiora, Railway Road; Oxford, High Street; Kaiapoi, Charles Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(all toilets currently provided in public gardens serve as town centre toilets)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage Parks (one of these currently serves as a town centre toilet)</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Not generally required but may be exceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Parks (local)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Not generally required but may be exceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Public Gardens (district)**
- High
- All reserves
- High Quality
- Generally bespoke to fit the character of the setting
- Up to 4 unisex cubicles in stand-alone toilet blocks
- At least one accessible cubicle per block or more as required by building code
- Electronic locking system as toilets are built or upgraded
- Internal and external lighting
- Hand dryers
- Baby changing facilities
- Sanitary disposal bins
- Mirrors
- Cold water supplied to basin
- Soap dispensers
- Toilet paper
- In accordance with CPTED criteria
- See town centre if serving a town centre function
- High standard of cleanliness to be achieved
- Minimum of daily, 7 days per week, including public holidays
- Open 24/7 or daylight hours if fitting with an electronic locking device

**Cultural Heritage Parks (one of these currently serves as a town centre toilet)**
- Variable
- Generally low but could be moderate during burials
- Not generally required but may be exceptions
- High use parks
- Where long stays warrant provision
- Exceeds normal walking distance (500m or 10 minutes' walk)
- Park caters for larger than normal geographic area and/or number of residents
- New provision to be assessed using New Park Toilet Assessment Form
- See town centre if serving a town centre function
- Stand-alone toilet with one to two unisex cubicles
- Electronic locking system as toilets are built or upgraded
- All cubicles to be accessible in new toilets
- Internal and external lighting
- Cold water supplied to basin
- Toilet paper
- In accordance with CPTED criteria
- See town centre if serving a town centre function
- Minimum of 2 x week
- See town centre above if serving a town centre function
- Open 24/7 or daylight hours if fitting with an electronic locking device

**Neighbourhood Parks (local)**
- Moderate
- Not generally required but may be exceptions
- High use parks
- Where long stays warrant provision
- Exceeds normal walking distance (500m or 10 minutes' walk)
- Park caters for larger than normal geographic area and/or number of residents
- New provision to be assessed using New Park Toilet Assessment Form
- Standard quality
- Off the shelf design
- Stand-alone toilet generally with a single unisex cubicle
- Electronic locking system as toilets are built or upgraded
- All cubicles to be accessible in new toilets
- Internal and external lighting
- Cold water supplied to basin
- Toilet paper
- In accordance with CPTED criteria
- Minimum of 3 x week
- Open 24/7 or daylight hours if fitting with an electronic locking device

**Availability**
- 24/7
- Open during daylight hours
- Open 24/7 or daylight hours if fitting with an electronic locking device

**Name of Toilet**
- Trousselot Park
- Victoria Park
- Kaipoi Cemetery
- Kaiapoi Memorial Reserve
- Bayliss Drive Park
- Elephant Park
- Wanaka Reserve
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Category</th>
<th>Expected Level of Use</th>
<th>Expected Toilet Provision</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Design Features</th>
<th>Location on Site</th>
<th>Cleaning</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Name of Toilet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Parks (community)</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Lower use for some rural domains although these can have peaks in use</td>
<td>All reserves but there may be exceptions where toilets are not required where the purpose of the reserve is for people to use a community building where the reserve is not suitable for this type of development</td>
<td>Standard quality</td>
<td>Off the shelf design</td>
<td>Generally a stand-alone toilet with one to two unisex cubicles Some existing toilets are incorporated in a building. All but one have external access Electronic locking system as toilets are built or upgraded All cubicles to be accessible in new toilets Internal and external lighting Cold water supplied to basin Toilet paper</td>
<td>In accordance with CPTED criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Parks (district)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All reserves where other toilets aren’t located close by</td>
<td>Standard quality</td>
<td>Off the shelf design</td>
<td>Stand-alone toilet with two unisex cubicles Electronic locking system as toilets are built or upgraded All cubicles to be accessible in new toilets Internal and external lighting Cold water supplied to basin Toilet paper</td>
<td>In accordance with CPTED criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport &amp; Recreation Parks (community)</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Low for rural parks but higher during sports events</td>
<td>Moderate use for toilets located near schools</td>
<td>All reserves</td>
<td>Standard quality</td>
<td>Off the shelf design</td>
<td>Stand-alone toilet with a minimum of two unisex cubicles Electronic locking system as toilets are built or upgraded All cubicles to be accessible in one and two cubic blocks and at least one in larger blocks Internal and external lighting Cold water supplied to basin Toilet paper</td>
<td>In accordance with CPTED criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport &amp; Recreation Parks (district)</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Higher during sports events</td>
<td>Moderate use for toilets located on multi-purpose urban parks</td>
<td>All reserves</td>
<td>Standard quality</td>
<td>Off the shelf design</td>
<td>Stand-alone toilet with a minimum of two unisex cubicles May be located in a building with external access Electronic locking system as toilets are built or upgraded All cubicles to be accessible in one and two cubic blocks and at least one in larger blocks Internal and external lighting Cold water supplied to basin Toilet paper</td>
<td>In accordance with CPTED criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Category</td>
<td>Expected Level of Use</td>
<td>Expected Toilet Provision</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Design Features</td>
<td>Location on Site</td>
<td>Cleaning</td>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Name of Toilet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sport &amp; Recreation Parks</strong> (region)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard quality</td>
<td>Stand-alone toilet with a minimum of two unisex cubicles, May be located in a building with external access, Electronic locking system as toilets are built or upgraded, All cubicles to be accessible in one and two cubic blocks and at least one in larger blocks, Internal and external lighting, Cold water supplied to basin, Toilet paper</td>
<td>In accordance with CPTED criteria</td>
<td>Minimum of 3 x week</td>
<td>Open 24/7 or daylight hours if fitting with an electronic locking device</td>
<td>Mainpower Oval, Rangiora Airfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Parks (community)</strong></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Not generally required but may be exceptions - Moderate use reserves where other toilets aren’t located close by and long stays are envisaged</td>
<td>Standard quality</td>
<td>Stand-alone toilet with single unisex cubicle, Electronic locking system as toilets are built or upgraded, All cubicles to be accessible in new toilets, Internal and external lighting, Cold water supplied to basin, Toilet paper</td>
<td>In accordance with CPTED criteria</td>
<td>Minimum of 3 x week</td>
<td>Open 24/7 or daylight hours if fitting with an electronic locking device</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Parks (district)</strong></td>
<td>Moderate to high</td>
<td>All high use parks - Parks where long stays are envisaged</td>
<td>Standard or basic quality depending on level of use and location, Off the shelf design, Could be composting option</td>
<td>Stand-alone toilet generally with two unisex cubicles, Electronic locking system as toilets are built or upgraded, All cubicles to be accessible in new toilets, Internal and external lighting, Cold water supplied to basin, Toilet paper, Molded plastic (basic)</td>
<td>In accordance with CPTED criteria</td>
<td>Minimum of 3 x week</td>
<td>Open 24/7 or daylight hours if fitting with an electronic locking device</td>
<td>Ashley Picnic Grounds, Kaiapoi Lakes – old main road, Matawai Park, Northbrook Wetlands, Gietlui Waterfall Reserve (toilet supplied by DOC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Parks (regional)</strong></td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>All high use parks - Parks where long stays are envisaged</td>
<td>Standard quality</td>
<td>Stand-alone toilet with a minimum of 2 unisex cubicles, often up to 4 or more, Electronic locking system as toilets are built or upgraded, All cubicles to be accessible in two cubic blocks and at least one in larger blocks, Internal and external lighting, Cold water supplied to basin, Toilet paper</td>
<td>In accordance with CPTED criteria</td>
<td>Minimum of 1 x day, 7 days per week, including public holidays during summer, Minimum of 2 x week off season (Ashley Gorge Reserve), Minimum of 3 x week off season (beach reserves)</td>
<td>Open 24/7 or daylight hours if fitting with an electronic locking device</td>
<td>Ashley Gorge Reserve, Waikuku Beach - Ashley/Rakahuri River Mouth, Kairaki Beach, Pegasus Beach car park, Woodend Beach Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recreation &amp; ecological linkages</strong> (local)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Not provided apart from in exceptional circumstances, for example, if forms part of a well-used long walkway outside of an urban area</td>
<td>Basic, Composting option</td>
<td>Could be molded plastic, Composting option</td>
<td>In accordance with CPTED criteria</td>
<td>Minimum of 1 x week</td>
<td>Open 24/7 or daylight hours if fitting with an electronic locking device</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Category</td>
<td>Expected Level of Use</td>
<td>Expected Toilet Provision</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Design Features</td>
<td>Location on Site</td>
<td>Cleaning</td>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Name of Toilet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Recreation & ecological linkages (community) | Low to moderate                                       | Not generally required but may be exceptions  
- Significant walkway/ cycleway systems  
- Significant R & E sites, for example, popular picnic or fishing spots | Basic    | Could be molded plastic                                                        |       | In accordance with CPTED criteria                                               | Minimum of 1 x week                                | Open 24/7 or daylight hours if fitting with an electronic locking device |
| Recreation & ecological linkages (district)  | Variable                                              | High (summer)  
- Moderate (off season)                                                                 | Stand-alone toilet with two unisex cubicles  
- Electronic locking system as toilets are built or upgraded  
- All cubicles to be accessible in new toilets  
- Internal and external lighting  
- Cold water supplied to basin  
- Toilet paper  
- Molded plastic (basic) | Stand-alone toilet with one to two unisex cubicles  
- Electronic locking system as toilets are built or upgraded  
- All cubicles to be accessible in new toilets  
- Indoor and external lighting  
- Cold water supplied to basin  
- Toilet paper  
- Molded plastic (basic) | In accordance with CPTED criteria                      | Minimum of 1 x day (summer)                                                               | Open 24/7 or daylight hours if fitting with an electronic locking device |
| Recreation & ecological linkages (district)  | Variable                                              | High use sites where other toilets aren’t located close by and when long stays warrant provision | Standard or basic quality depending on level of use and location  
- Off the shelf design  
- Could be composting option | Stand-alone toilet with one to two unisex cubicles  
- Electronic locking system as toilets are built or upgraded  
- All cubicles to be accessible in new toilets  
- Internal and external lighting  
- Cold water supplied to basin  
- Toilet paper  
- Molded plastic (basic) | In accordance with CPTED criteria                      | Minimum of 3 x week (off season)                                                          | Open 24/7 or daylight hours if fitting with an electronic locking device |
| Outdoor Adventure Parks                     | Variable                                              | High use sites where other toilets aren’t located close by and when long stays warrant provision | Standard or basic quality depending on level of use and location  
- Off the shelf design  
- Could be composting option | Standard port-a -loo  
- Site specific  
- Daily  
- Open 24/7 | In accordance with CPTED criteria                      | Open 24/7 or daylight hours if fitting with an electronic locking device |
| Seasonal toilets                            | High                                                  | May be provided in special locations  
- Each proposal considered on its own merits  
- Public toilets for events are expected to be hired in by event organiser | Port-a -loo | Site specific  
- Daily  
- Open 24/7 | In accordance with CPTED criteria                      | Open 24/7 or daylight hours if fitting with an electronic locking device |
| Toilets on/or servicing sites owned by others| Variable                                              | High seasonal demand  
- Each proposal considered on its own merits  
- Priority given to:  
  - Possible partnerships  
  - Where the site is a better location than a Council-owned site  
  - Popular visitor destinations  
  - Proposals of benefit to District residents | Standard or basic quality depending on level of use and location  
- Off the shelf design  
- Could be composting option | As per negotiated agreement  
- As per negotiated agreement  
- Open 24/7 or daylight hours if fitting with an electronic locking device | In accordance with CPTED criteria | As per negotiated agreement | Open 24/7 or daylight hours if fitting with an electronic locking device |
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Executive Summary

A play space strategy is important in helping Council provide well-designed and well-maintained play spaces that are exciting, attractive, and highly valued by the community. It will provide a deeper understanding of play’s importance, and its value to participants of all ages and levels of ability.

Planning and management principles advocated in the strategy will help ensure the desired community benefits are achieved. These standards will then become the benchmark for ongoing provision.

Scope

The scope of the Play Space Strategy is defined in terms of physical play spaces owned and managed by Waimakariri District Council and freely accessed by the public. These settings offer specific play facilities over and above the free play opportunities generally available in most public parks and reserves.

Aims and Objectives

The primary aim of the play space strategy is to guide the planning, development and ongoing management of the Waimakariri District’s growing play space network. This will ensure good quality play opportunities are available to all those who wish to participate.

Council will meet a diverse range of identified community play needs in a creative and cost-effective way that ensures the benefits and financial implications of play space provision are clearly understood and evaluated.

Play Space Allocation

Most play spaces are provided at neighbourhood parks, which are primary destinations for community recreation. Some sport and recreation parks and other high profile reserves also have designated play areas.

Access guidelines based on the travel distance to a play space, and the number of residents a site is expected to cater for, ensure an equitable distribution of play space throughout the District.

Play areas are classified according to the catchment area they serve. The scale and range of facilities varies between sites catering for a small local area, and those serving a wider community or attracting visitors on a district-wide or regional scale. Each level of provision should meet the quality and play value standards required for the user groups targeted.

Play Space Quality

A focus on play quality helps maximise the benefits of future investment in play, without the need for greatly increased expenditure. Provision is targeted in a more efficient and effective manner.

Play Value

Play value is a key element in the creation of high quality play environments. A table included in the Strategy (Appendix B: WDC Play Values Checklist) identifies a range of important play values and highlights their significance at the various stages of child development.
A 2017 assessment of play value in Council play spaces found that 30 out of 67 (45%) do not meet contemporary play value standards. Priority improvements identified in the assessment form part of a ten-year play space upgrade and replacement programme (Appendix D: Priority WDC Play Space Renewals (2018-19 to 2027-28).

**Contextual Play Value**

The setting and support facilities associated with a play space have a significant impact on visitor experience. An inviting and well-designed site plays an important role in attracting visitors and maximising the value and status of a play space.

**Universal Design and Inclusive Play**

Universal Design focuses on the diverse range of needs that are common to everyone. Its aim is to incorporate features that enable as many people as possible to independently use an environment or product.

The concept of Inclusive Play encourages people of any age and ability to independently access and enjoy a play space and its facilities. It acknowledges the physical, social, emotional, sensory and cognitive learning aspects of play and their importance to child development and well-being.

If inclusive design principles are followed, the provision of specialised or separate facilities for children with disabilities is largely unnecessary and undesirable.

**Play Choice and Diversity**

Council prescribes no particular play space design or combination of elements. This allows greater flexibility when looking to provide inviting contemporary play spaces.

In response to changing community needs, preferences and expectations, there is scope to expand some types of play not well represented in Council’s current play space network.

- Natural Play
- Sensory Play
- Water Play
- Themed Play
- Digitally-Assisted Play
- Adventure Play
- Outdoor Fitness & Exercise
- Young Adult Zones
- Older Adult Zones

**Play Space Safety and Maintenance**

All play spaces comply with the current New Zealand Standard (NZS 5828:2004 Playground Equipment & Surfacing). Programmed inspection and maintenance is a requirement of Council’s District Parks and Reserves Maintenance Contract.

Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) assessments are undertaken prior to the installation of all new and redeveloped play spaces.
Play Spaces in New Residential Subdivisions

Developer involvement in the layout and installation of a new play space and its support facilities can benefit all parties:

- Established park and play facilities are available when most residents first move into a new development.
- Council save on administration and development costs through use of developer and contractor services already involved with on-site consent works.

Community Engagement

New and upgraded play spaces are designed and developed with input from the community. Consultation methods may differ, ranging from informal to formal, while the scope of input can vary from local to district-wide depending on catchment status. Particular emphasis is placed on children likely to be using a new play space.

The appropriate Council Community Board is involved in the consultation process and gives final approval to development plans.

Play spaces developed within a new subdivision prior to the establishment of a residential community must meet Council's established site design and level of service standards. These standards reflect community input to the relevant administrative documents.

Financial Implications

Current capital replacement funding levels are adequate to finance priority play space renewals and upgrades scheduled over the next ten years. This includes provision for improvements required to bring targeted facilities up to a play value standard of average or higher.

Additional capital works funding is required to develop three play spaces - and one community skate park - on council reserves in areas where existing coverage does not meet level of service requirements.

Key Level of Service Components

Provision standards:

- Most urban and suburban residential properties to be within 500 metres radial distance of a local play space and 1,000 meters of a community play space. One play space per 1,000 people to serve as an overall minimum standard.

- Local catchment play spaces to prioritise play provision for pre-school and young primary age children.

- Increased emphasis on ‘play value’ as a key performance indicator in play space provision.

- The application of universal design and inclusive play principles to enable as wide a range of people as possible to access and enjoy play facilities.

- Recognition of play space as a community focal point within a park. The setting and support infrastructure to be included when evaluating overall play space design, quality and level of service requirements.
Asset related:

• Use of diverse and appealing play elements that maximise play value for targeted users.

• Engineered wood fibre to be Council’s preferred standard safety surface for play areas. It is a cost-effective ‘accessible’ surface.

• Shade cover to be available at high-use longer stay play sites. Junior play spaces with no natural shade to receive priority.

• Park play spaces will not be lit at night. The use of play facilities during hours of darkness is not recommended.

• Fencing of playgrounds is undesirable, except where an identified hazard cannot otherwise be managed.

Financial implications:

• Current capital funding levels are adequate (as a minimum) to finance priority play space upgrades and replacements scheduled over the next ten years (2018-2028). Annual budget funding for this work is currently $190,000.

• New capital works funding of $265,000 is required over the next ten years for development of three new play spaces in established residential areas. This will eliminate existing level of service shortfalls where current provision does not meet community access (travel distance) guidelines.

• New capital works funding of $150,000 is required for a community skate park in the Woodend-Pegasus area. This key activity centre currently lacks a skate park of a size and quality appropriate to its population catchment.

• Efficiency gains will be generated through a more prescriptive and coordinated approach to Council’s investment in play space.
1. Introduction

1.1 Why is a play strategy needed?

A play space strategy is important in helping Council provide well-designed and well-maintained play spaces that are exciting, attractive, and highly valued by the community. It helps provide a deeper understanding of play’s importance and its value to participants of all ages and levels of ability. This extends to those supporting and sharing in the play experience and the positive social and wider community benefits a good quality play space can deliver.

Planning and management principles advocated in the strategy will help ensure the desired community benefits are achieved. These standards will then become the benchmark for ongoing provision.

1.2 Community context

The Waimakariri District covers approximately 2,250 square kilometres (225,000 hectares) of North Canterbury. It extends across the Canterbury plains from Pegasus Bay in the east to the Canterbury foothills in the west. The Waimakariri River’s journey from the hills to the sea defines the southern boundary. The Hurunui District lies to the north. The main urban areas are Rangiora and Kaiapoi, with smaller towns at Woodend, Pegasus and Oxford. Beach settlements punctuate the coastline at Waikuku, Woodend, The Pines and Kairaki. Waimakariri still retains a strong rural character, with a third of ratepayers living in rural areas and villages such as Cust, Ohoka, Sefton and Tuahiwi.

There are currently 67 Council owned play spaces in the Waimakariri District. 27 of these are found in local parks where most visitors live close by. 25 are community play areas that have a greater range of play facilities and provide a focal point for residents from a wider residential area. 12 have district significance, being located at important destinations for sport or general recreation. These play spaces still meet the needs of the surrounding community. The remaining 3 play spaces are located at regional parks. These destinations have attractive recreational settings and attract visitors from the wider Canterbury region and beyond.

The distribution of play spaces is relatively even relative to the population and geographical spread of the District’s towns and suburban areas. In addition, all significant rural and coastal settlements have play spaces. These are primarily located at a community focal point such as the local Domain.

1.3 Population and social trends

The District’s population has grown rapidly over the past 15 years and is expected to continue increasing until 2048. The Council has adopted a medium population growth scenario for its 2018-2048 infrastructure planning. This assumes a projected population of 97,000, which is an increase of 39,000 from 2016.

The population in the District has a higher median age than New Zealand as a whole and this is expected to rise further through to 2048. Despite this, there are a significant number of young people aged under 15 years (19.5% of the population). This is close to the national median of 19.6%.

It is important that Waimakariri District Council continues to recognise the value and importance of play space provision. Play opportunities encourage physical activity and promote community health and well-being. This is particularly important given decreasing levels of physical activity in children and young adults. High-quality play spaces also acknowledge the importance of social, emotional and psychological aspects of child development and all-round health.
Given current population trends in the District, it is important that young children and older adults have good access to high quality play spaces that accommodate both participation and support roles. In an ageing population, older adults also have a need for increased social and physical activity space as they look to maintain good health into later years.

Older children and young adults form a smaller proportion of the district population, but they also have important social and activity space needs that are not well recognised. This was evident in young people’s responses to the Waimakariri Youth Development Strategy, 2010.

2. **The Concept of Play**

Play is freely chosen activity through which people express themselves and have fun. Children are the primary focus of play space provision, but people of any age and ability can enjoy play. It is engaged in for its own sake, and the rewards are inherent in the activity

Play is so important to optimal child development it has been recognized by the United Nations High Commission for Human Rights as a right of every child. (Convention on the Rights of the Child. Resolution 44/25, 20/11/1989).

**Key Benefits:**

Play is important to quality of life. It has a positive influence on health and well-being, developmental learning, and emotional and social development.

Inviting and well-designed play spaces are important community settings. They generate social interactions and shared experiences that contribute to the development of a vibrant and resilient community.

3. **Scope and Content**

The scope of the Play Space Strategy is defined in terms of physical play spaces owned and managed by Waimakariri District Council and freely accessed by the public. These settings offer specific play facilities over and above the free play opportunities generally available in most public parks and reserves.

Play space provision focusses on children up to 16 years of age, but also accounts for adults; including those supporting, and participating in, children’s play.

A public play space is often referred to as a playground. This can lead to an assumption that play is undertaken within a defined area on a specific range of purpose-built equipment. Opportunities exist to broaden the concept of play and what constitutes a quality play experience. A number of connected play spaces can be provided to meet the needs of different age groups and abilities, and improve their integration within a park setting. This can extend to complementary play facilities such as half courts and skate parks. Play opportunities can also be created through the thoughtful design and layout of other built elements and landscape features.
4. Aims of the Strategy

Guide the planning, development and ongoing management of the Waimakariri District’s growing play space network.

Promote best practice principles in play space planning and design.

Ensure quality play opportunities are available to children of all ages and abilities.

Provide a guiding document for subdivision developers involved in the design and development of new play spaces.

5. Key Objectives

- Provide a diverse range of play spaces that meet identified play needs and values.
- Ensure an equitable distribution of local and wider-community play spaces based on measurable provision guidelines.
- Produce well designed, constructed and maintained play spaces supported by sound administration.
- Enable the financial implications of strategic play space provision to be clearly understood and evaluated.

An accompanying checklist, ‘Play Space Strategy – Key Principles’ is included in the appendices; Appendix A.

6. Where a Play Space is provided

Council community green space comprises nine park and reserve categories. Each of these has a different primary purpose.

6.1 WDC Park Categories

- Neighbourhood
- Sport & Recreation
- Natural
- Cultural Heritage
- Public Gardens
- Civic Space
- Recreational & Ecological Linkage
- Streetscape
- Outdoor Adventure
6.2 Parks and reserves with a play space

Most purpose-built play spaces are located within Neighbourhood Parks in an urban or suburban area. Others are located in Sport and Recreation Parks that serve a wider neighbourhood park function. Although not provided at every neighbourhood park, a play space is normally readily accessible to most residents within a built-up residential area (see Play Space Distribution).

6.2.1 Neighbourhood Parks

Neighbourhood Parks provide the opportunity for recreation, play and social activity in a pleasant and relaxing environment. The key focus is on local residents, with larger high-profile parks also attracting visitors from further afield.

6.2.2 Sport & Recreation Parks

Sports play is the primary purpose of these parks. Toilets, changing rooms and car parks are usually available and some have resident club facilities. A number have play spaces that cater for both park visitors and local residents.

6.2.3 Rural settlement reserves

Rural play spaces are typically located in a Domain or comparable reserve that serves as a focal point for the surrounding community. These sites are included in the category Neighbourhood Parks with a Community Catchment.

6.2.4 Destination sites

Popular visitor destinations such as Public Gardens and Natural Parks may incorporate play spaces.

6.2.5 Other sites

A play space may be located at an alternative reserve or other suitable public space where a traditional neighbourhood park or sport & recreation park is not available.

7. How play space is allocated to meet community needs

7.1 Play Space Distribution

The distribution of play space aims to comply with the following community access guidelines. These guidelines ensure that residents in urban areas, including residential townships, are close to a park with a play space suitable for young children, and within manageable distance of a park with play facilities designed for a wide range of ages and abilities.

*Most residential properties in an urban or suburban area will be within reasonable walking distance of a play space. Ideally within a 500 metre radius or under 10 minute walk.*

*Most residential properties in an urban or suburban area will be within a longer walk or reasonable cycling distance of a medium to large community play space. Ideally within a 1,000 metre (1km) radius or 15 minute walk.*

The following supplementary guideline ensures play spaces have the capacity to meet community demand, particularly in high-density areas.
A minimum of one play space per 1,000 residents in urban and suburban areas.

The spread of parks and play spaces across the District’s residential zones is not always uniform. A number of factors influence the precise pattern of distribution and scale of provision.

- Parks and play spaces are normally located within, or very close to, high-density living areas. This enables a large number of local residents to easily access and use a play space. High-density living is becoming more common in the Waimakariri District, due to a fast-growing population and constraints on the availability of new residential land.

- Where the preferred or existing location of a play space means a significant number of surrounding residential properties do not meet access standards, an additional park and play space is normally required. This is accounted for when new residential development is planned, and programmed for existing areas if suitable open space is available.

- Where an increasing population, and the lack of a suitable alternative site, make it difficult to cater for play needs at a park, an expansion of existing on-site play facilities is normally undertaken. This is subject to suitable space being available.

- In extensive new residential areas, increased capacity and value is best achieved through provision of a large well-located community park and play space. Subject to meeting access guidelines, this is preferable to one or two smaller parks that are unable to provide adequate space and play facilities to accommodate all age levels and abilities.

- Physical barriers can have a significant impact on the accessibility and safe use of a play space. A busy road or significant waterway can make a play site inaccessible to many potential users. In these circumstances, an alternative site with low-risk access needs to be available. Safe and inviting pedestrian connections are an important consideration when designing parks and their surroundings.

- Rural settlements and recently developed rural-residential communities will normally have a play space within walking, cycling, or short driving distance of residents. This is due to their lower-density populations, which are often spread over a wide geographical area.

### 7.2 Play Space Catchments and Levels of Service

Catchment size is used to organise parks and play spaces into categories that best meet community needs and visitor demand. Local play spaces cater for nearby residents while Community, District and Regional play spaces increasingly attract visitors from further afield.

Catchment levels and associated play space levels of service described in this document are consistent with Council’s Parks Categories and Levels of Service, 2011.

Table 1: Visitor Catchments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catchment Level</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Serves the immediate local area. Readily accessed by walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Community/Suburban</td>
<td>Serves the surrounding community, suburb or small town. Access by walking, other non-motorised means or motor vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catchment Level</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>City/District wide</td>
<td>Serves the wider Waimakariri District. Significant level of access by motor vehicle or public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Serves the entire region, including several major centres or districts. Access primarily by motor vehicle or public transport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Catchment Zones

Parks with a larger catchment area usually have a larger play space with a wider range of play elements. Many sites have additional recreation facilities, or feature natural elements that improve overall play value, particularly for older children. These range from casual game play assets such as multi-sport goalposts and basketball half-courts, through to cycle tracks and skate parks at select larger sites. In some cases, play opportunities extend to natural elements such as a beach, lake, river or forest. Levels of service may vary depending on a park’s primary purpose, site characteristics, and visitor demand.

Provision of premium supplementary play assets, such as skate parks, is necessarily limited. The aim for these assets is balanced distribution across the District’s main centres. This also provides reasonable accessibility from outlying areas. A secondary site for a premium asset may be a popular visitor destination park that also caters for a significant residential community. All premium assets are located in parks with a community, district or regional catchment.

Not all play spaces fully meet the catchment level of service guidelines outlined in the following tables. Prioritised improvements will be made in line with available funding.
Table 2: Play space levels of service by catchment type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Local Play Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Small to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catchment Area</td>
<td>Local neighbourhood. Within walking distance of most residential households.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Primary focus on walking, cycling and other non-motorised travel. Roadside vehicle parking along one or more park boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage</td>
<td>Primarily local residents using the play space on a regular basis for short to moderate periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Groups</td>
<td>Priority focus on pre-school (under 5) and young primary age (5-8). A play space catering for a relatively large or high-density catchment should include elements for older children.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Play Value           | The play environment incorporates…  
All core play values for the age levels targeted.  
Primary play values at the highest level achievable within the scope of 'local catchment' provision.  
(See Appendix B: Play Values Checklist) |
| Supporting Infrastructure | Open grass space, shade trees, low-maintenance landscaping and seating. Toilet facilities not normally provided unless the site attracts long-stay visits and/or significant visitor numbers from outside the local area. |
| Other Possible Infrastructure | Paths, shade facilities, picnic table, drinking fountain, litter bin. Supplementary recreation/play facilities compatible with park size and characteristics e.g. basketball half court |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Community Play Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Medium to large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catchment Area</td>
<td>Urban or suburban area. Small town or rural settlement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Access via non-motorised means, a short drive, or public transport. Roadside vehicle parking along one or more park boundaries. Additional off street parking may be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage</td>
<td>Community residents using the play space on a regular basis for short or long periods. Occasional visitors from further afield.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Groups</td>
<td>All age levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Play Value           | A play environment that incorporates…  
All core play values for the age levels targeted.  
Primary play values at the highest level achievable within the scope of 'community catchment' provision.  
Additional play value contributed by other on-site recreation facilities.  
(See Appendix B: Play Values Checklist) |
### Community Play Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Supporting Infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open grass space, shade trees, landscaping, paths, seats and tables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supplementary recreation/play facilities compatible with park size and characteristics e.g. basketball half court, sports goalposts, exercise/fitness equipment, skate/scooter/cycle facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toilet facilities usually provided on site, or available and easily accessed nearby.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Other Possible Infrastructure | Shade facilities, drinking fountain, litter bin. |

### District Play Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>District Play Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Medium to Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catchment Area</td>
<td>Local community residents and visitors from across the Waimakariri District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Access via non-motorised means, a short to medium drive, or public transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roadside vehicle parking along one or more park boundaries and/or off street parking provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage</td>
<td>Waimakariri District residents using the play space on a regular or occasional basis for short or long periods. Occasional visitors from further afield - particularly at high-profile destinations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Groups</td>
<td>All age levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Value</td>
<td>A play environment that incorporates…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All core play values for the age levels targeted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary play values at the highest level achievable within the scope of ‘district catchment’ provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional play value contributed by other on-site recreation facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*(See Appendix B: <em>Play Values Checklist</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Infrastructure</td>
<td>Open grass space, shade trees, landscaping, paths, seats and tables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supplementary recreation/play facilities if compatible with the park’s primary purpose, size and characteristics e.g. basketball half court, sports goalposts, exercise/fitness equipment, skate/scooter/cycle facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural attractions add to recreation and play value at some destination sites e.g. beach, river, lake, forest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toilet facilities provided on site, or available and easily accessed nearby.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Possible Infrastructure</td>
<td>Shade facilities, drinking fountain, litter bin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>Regional Play Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Medium to Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catchment Area</td>
<td>Residents within the Waimakariri District plus visitors from the wider Canterbury area and beyond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Access via non-motorised means and large numbers using a motor vehicle or public transport. Roadside vehicle parking along one or more park boundaries and/or off street parking provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage</td>
<td>Waimakariri District residents using the play space on a regular or occasional basis for short or long periods. Significant visitor numbers from further afield - particularly at popular visitor destinations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Groups</td>
<td>All age levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Value</td>
<td>A play environment that incorporates… All core play values for the age levels targeted. Primary play values at the highest level achievable within the scope of 'regional catchment' provision. Additional play value contributed by other on-site recreation facilities. (See Appendix B: Play Values Checklist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Infrastructure</td>
<td>Open grass space, shade trees, landscaping, paths, seats and tables. Supplementary recreation/play facilities if compatible with the park’s primary purpose, size and characteristics e.g. basketball half court, sports goalposts, exercise/fitness equipment, skate/scooter/cycle facilities. Natural attractions add to recreation and play value e.g. beach, river, lake, forest. Toilet facilities provided on site, or available and easily accessed nearby.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Possible Infrastructure</td>
<td>Shade facilities, drinking fountain, litter bins.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Play Space Quality

In addition to the benefits of physical coordination and exercise, ideal play environments enable children to escape the everyday, relieve stress, feel joy, fire the imagination, share experiences and engage in game play.

By identifying and responding to different play needs, a comprehensive targeted range of outdoor play opportunities is created. This encourages participation and is likely to increase overall levels of satisfaction.

A focus on play quality helps maximise the benefits of future investment in play without the need for greatly increased expenditure. Provision is targeted in an efficient and effective manner.

8.1 Play Value

An emphasis on play value can help providers meet the developmental needs and preferences of target groups. It is an important element in the creation of high quality play environments.
The following table identifies and prioritises key play values. It also serves as a checklist. See Appendix B: *WDC Play Values Checklist*

Table 3: Play Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play Values</th>
<th>Development Level (Age)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solitary Play</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel Play</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associative Play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimenting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawling</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sliding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swinging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balancing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climbing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spinning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chasing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

- Core Values ●
- Primary Values
- Secondary Values

As children grow, they progressively develop capabilities in each of the four types of play listed in the table. Each is particularly important at a specific stage of child development. Progression is made from solitary play, where a child plays alone and is focussed on its own activity, through to cooperative play, where a child takes an interest in others as well as the activity. Cooperative play sees an increase in shared experiences and social play activities, such as improvised game play.

The spectrum of experiential play values listed in the table are the key elements that encourage and support play activity at the various levels.

### 8.1.1 Play Value Assessment of Council Play Spaces

A 2017 assessment of play value in Council play spaces found that 30 out of 67 (45%) do not meet contemporary play value standards. These standards are noted in Table 2: *Play space levels of service by catchment type*. When applied across individual sites, an acceptable standard equates to a play value rating of between one and three out of five (very good to average). See Appendix C: *Play Value and Condition Assessment for WDC Play Spaces (2017).*
Some shortfall in play value is to be expected, particularly at older sites, as knowledge and expectations of play have changed significantly over recent years. Improvements are planned through Council’s reserve enhancement and asset replacement programmes. Scheduling of work is based on priority and subject to available funds. See Section 13: Financial Implications – Replacements

Listed below are key areas of improvement identified during the assessment. They will play an important role in lifting the overall quality of Waimakariri District play spaces.

- Improved provision of elements that promote the core play values of participating and gathering. This focus will increase opportunities for group play and social interaction. It is achievable by providing a greater range of interconnected and multi-user play elements. This in turn will increase overall play value and capacity, allowing more users to be actively engaged in play at the same time.

- Improved provision of play facilities for 1-5 year olds; including elements that enable young children to access activities independently. This is particularly important at local catchment play spaces, where overall provision is constrained, and pre-schoolers are a priority user-group.

- Greater provision of play elements for 12-15 year olds and over. This age range is relatively independent and able to travel alone, or with friends or family, to community level and other large parks. Correspondingly large play areas have the scope to provide spaces and challenging elements that appeal to older children and motivated adults who wish to participate.

- Increased opportunities for activity-focused play and informal game play. This encourages children into deeper and more prolonged play. Activity-based play is particularly important for young children, as pretending and experimenting are core play values for this age group. Sound, touch and movement are important sensory elements. Sand and water are traditional materials used in this type of activity.

- Improved accessibility in and around play spaces. This is particularly important where continuous high-sided playground edging presents a significant physical and psychological obstacle for young children, older adults and others who are wheelchair dependent, or have limited mobility or co-ordination.

- Increased provision of support facilities in and around play zones, with the play space being the focal point. A landscaped setting, seats, tables and pathways are key components.

- A specific focus on shade provision for play space users and spectators.

8.2 Contextual Play Value

The setting and support facilities associated with a play space have a significant impact on visitor experience. The level of support facilities may vary due to a park’s catchment status, but an inviting and well-designed site plays an important role in attracting visitors and maximising the value and status of a play space.

8.2.1 Setting

Play spaces should be well integrated with attractive and suitably landscaped surroundings. Where possible these surroundings should add play value. Good environmental design makes a site accessible, safe and welcoming for everyone.
8.2.2 Support Facilities

A play space is an important focal point for park activity. An inviting and relaxed social environment with an appropriate range of facilities should support this:

**Public toilets**
Toilet facilities are provided at high-use sites characterised by long stays and a significant number of visitors travelling a long way from home. These parks and play spaces usually have a community level catchment or higher.

**Seating and tables**
Well-placed seating is important at all play sites. Tables are important for accommodating groups and longer-stay visitors. Picnic and barbecue facilities may be provided at a high-use long stay destination site, such as a coastal park, or a park that is an important venue for community gatherings and events.

**Pathways and surfacing**
Paths guide visitors and improve accessibility. Larger high-use parks may feature additional paved areas as gathering points. Artificial turf mounds and other improvised surfaces can add variety and play value.

**Shade and shelter**
Shade cover is important to site amenity. This is normally provided through the establishment of suitable trees. At long stay sites where adequate tree cover alongside a play area is difficult to achieve, shade sails or shelters may be installed.

**Artistic elements**
Artistic elements add interest and novelty to a play setting. Purposefully designed components and structures have the potential to raise curiosity, stimulate the imagination and enhance play value.

**On-site parking**
On-site parking improves the capacity and accessibility of large high-use parks, especially where roadside parking is limited. Parking facilities for cycles and scooters may also be provided. Local parks do not warrant on-site parking, due to the need to protect limited recreation space. Most regular users are able to access a local park and play space without the use of a motor vehicle.

Play area fencing is generally undesirable; except where an identified safety hazard cannot otherwise be managed. Fencing can impede free movement and accessibility, and discourage or control participation. It can also lead to a false sense of security for parents and caregivers. In some circumstances, semi-permeable barriers or obstacles can assist in guiding the movements of children with autism or similar behavioural traits. Where possible, these should be integrated landscape elements, and should not isolate the play area.

Lighting is not provided at park play spaces, as the use of play areas during the hours of darkness is not encouraged. Targeted lighting can attract people to an otherwise poorly lit and potentially unsafe area. Any site deemed appropriate for evening use must have fully lit surroundings and meet important environmental safety requirements. This includes high levels of surrounding community activity and oversight.

8.2.3 Complementary Recreation Facilities

The following recreation/play facilities can add substantial play value, particularly for older children and adults. The list is indicative, based on current trends and existing provision at suitable parks with a compatible level of service. See 7.2: Play Space Catchments and Levels of Service. Natural assets such as a beach, river, lake or forest also contribute significant play value at a number of sites.
• Basketball half court
• Sports goalposts
• Exercise stations
• Fitness trail
• Skate park
• Community BMX track or pump track
• Tennis courts
• Rebound wall
• Petanque court

8.3 Universal Design and Inclusive Play

8.3.1 Universal Design

Play for all is a realistic goal. Some level of participation in a shared play experience is possible for everyone. Not all play spaces can meet everyone’s needs and preferences, but individually and collectively, they should provide opportunities for all who wish to participate.

The concept of Accessible Design emphasises the importance of access for people with impairments or disabilities. The primary focus of facility providers is often physical disability. Health and education statistics in the United States show that physical disabilities (excluding chronic health issues) account for less than two percent of all disabilities identified in children and young adults.

Viewed in a wider context, anyone who wishes to participate in play, but is unable to do so, is effectively disabled. A Universal Design approach acknowledges the importance of accessibility, and addresses it from this wider perspective. Universal Design focuses on the diverse range of needs that are common to everyone. Its aim is to incorporate features that enable as many people as possible to independently use an environment or product. To minimise exclusions or barriers to participation, this is an appropriate starting point for any design. When applied to play settings, the outcome is park environments and integrated play spaces that are more accessible, inviting, convenient and safer for everyone, regardless of age and ability.

“Universal design is the design of products and environments to be usable by all people, to the greatest extent possible, without the need for adaptation or specialized design.”

(Ron Mace, 1985, founder of the Centre for Universal Design, North Carolina State University)

8.3.2 Inclusive Play

The concept of Inclusive Play encourages people of any age and ability to independently access and enjoy a play space and its facilities. It reinforces the concept of universal design. Truly inclusive play incorporates many features important to child development and well-being. It also reduces the need for caregivers to control or directly assist with play activity.

Key aspects of Inclusive Play:

**Cognitive**
- learning, judgement, concentration, confidence, problem solving and overcoming challenges

**Social**
- interaction, association, relationships, friendship
Emotional feelings, self-expression, release, imagination (play-acting), well-being and sense of belonging

Communicative language, expression, understanding, negotiation (important aspects of cognitive, social, and emotional development)

Sensory perception, awareness, exploration and discovery

Physical movement, motor skills, coordination and fitness

Moral conscience, fairness, sharing, concepts of right and wrong

Disabilities feature in all areas of child development, particularly cognitive, social and emotional development. The concept of 'play for all' needs to acknowledge the importance of these components alongside the more recognised physical and sensory aspects of play. Viewed holistically, play has significant restorative and rehabilitative potential.

If Inclusive Play design principles are followed, the provision of specialised or separate facilities for children with disabilities is largely unnecessary and undesirable.

8.4 Play Choice & Diversity

The principle that play space should be readily accessible, meet community needs, and accommodate key play values, is fundamental. Beyond this, Council prescribes no particular play space design or combination of elements. This allows greater flexibility when looking to provide inviting contemporary play spaces.

Community play expectations and preferences are constantly evolving. While some traditional types of provision do not change dramatically, others are strongly influenced by population, lifestyle and technology change. Research and community consultation are used to assess the District’s need and demand for new and evolving forms of play. This is already influencing some aspects of provision, including a move to provide more exercise and fitness related equipment.

The following types of play are either very limited or not specifically provided for within the current play space network. Given the transient nature of some play trends, future investment in these or other evolving play styles, is subject to ongoing assessment.

Natural Play The use of natural surfaces, materials and structural elements to add play value and help create an inviting and attractive play environment.

Sensory Play Play that engages and stimulates the senses. It is particularly beneficial for young children who are exploring and experimenting in order to learn and make sense of the world around them. Suitably integrated sensory elements also provide therapeutic and developmental opportunities for autistic children to participate on their own terms.

Water Play Water utilised as an element of sensory and creative play, or in a universal application such as a splash pad at a beach park

Themed Play An overarching theme and context for a play space or particular aspects of play. This can stimulate imagination and game-play, and provide a point of difference with other play areas. Themes that reference their setting or an aspect of local interest are fitting examples.
Digital Play
Physical play supported by a digital component designed to enhance the play experience at a given site. Concepts include app-supported play and augmented reality play (outdoor gaming), which can be accessed using personal devices such as smartphones.

Adventure Play
Challenging play using elements designed to build confidence and a sense of achievement.

Outdoor Fitness
Exercise, training and rehabilitation facilities with a particular emphasis on older children and adults. These facilities can be stand-alone or located adjacent to another play space. Being in close proximity enables inclusive use of an area by families and different age groups.

Young Adult Zones
Spaces with a range of facilities designed to meet the needs of young adults.

Older Adult Zones
Spaces with a range of facilities designed to meet the needs of older adults.

Sites catering for a wide age range and diverse play needs benefit from a degree of spatial distinction between areas. This encourages use while minimising potential conflict. The degree of separation should not undermine overall site integration, connectivity and visibility.

8.5 Play Elements and Safety Surfaces

Play elements come in various forms. All contribute to overall play value, and collectively create a diverse range of play opportunities to meet community needs and preferences.

- Standards approved supplier elements in a wide range of materials and design styles
- Improvised and custom-made elements
- Natural elements integral to the site or added as features

Safety surfaces can strongly influence the design style and character of play spaces. They can also aid or impede site access. Some surfaces, such as sand and graphic-imprinted matting, add play value. All Council play spaces have safety surfaces that comply with the current New Zealand Standard (NZS 5828:2004 Playground Equipment & Surfacing)

Re-harvested or engineered wood fibre mulch is Council’s current preference as a standards approved safety surface. It has accessibility, durability and impact protection qualities that exceed those of bark and non-compliant landscape mulches. Existing sites that currently lack an accessible safety surface will be upgraded at the time of renewal. Notable exceptions are small niche sites, such as a sand play area with high play value. Good site design can still ensure sand play is accessible to all.

The approved surfaces listed below are currently used in Council play spaces.

- Re-harvested or engineered wood fibre mulch *
- Bark mulch
- Synthetic/rubber matting *
- Poured synthetic/rubber surface* (coloured graphics option for added play value)
- Sand
- Turf or artificial turf * (for fall height <1m only)

* Wheelchair and pushchair accessible
Other factors to consider when selecting play elements and safety surfacing:

- Play value
- Play ‘flow’
- Compatibility with the setting
- Versatility and adaptability – ability to customise & retro-fit
- Appropriate style and colour combinations
- Durability and life span
- Value for money

9. Play Space Safety and Maintenance

9.1 Safety

The following factors are important when it comes to safety in and around Council play spaces:

- Compliance with the current New Zealand Standard (NZS 5828:2004 Playground Equipment & Surfacing)
- Safety compliance and risk assessment for non-standard or improvised play elements
- Programmed inspections and maintenance carried out under Council’s District Parks and Reserves Maintenance Contract.
- Appropriate siting of play spaces that are away from significant hazards, afford good visibility and minimise the need for protective barriers.
- The application of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles for all new and redeveloped play spaces. These principles highlight desirable site characteristics that help create an attractive, comfortable and non-threatening environment. A site-specific CPTED analysis is implemented at the design and construction phases of a development.

9.2 Risk

Risk is an inherent component of play and the creation of play value. It is managed through a combination of appropriately designed and maintained play elements, and the judgement, confidence and skill level of participants. It is important that a challenging activity be transparent and unlikely to mislead the user. Variety is important in allowing users with differing needs and abilities to find their own level.

9.3 Shade Provision and UV Protection

During summer months, the Waimakariri District experiences hot sunny days and relatively high levels of ultra-violet radiation (UV). Park visitors are responsible for their own sun protection, but Council also manages play environments to help minimise risk. The aim is to provide a degree of sun relief, while still acknowledging the important role sunlight provides in creating an attractive and inviting setting for most of the year.
Shade cover is generally provided through the establishment of suitable shade trees. Where necessary, larger grade trees will be installed to reduce the time required to establish effective cover. Trees may be transplanted from other Council sites if they are surplus to requirements.

Shade sails or structures may be installed at high-use long stay sites to provide additional or short-term cover.

Council maintains a record of shade cover in and around all Council play spaces. Necessary improvements will scheduled based on their priority. (See Appendix E: Play Space Shade (2017).

9.4 Maintenance

A structured programme of inspection and maintenance is essential to ensure play spaces perform effectively, comply with safety standards and meet community expectations. Play elements, safety surfaces and their surroundings are all important components of a safe, inviting and well-performing play space.

Play Space inspection and maintenance is a scheduled requirement of the WDC District Parks and Reserves Maintenance Contract. A qualified Council staff member also audits contract performance. Council play spaces need to comply with NZS 5828:2004.

A further Council initiated audit is carried out every three years to update condition ratings for play spaces and their equipment. Registered Playground Inspectors (RPII Level 3 or recognised equivalent) carry out this work.

All play elements are maintained to a serviceable ‘safe-use’ standard. If this standard cannot be met, equipment is temporarily closed or removed. Elements permanently removed are replaced. When a large number of elements reach the end of their useful life, a play space is fully redeveloped. Any play elements with significant remaining life are relocated to a site where they can improve play value. Play space redevelopment is often aligned with wider park improvements for increased efficiency and community benefit.

Audit and maintenance reports are used by Council’s Green Space Operations Team to prioritise, programme and budget play space repairs and replacements.

Council’s ‘request for service’ system encourages park users and residents to report maintenance issues.

10. Planning & Design

Plans will be developed and approved for all new play spaces and existing play spaces that are subject to substantial upgrade or renewal. This process will take account of all principles and good practice guidelines covered by this document, along with any other relevant Council policy and level of service requirements.
11. Play Spaces in New Residential Subdivisions

Once a suitable park location is approved for a new residential subdivision, the developer is further consulted regarding potential involvement with new play space design and development. Any involvement must comply with Council’s level of service and construction standards for new community play space.

Developer involvement in the layout and installation of a new play space and its support facilities can benefit all parties:

- The community benefits from having established park and play facilities available when most residents first move into a new development.
- Council save on administration and development costs through use of developer and contractor services already involved with on-site consent works.
- The subdivider/developer has approved plans or established community facilities in place when marketing open space and lifestyle components of a new development.

Play space assets installed on a new Council reserve by a private developer must comply with specified agreements and resource consent conditions. Council’s Green Space Team must approve the design, suppliers, play elements and all associated costs.

Upon issue of a Practical Completion Certificate covering play space construction, the inspection and maintenance responsibilities for installed play equipment transfer to Council. Landscape elements associated with the play space remain part of the developer maintenance period specified in the applicable resource consent.

12. Community Engagement - New Play Spaces and Replacements

New and replacement play spaces are designed and developed with input from the community. Consultation methods may differ, ranging from informal to formal, while the scope of input can vary from local to district-wide depending on catchment status.

Wide-ranging community input is desirable, with particular emphasis on children likely to be using a new play space.

A specialised high value asset such as a community skate park requires specific consultation with key user groups.
Play spaces developed within a new subdivision prior to the establishment of a residential community must meet Council’s established site design and level of service standards. These standards reflect community input to key administrative documents, including the Green Space Unit Activity Management Plan, Neighbourhood Parks Management Plan, and the WDC Parks Levels of Service.

13. Financial Implications

13.1 Principles

- Investment in play spaces is prioritised, realistic and achievable while acknowledging the District’s residential growth and the need to refine standards of provision.

- Priority improvements are funded through existing asset renewal budgets and capital funding applications to Council’s Annual and Long Term Plans. Scheduling of work is subject to available funds.

- Major upgrades are aligned with life-cycle renewal funding, with less critical works prioritised over time.
13.2 Analysis

The main change in level of service emphasis for play space is the greater consideration given to play value. This approach ensures high quality play opportunities are available to children of all ages and levels of ability. A change in emphasis is evident in the standard of recently installed new and replacement play spaces in Council parks.

The general need for play quality improvement is acknowledged in current levels of funding. As a result, the financial implications are relatively minor. This is helped by a greater awareness and understanding of play value, which is leading to better design and increased choice and play diversity for a similar level of expenditure.

When scheduling and funding the renewal of play space, physical condition and expected life is still the key determinant. In terms of community value, the need to maintain and improve play quality is also very important.

Thirty (or 45%) of the 67 existing Council play spaces do not meet a play value standard of ‘average’ or higher for targeted users. They rate poor to very poor. To bring these play areas up to a minimum ‘average’ standard requires investment. Many of the poorest play value sites are approaching the end of their useful life, and cost-effective improvements can be made at the time of a scheduled full renewal. Those in better condition can have play value improved by the addition of appropriate new elements. This work can be scheduled over time based on site priority. See Appendix C: Play Value and Condition Assessment for WDC Play Spaces (2017).

The operational life of a play space is based on the expected useful life of most of its play elements. Allowing for variables, 25-30 years is judged to be the average life span of a Waimakariri District Council play space. Useful life assessments across comparable public play space providers range between 15 and 30+ years. This may reflect the variable durability of different components, but also varying interpretations of what determines ‘useful life’. Low demand, obsolescence, and perceptions of an unacceptably low level of service may trigger the decision to renew a play space, even if components are still safe and otherwise functional. End of life predictions are always subject to re-evaluation, as individual circumstances can considerably shorten or extend useful life.

13.3 Replacements

Council’s current $190,000 annual replacement budget for play-related assets is sufficient to meet the current projected annual cost of renewals for the long-term plan period 2018-19 to 2027-28 (see Appendix D: Priority WDC Play Space Renewals (2018-19 to 2027-28). In addition to play elements and safety surfacing, this budget funds associated park facilities such as paths, seating and shade provision. Separate budget funding is available for other significant assets, including toilets, park landscaping, and hard court recreation facilities. Current funding for reserve enhancement (new works) can be used for newly introduced assets such as shade structures.

The budget required for subsequent ten-year periods will need to increase significantly to maintain level of service standards. An increasing number of parks will reach end of life because of increasing population growth in the District. Newer parks and play spaces also have a significantly higher level of service and replacement cost in comparison to the District’s oldest sites, which have a basic level of service and limited play value. These older sites will receive a significantly improved level of service over the next ten years, but not necessarily to the level or cost now required for larger parks in urban growth areas with higher-density visitor catchments.
A well-managed replacement programme can make investment in play space more efficient and effective.

- Play space redevelopment can often be aligned with wider park improvements.
- Not all play areas require full replacement. The replacement of degraded and obsolete elements can significantly extend the useful life of a play space while at the same time improving play value.
- Viable elements removed from a play space to accommodate a comprehensive renewal should be reinstalled at a suitable site where they can improve play value.

### 13.4 Gaps in Level of Service Provision

Three key areas within existing urban residential zones have a significant number of residents living outside the travel distance considered acceptable under play space access guidelines (distance to a play area). In each of these areas, Council has an existing reserve suitable for the development of a play space. New capital funding is required if these level of service gaps are to be addressed during the 2018-19 to 2027-28 long-term plan period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Estimated Cost ($)</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hurunui Reserve</td>
<td>Pegasus</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millton Memorial Reserve</td>
<td>North Rangiora</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kippenberger / Elm Green Linkage</td>
<td>East Rangiora</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(NB: Members of the Eyreton community wish to re-establish the Eyreton Domain as a neighbourhood recreation reserve. Local demand for the use of sport and recreation facilities at the Domain seriously declined when extensive facilities were established at Mandeville. The disused Eyreton Domain pavilion was removed from the site in 2008. Relative to rural settlement levels of service, this site is currently a low priority for development).

The proposed level of service for premium play assets such as skate parks, aims to ensure their equitable distribution across the District’s key activity centres. The north-east area of the District currently lacks a high standard skate park of a size and scale appropriate to the population catchment of the Woodend-Pegasus area. The selection of an appropriate site will need to be investigated and approved through a community consultation process.

The estimated capital funding required for a skate park in the Woodend-Pegasus area is $150,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Estimated Cost ($)</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Skate Park</td>
<td>Woodend-Pegasus</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 13.5 New Development

The population of Waimakariri District is predicted to grow by 11,500 over the next ten years (2018 – 2027). In response, around one hectare of public park and reserve space per year will be needed to maintain the parks level of service minimum guideline of one hectare per 1000 residents. While some existing parks have capacity to absorb a portion of this growth, up to ten new parks with play spaces catering for a local or community catchment will still be required.
Under current growth scenarios, it is anticipated that existing funding levels for neighbourhood land development will be sufficient to ensure all new play space reserves are developed to the appropriate park category and catchment level standard.

Currently undeveloped Council-owned reserves in Rangiora and Woodend are also available to help meet future neighbourhood park needs. Development of two or more of these reserves is likely if anticipated urban-residential growth scenarios for both centres are realised.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Townsend-Pentecost Road</td>
<td>South-West Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eders Road</td>
<td>East Woodend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehmans Road</td>
<td>West Rangiora</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 13.6 Partnerships:

Council will consider the potential and merit of partnership agreements in helping to provide and allocate public play space. This could include sponsorship and shared-use agreements with schools or private landowners.
Appendix A:

Play Space Strategy - Key Principles

Equitable distribution - appropriate distribution of play spaces in accordance with a hierarchy of provision to ensure that residents have reasonable access to a variety of play opportunities and experiences.

Access and connectivity – a coordinated network of well-located and easily accessible play spaces which meet community needs.

Inclusion – a network of well-designed play spaces that can be enjoyed by people of all ages and abilities.

Diversity and choice – varied play spaces offering a range of play opportunities and experiences.

Maximising use and benefits - play spaces that encourage a wide range of people to access and enjoy a diverse range of play experiences and interactions.

Quality facilities and experiences – well functioning play spaces and support facilities that are attractive and well maintained.

Safety – play facilities that manage the balance between risk and safety, and are developed and maintained to a high standard and in accordance with relevant standards and guidelines; underpinned by informed environmental design that promotes site safety and security.

Community participation – play spaces that involve residents in their design, promote social interaction and foster a sense of community ownership and pride.

Sustainability – a manageable level of play space provision that can be supported by Council resources.

(Adapted from the Cardinia Shire Council Play Space Strategy 2014)
Appendix B:

Play Values Checklist

Play space size and content will vary depending on catchment hierarchy.

Play spaces incorporate diverse play values appropriate to the age and ability levels catered for (see table below).

Consultation with children likely to be using a new or redeveloped play space is always desirable.

Development level guide:

- 1 – 3 years Toddler
- 3 – 6 years Preschool
- 6 - 12 years Primary
- 12+ Teenage to adult

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play Values</th>
<th>Development Level (Age)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solitary Play</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel Play</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associative Play</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Play</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretending</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimenting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawling</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sliding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swinging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balancing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climbing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spinning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chasing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- Core Values ●
- Primary Values
- Secondary Values
Appendix C:

Play Value and Condition Assessment for WDC Play Spaces (2017)

Maximising play value is a key consideration when assessing the need to replace or upgrade existing play spaces. It is also important to assess the maintenance condition of existing play elements and review estimates of their useful life. An evaluation of both factors is important in helping prioritise necessary improvements in a cost-effective manner.

The following tables rank Council play spaces from highest to lowest according to combined play value and condition ratings. Each category can be considered separately to identify the main driver for improvement at each site. Ratings given are relative to a play area’s catchment status and expected levels of service.

A poor condition rating of 4-5 for a play area is an indication that total replacement might be a cost-effective or necessary option. A very good to average condition rating of 1-3 will only require improvements if inadequate play value needs addressing.

New, replacement and upgraded play spaces should achieve an overall play value rating of 1-3 (Very Good to Average) for the age levels targeted.

Any viable elements removed from a play space to accommodate a comprehensive upgrade will be relocated to an alternative site where they can improve play value.

NB: Play value may be lower than expected at some locations due to site constraints, lower demand, and/or the availability of an alternative well-appointed play space nearby. These play spaces* are considered supplementary to the primary play site serving an area.
## Play Value and Condition Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Play Value</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Catchment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koura Stream Reserve</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torlesse Park</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuhoe Avenue Reserve</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant Park</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayliss Drive Park</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanaka Reserve</td>
<td>Pegasus</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regent Park</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverstream Estates Esplanade Reserve No1*</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>4-5*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Tai o Mahaanui Reserve</td>
<td>Pegasus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkhouse Reserve</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audley Street Reserve</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Street Reserve*</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiln Place Reserve*</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>3-4*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnard Street Reserve*</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>4-5*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matai Place Reserve*</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>4-5*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuller Street Reserve</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kowhai Avenue Reserve</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skevington Park</td>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Bryden Reserve</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Crescent Reserve</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panckhurst Reserve</td>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush Street Reserve</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus View Park</td>
<td>Waikuku</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Street Reserve</td>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allin Drive Reserve</td>
<td>Waikuku</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newnham Street Reserve*</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>4-5*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currie Park</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Play Value and Condition Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Play Value</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Lakes (East) Reserve</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Park</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acacia Avenue Community Park</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakwood Park</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryder Park</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pines Oval</td>
<td>The Pines Beach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi Sport &amp; Recreation Centre</td>
<td>Tuahiwi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Park</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirikatene Park</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Graham Reserve</td>
<td>Cust</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grange View Reserve</td>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorcroft Reserve</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinemoa Park</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Eyreton Domain</td>
<td>West Eyreton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Street Reserve</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust Domain*</td>
<td>Cust</td>
<td>3-4*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darnley Square*</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>3-4*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Community Reserve</td>
<td>The Warren (Oxford)</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Domain</td>
<td>Ohoka</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lees Valley School Reserve</td>
<td>Lees Valley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View Hill Domain</td>
<td>View Hill</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swannanoa Domain</td>
<td>Swannanoa</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen Stalker Park</td>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCF Park</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Domain</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Play Value and Condition Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Play Value</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Catchment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Lake Waterfront</td>
<td>Pegasus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trousselot Park</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville Domain</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Park Senior (Burnett St.)</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Park Junior (Main St.)</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Park</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach - Central Area</td>
<td>Waikuku</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loburn Domain</td>
<td>Loburn</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone Park (2017-18yr)</td>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook Park</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sefton Domain</td>
<td>Sefton</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach North Oval*</td>
<td>Waikuku</td>
<td>4-5*</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Catchment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Gorge Reserve</td>
<td>Ashley Gorge</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Beach Domain</td>
<td>Woodend Beach</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kairaki Reserve*</td>
<td>Kairaki Beach</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D:

Priority WDC Play Space Renewals (2018-19 to 2027-28)

Maximising play value is a key consideration when assessing the need to replace or upgrade existing play spaces. It is also important to assess the maintenance condition of existing play elements and review estimates of their useful life. An evaluation of both factors is important in helping prioritise necessary improvements in a cost-effective manner.

The table below lists Council play spaces that have a current combined play value and condition rating of between 3 and 5 (below average to very poor). Each category can be considered separately to identify the main driver for improvement at each site. Ratings given are relative to a play area’s catchment status and expected levels of service.

- A poor to very poor condition rating of 4-5 for a play area indicates that total replacement might be a cost-effective or necessary option.
- An average to poor condition rating of 3-4 indicates that some play elements are due for replacement.
- A below average to very poor play value rating of 3-4 or 4-5 indicates that inadequate play value needs addressing through an upgrade and an improved combination of play elements.

Following replacement or upgrade, all play spaces should achieve a play value rating of 1-3 (Very Good to Average) for the age levels targeted, and a corresponding condition rating of 1-3.

Any viable elements removed from a play space to accommodate a comprehensive upgrade will be relocated to an alternative site where they can improve play value.

Cost estimates are based on the assessed need for a full replacement, partial replacement, and/or a minor to major play value upgrade.

Costs reflect 2017 prices and will be adjusted to reflect financial values at the time work is programmed.

Other factors influencing levels of service and renewals scheduling:

Play value may be lower than expected at some locations due to site constraints, lower demand, and/or the availability of an alternative well-appointed play space nearby. These play spaces* are considered supplementary to the primary play site serving an area.
Increased residential development, population density and visitor numbers in an area may result in a play space receiving a higher priority for upgrade or replacement.

NB: Ohoka Domain’s upgrade has been prioritised due to population growth and increased visitor demand resulting from nearby rural-residential development.
# Appendix E:

## Shade Assessment for WDC Play Spaces (2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Play Elements</th>
<th>Play Setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Parks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newnham Street Reserve*</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush Street Reserve</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant Park</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allin Drive Reserve</td>
<td>Waikuku</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus View Park</td>
<td>Waikuku</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Bryden Reserve</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Street Reserve</td>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Crescent Reserve</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Street Reserve</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matai Place Reserve</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Tai o Mahaanui Reserve</td>
<td>Pegasus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanaka Reserve</td>
<td>Pegasus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regent Park</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kowhai Avenue Reserve</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currie Park</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuller Street Reserve</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skevington Park</td>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnard Street Reserve</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayliss Drive Park</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koura Stream Reserve</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torlesse Park</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverstream Estates Esplanade Reserve No1</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkhouse Reserve</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiln Place Reserve</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuhoe Avenue Reserve</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panckhurst Reserve</td>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Play Space Shade Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Shade Cover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Parks</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka Domain</td>
<td>Ohoka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Domain</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen Stalker Park</td>
<td>Woodend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Community</td>
<td>The Warren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Park</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi Sport &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>Tuahiwi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lees Valley School Reserve</td>
<td>Lees Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View Hill Domain</td>
<td>View Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swannanoa Domain</td>
<td>Swannanoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Lakes (East)</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damley Square</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pines Oval</td>
<td>The Pines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Eyreton Domain</td>
<td>West Eyreton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Graham Reserve</td>
<td>Cust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grange View Reserve</td>
<td>Woodend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Street Reserve</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acacia Avenue Community</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cust Domain</td>
<td>Cust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCF Park</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakwood Park</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryder Park</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirikatene Park</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Park</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorcroft Reserve</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinemoa Park</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Play Space Shade Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Shade Cover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Within five years (tree growth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Site | Area | Play Elements | Play Setting |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Park Junior (Main)</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville Domain</td>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Park</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Lake Waterfront</td>
<td>Pegasus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trousselot Park</td>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbrook Park</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loburn Domain</td>
<td>Loburn</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach - Central</td>
<td>Waikuku</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku Beach North Oval</td>
<td>Waikuku</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sefton Domain</td>
<td>Sefton</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone Park</td>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Park Senior</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley Park (skate park)</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Regional Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Shade Cover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Within five years (tree growth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Site | Area | Play Elements | Play Setting |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Gorge Reserve</td>
<td>Ashley Gorge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kairaki Reserve</td>
<td>Kairaki Beach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Beach Domain</td>
<td>Woodend</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
Sixteen play spaces have no shade protection in or around the playground. Estimated cost of shade provision $5,000 - $15,000 per site (via large grade or relocated shade trees; plus supplementary shade sails or structures in high use areas with harsh site conditions).
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO: RES-23/ 171026115830
REPORT TO: Community and Recreation Committee
DATE OF MEETING: 21 November 2017
FROM: Craig Sargison, Manager Community and Recreation
SUBJECT: COMMUNITY FACILITIES PROVISION

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is for Council to consider the future provision of community facilities to in light of the projected population growth.

1.2. Key areas covered in the report are:

1.2.1. Levels of service for Library space. The report proposes the provision of library service on the basis of 60m2 of building space per 1000 population.

1.2.2. The provision in the Draft LTP of $6,500,050 million, for the extension of the Rangiora Library. This would be spread over three years with $50,000 in Year 4, $3million in Year 5 and $3.5million in Year 6.

1.2.3. The exploration of interim off site storage for collection items during 2018/19 with a subsequent report to Council

1.2.4. The provision of $40,000 in Year 1 of the Draft LTP to allow for further investigation of the provision of a Library/Community Meeting Space in either Ravenswood or Pegasus with such a facility coming on line in Year 10 of the Draft LTP.

1.2.5. A discussion about community meeting space in Rangiora with a recommendation for no financial provision but to work with other providers on a needs assessment with a view to utilising existing facilities and those being proposed by Churches in the next few years.

1.2.6. A proposed level of service for community meeting space.

1.2.7. A proposal to make some existing Council owned land available for community groups to locate their own buildings (similar to the existing Northbrook Studios).

1.2.8. A provision in the Draft LTP of $5,000 in Year 5 and $50,000 in Year 10 for the development of car-parking and landscaping. The exact timing will depend on the level of uptake from community groups.
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee recommends to Council for consideration at its 30 January 2018 (LTP) meeting:

(a) Receives report N° 171026115830

(b) Receives the Community Facilities Report (Trim 171017112201)

(c) Approves the level of service for provision of library space of 60m² per 1000 population

(d) Approves staff investigating off site storage space for library collection storage in either Rangiora or Kaiapoi and reporting back to Council.

(e) Approves the provision of $40,000 in Year 1 of the Draft LTP to allow for further investigation of the provision of a Library/Community Meeting Space in either Ravenswood or Pegasus with such a facility coming on line in Year 10 of the Draft LTP.

(f) Approves the level of service for provision of community meeting space for new communities to service a population of 2,500 it is proposed that there is a facility to cater for around 80 people plus storage space. This can be stand alone or incorporated as part of a facility such as a Library.

(g) Notes that the only part of the District that does not meet this standard is Pegasus and potentially Ravenswood depending on the speed of residential development.

(h) Notes that it is expected that the need for additional community facilities for meeting spaces in Rangiora will be met by developments currently being planned by the Anglican and Presbyterian Churches.

(i) Approves staff investigating the potential for using available Council owned land at Northbrook Road or Mixed Use Business Land in the Regeneration Area, for potential development of community owned buildings and notes that staff will prepare a report for Council’s consideration.

(j) Notes that there is no provision for further expansion or development of Aquatic Facilities in the District for the next ten years as the existing facilities have capacity to cope with projected growth.

(k) Approves the following financial provisions being included in the Draft LTP:
### LTP Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Investigation into location of Library Ravenswood/Pegasus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Further planning for library extension at Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$3million</td>
<td>Detailed design and construction commencement of Rangiora Library extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>Car-parking development for land approved for community groups buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$3.5million</td>
<td>Completion of Rangiora Library extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Landscaping/car-parking on land approved for community group’s buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3.9million</td>
<td>New Library at Ravenswood/Pegasus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(I) Circulates this report to the Boards.

### 3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

#### 3.1. Background

3.1.1. In 2012 the Council adopted a policy which outlined its role in providing community facilities. The policy does not provide the Council with any objective criteria which addresses when facilities may be needed to cope with growth.

3.1.2. The 2012 policy omitted any reference to the provision of Library services for the District.

3.1.3. Recent experience with the Pegasus community has demonstrated how new or growing communities expect to have access to meeting spaces for local groups/residents to meet.

3.1.4. As part of the planning for growth in the District, Staff commissioned Sue Sutherland to undertake a study of community facility provision and to recommend some standards for the provision of new facilities as well as a standard for the space required for the ongoing provision of library services in the District. Note that sporting facilities were specifically excluded from scope.

#### 3.2. Community Facilities Report

3.2.1. The report summarises the current provision of community facilities and libraries in the District and provides a comparative with what some other NZ and Australian areas are planning for levels of service for community facilities.

3.2.2. The critical components of the report for the Council’s forward planning are:

- A proposed standard of space provision for library service
• A proposed level of service standard for the provision of community facilities with criteria or trigger points to be applied in response to growth
• Impacts for the Council on adopting those levels of service

3.2.3. While the complete Community Facilities Report is attached, this report will address each of those components along with further commentary from staff on impacts for the Council and potential matters to be considered as part of the forthcoming LTP.

3.3. **Standard of provision for Library service**

3.3.1. The report discusses the various standards that are used in NZ for library service from the Library Association Standard of 70m², to Auckland at 41m² and Christchurch of 60m² per 1000 population

3.3.2. Staff agree with the report recommendation to adopt a standard of 60m² per 1000 population. This allows sufficient space to both provide for resource storage as well as meeting spaces, reading spaces and other facilities offered by modern libraries.

3.3.3. This figure is also based on the continuing development of electronic service delivery.

3.3.4. The report concludes that there is no additional space required to meet standards in the West of the District but there is a need for more space in Rangiora and to service the growing Ravenswood/Pegasus area.

Rangiora Option

3.3.5. The report’s preferred option is to extend the Rangiora Library by 1000 – 1,200m² within the next 5 years.

3.3.6. AECOM, Quantity Surveyors, after analysing recently completed projects and their “bottom line” costs i.e. building works plus external works plus professional fees plus consents plus furniture and equipment and a project contingency are in the range of $6,200/m² to $6,800/m²

3.3.7. A mid-point would be $6,500m² would mean the cost of extending the Rangiora Library would be in the order of $6.5 - $7.8 million.

3.3.8. Before actually committing to such a development there would need to be some detailed planning and a specific report investigating options for the consideration of Council. That report should also include potential synergies with any development of office space for Council staff.

3.3.9. It would be prudent to include an allowance of $50,000 in Year 4 of the LTP for further investigation and a provision of $3 million Year 5 of the Plan for the actual development and $3.5million in Year 6 as the development would not be fully finished within a 12 month period. The timing of those provisions could change in future LTPs depending on the speed of population growth and also the outcome of further investigations around the potential development of further office space for Council staff at Rangiora.

3.3.10. In the interim there is a developing challenge for print resource storage. Up until 2017 the Library collection has been accommodated within the available storage
areas and acquisitions have been largely offset by the need to discard old worn items.

3.3.11. With the current collection modelling on the Library’s asset management system it is now likely that in 2018/19 the majority of old stock has been removed and we will now start to make a “net gain” in collection holdings per annum. For example, in 2016/17, 16,921 physical items were added to the collection and 13,041 were withdrawn resulting in a net gain of 3,880 items (equivalent to 30 bays of shelving).

3.3.12. This is a desired state and it is something that the acquisition planning over the last 20 years has been working towards, as up until now the Library has largely only had a current collection with older titles wearing out and needing to be replaced. Now 84 percent of the current physical collection is less than ten years old; 13 percent is 11 to 20 years old; and 3 percent is more than 21 years old.

3.3.13. The collections from 2018 should allow for the retention of key items, particularly series and collections from authors that are likely to still be in demand.

3.3.14. One solution to this until more permanent space becomes available is to provide for some off site storage by leasing some existing office/storage space in either Kaiapoi or Rangiora.

3.3.15. The number of items held per capita is another important factor in the provision of an adequately sized quality collection. In 2008, the Waimakariri District Libraries held 2.61 items per capita (with a target of 3.0 items by 2019 based on National Library standards). Currently, we hold 130,000 (physical and eBook) items, which against the current estimated population of 61,000, equates to 2.13 items per capita. By comparison, Christchurch City Libraries aim to hold between 3 and 3.5 items per capita and currently maintain a collection of 3.2.

3.3.16. An interim target of 2.7 items per capita would suggest a collection size of 164,700 and achievement of this would require an additional 230 bays of (5 shelf high) storage space.

3.3.17. It should be possible to lease some interim storage space in Kaiapoi or Rangiora to accommodate off site storage until a permanent solution is in place.

Ravenswood/Pegasus Provision

3.3.18. The report discusses the need for a new library service point to meet the needs of the growing communities around Pegasus and Ravenswood. It suggests that with an expanded Rangiora Library and the existing Kaiapoi Library there will be enough space for approximately the next ten years.

3.3.19. The exact timing of a future development will need to be reviewed as it will depend on the speed at which new residential development at Ravenswood proceeds.

3.3.20. The report has some discussion about the relative merits of Ravenswood and Pegasus for a new development and comments that further work will be needed to determine the better location.

3.3.21. Such a facility would also include community meeting space which is separately discussed below, but the library component of a new facility would be in the
range of 4-600m². As a comparison the new Oxford facility is around 347m² and the library component of that building is around 273m².

3.3.22. While such a development is not anticipated for around ten years it would be prudent to determine a location within the next 2018/19 year so that if it is decided to have a library at Ravenswood then the Council should look to secure land for such a building in the immediate term as once the business land is built up it would be very difficult to find a good site for a library/community centre. Similarly if Pegasus is determined to be the best location it would be possible to work with Todd’s on potentially securing a building or else land.

3.3.23. The size of land needed would be around 1000m² and the actual size will be determined by car parking requirements. It is suggested that Staff be authorised to negotiate with the developers to secure a block of land of around 800 – 1,000m² for a library/community centre as the land that will be vested in Council as reserve will not be suitable for the development of a Library. This is principally because most of the land to be vested is not of a suitable shape or location.

3.3.24. Another option is to further explore the purchase of the building at Pegasus which currently the Council lease’s space in for the community centre.

3.3.25. During 2018/19 it would be prudent to undertake a more in-depth analysis of the relative merits for locating a library/community meeting space at either Pegasus or Ravenswood. This analysis should also include an investigation of the options available at both locations in terms of land and buildings and options around ownership.

3.3.26. For 2018/19 financial year it is recommended that a provisional sum of $40,000 be included in the budget to allow for the engagement of appropriate specialist advice as required.

3.3.27. It is anticipated on current growth projections that a new library/meeting area will be needed at Pegasus or Ravenswood by Year 10 of the LTP so it would be prudent to include a financial provision by way of a placeholder.

3.3.28. Using the same m² rate as for Rangiora Library of $6,500 for a 600m² building this equates to $3.9million.

3.4. Community infrastructure excluding libraries

3.4.1. The report identifies that the District is well served for performing arts venues and halls and it is not anticipated that there will any need for this type of facility to address growth.

3.4.2. The report does identify that there is a need for smaller to medium sized spaces that can accommodate workshops, social activities such as book groups, parent and baby gatherings and group exercise sessions such as yoga. Storage of equipment, possibly shared office space for different community organisations and a well fitted out kitchen is also common. There is a trend for such facilities to be co-located or integrated with other activities which support community well-being such as early childhood centres, health care facilities, libraries, or active recreation spaces.

3.4.3. There are no identified standard for the amount of space for community meeting purposes to be used recreation, learning, small meetings, visiting speakers, and associated activities. This includes activities such as indoor bowls, gymba...
chess clubs and book clubs. More active recreation such as badminton and basketball are catered for by sports facilities and indoor courts.

PROPOSED LEVEL OF SERVICE

3.4.4. To service a new community population of 2,500 it is proposed that the following provision is required:

- One large room that will accommodate up to 40 people in workshop mode, or 80 people in theatre style seating;
- A smaller room with more comfortable seating that will be available for smaller meetings such as book groups;
- A small kitchen with tea, coffee and food heating facilities – not a commercial kitchen;
- Sufficient toilets to cater for the maximum occupancy, including accessible toilet and baby changing facility;
- Storage for collapsible tables and chairs, and for community group materials and equipment.

3.4.5. Such a facility is likely to require the following space:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large room</td>
<td>115-145m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller room</td>
<td>40m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>15m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets x 3 including accessible toilet</td>
<td>15m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>60-100m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation/lobby</td>
<td>15m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total space</strong></td>
<td><strong>260-330m²</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.6. The only town in the District which does not have long term space for community meetings is Pegasus. Rented space is currently being secured to provide a 150m² for community use. By 2018 the population of Pegasus is projected to be 2512 and a more permanent community centre of between 260-330m² as outlined above, would be appropriate. This space could be used by community groups in the town, and the meeting spaces could be used by libraries to deliver programmes or other services such as JP access from time to time as noted above.

3.4.7. Ravenswood is the other new community that may require a community centre. By 2048 Ravenswood is projected to have a population of 3722 and it may well require a community centre similar to that for Pegasus. It would be sensible to look to develop community meeting space in Ravenswood included with the proposed library development.

3.4.8. Rangiora’s population is expected to double by 2048. If we applied the criteria above additional community facilities may be needed to cater for community use.

3.4.9. This projected growth also needs to be considered alongside other facilities being developed in Rangiora by Churches. There are significant developments being discussed by both the Anglican and Presbyterian Churches both of which will have space/s available for Community use.

3.4.10. There is also no hard data on the level of use of community facilities and with new developments planned by Churches and schools it would be useful to
gather some data on actual use and unmet demand, as far as practicable, when the significant new Church developments are completed.

3.4.11. There is also interest by some Community groups and Social Service Agencies to have a ‘community house’ in Rangiora. Discussions about this are in their infancy and there is as yet no agreement on scope, scale and services that could be provided.

3.4.12. It is likely that elected member representation will be sought for a Working Party to further explore the concept and in particular to address how such a concept would address the priority needs for community strengthening in the Waimakariri District.

3.4.13. A particular focus of such a Working Party will be discussions with key providers of community meeting spaces and exploring how existing and proposed developments could be best utilised to meet the needs for community development.

3.4.14. It is not proposed to make any provision for funding for such a development in the Draft LTP.

3.4.15. Similarly in Kaiapoi the nearly completed Riverside Church development has many different spaces available for community use and the recently completed Coastguard building also has space available for community use. It is not anticipated that there is a need in the foreseeable future to develop more community facilities in Kaiapoi.

3.5. **Land for community groups**

3.5.1. Northbrook Studios was originally established to supply land for community groups to develop premises on. Examples of current occupants include Woodworking and Drama.

3.5.2. All of the available land at Northbrook Studios has been built on for some time and staff have been having regular requests from Community Groups for land to establish a building on.

3.5.3. Recent examples include Wrestling and Model Railways.

3.5.4. Staff have had several discussions with the then Portfolio Holder, Councillor Allen on the options for land that the Council already has in its ownership.

3.5.5. The preferred option is to utilise a block of the “Sparks Land” on Northbrook Road. This land was originally purchased for drainage with the surplus available for recreation purposes.

3.5.6. Originally this was contemplated as a new home for the Rangiora Community Garden but they have since found a more suitable block of land.

3.5.7. A preliminary proposed draft concept plan is attached for this area. This will get refined as groups have detailed discussions with Council but the initial concept allows for a variety of sizes of building as well as associated carparking.

3.5.8. The concept allows for 6 small buildings of 100m2; 3 medium buildings of 150m2 and one large building of 300m2 and this would potentially allow for around ten
groups to be established on site. The exact number would be determined by the actual size of buildings.

3.5.9. The concept is that the Group/Club would meet the building costs and sewer/water connection costs but that Council would develop the carparking/landscaping as required.

3.5.10. It is envisaged that the car parks would be gravelled and only developed as groups come forward. It is hard to predict the timing of such developments as typically groups would approach staff about potential land and then proceed to try and source funding.

3.5.11. There is also the potential, as an alternative to Northbrook site, to utilise land designated as mixed use business in the Regeneration Area. This could have significant advantages in terms of servicing costs and access.

3.5.12. It is proposed that staff further investigate both options during 2018 and prepare a report for Council’s consideration.

3.5.13. At this early stage it is proposed to include $5,000 in Year 5 of the Draft Annual Plan for some car-parking/landscaping and a further placeholder provision of $50,000 in Year 10. These provisions can be further refined in subsequent LTPs as further information on timing from potential groups is obtained.

3.5.14. Staff anticipate that this land would meet demands for community groups wishing to relocate/build premises, not associated with Sports grounds for at least the next 10 years.

3.6. **Aquatic Facilities**

3.6.1. The District’s two indoor facilities at Dudley and Kaiapoi both have capacity for further learn to swim and recreational users.

3.6.2. Both facilities also currently attract out of District customers from both Christchurch City and Hurunui District.

3.6.3. It is anticipated that the new facilities being planned and developed in both Christchurch and Hurunui will significantly reduce the current utilisation of Waimakariri District facilities by out of District customers.

3.6.4. For those reasons it is considered that the current level of service of 2 year round indoor facilities, an outdoor pool at Oxford and a paddling pool/splash pad at Waikuku will be sufficient to cater for the projected growth of the District over the next ten years, although it is likely that there will be requests from some communities for further aquatic facilities.

3.7. The Management Team/CE has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. The views of the community will be sought through the Long Term Plan Process.
5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. The following table summarises the direct financial implications of the recommendations in this report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTP Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Investigation into location of Library Ravenswood/Pegasus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Further planning for library extension at Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$3million</td>
<td>Detailed design and construction commencement of Rangiora Library extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>Car-parking development on land approved for community groups buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$3.5million</td>
<td>Completion of Rangiora Library extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Landscaping/car-parking on land approved for community groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3.9million</td>
<td>New Library at Ravenswood/Pegasus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy

This matter is a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance Policy.

6.2. Legislation

N/A

6.3. Community Outcomes

i. People will involve themselves in a range of recreation activities.

Craig Sargison
Manager Community and Recreation
Waimakariri District Council
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Introduction
The Waimakariri District Council is experiencing significant growth in population which is expected to continue over the next 30 years. Work is underway on the District Development Strategy to determine where that growth is most likely to occur. The Strategy will focus on planning the physical aspects of the District, such as residential and business growth areas and relationships with transport, infrastructure, the environment, rural areas and community spaces and places. This includes understanding the impact of growth on community facilities and what additional facilities might be needed and when.

This report proposes a number of objective, evaluative criteria that can be used in determining what community facilities and libraries will be needed in response to growth. These have been informed by a review of existing Council policies and strategies, a desktop research exercise which looked at other local authorities who may have done similar work, and an in-depth analysis of library and information needs.

The report is in three parts. The first part outlines the policy context and the demographic and other factors that make the Waimakariri District unique. The second part looks at trends in libraries and community centres, and examines how five other local authorities in Australia and New Zealand are addressing changing needs in response to growth. The third part discusses how Waimakariri District can address growth and offers some possible criteria.
Section I: local context

Policy

Community facilities

The Council adopted a policy in 2012 which outlines its role in providing community facilities.\(^1\) Community facilities are defined as:

- **District wide** – large multi-purpose performing arts venues, sports venues or town halls that cater for a wide range of activities are capable drawing visitors from across or outside the District.
- **Community meeting facilities** – venues that provide space for regular or casual use by community groups, and for some local social service providers as the office space from which they base their operations. These spaces are used for meetings and for passive recreation for those involved in arts, crafts, cultural or other passive creation.
- **Sports pavilions** – venues that are primarily designed to provide changing and toilet facilities to support sports codes. They may also include function or meeting rooms and kitchens.

Sports pavilions are outside the scope of this report unless they have substantial meeting room facilities attached.

The policy identifies a number of criteria for determining whether or not to fund a new facility. In summary they are:

- Potential for multiple current and future use having functional areas that include meeting rooms/conference spaces, storage, and administration spaces
- There is no capacity in other parts of the district that would be suitable, including facilities provided by other than Council
- A business case projects the level of operating income, expenditure and potential subsidy, including any community fundraising or anticipated corporate or community sponsorship
- The business case also identifies the social, economic or cultural needs, particularly in relation to population growth.

These criteria provide a good checklist once the need for a facility has been identified. They do not, however, provide the Council with any definitive, objective criteria which anticipate when a new facility might be needed as the area grows. This report addresses that issue.

Libraries

The Community facilities policy does not cover libraries, and there is no Council policy on library provision. However, the Library and Information Association of New Zealand has standards and guidelines\(^2\) which provide some guidance on the appropriate level of provision of facilities and

---

\(^1\) Waimakariri District Council. Council’s role in the provision of community facilities. Adopted 23 January 2012
\(^2\) Standards for New Zealand Public Libraries. Library and Information Association of New Zealand Aotearoa, 2004
services. In determining the location and size of a library or libraries for a particular community the Council needs to take account of the following:

- The total population to be served, the make-up of the population and its distribution
- The commercial characteristics of the community or communities
- Distance between, and from libraries related to geographic and physical infrastructure of the area;
- The range of services and activities to be accommodated in the facility, including space for collections, study, programming and events, meeting, browsing, reading and use of technology.

The standards note that “a limited number of libraries may provide more effective service than a proliferation of small branches. However neighbourhood branches may be more accessible to many people, such as children, older people and those with limited incomes. Too many branches can create fragmentation of services and resources. The effectiveness of branches depends primarily on their location and accessibility for the user”.³

The standards recommend an overall provision of 70 square metres per 1000 population.

The State Library of NSW in Australia published *People Places*⁴ which provides two methods of assessing the required size – one based on population and the other based on the specific spaces to be provided. They provide another way of assessing appropriate size for a particular library, although their overall provision of space in Australia tends to be less that of New Zealand libraries.

The way space is utilised has also changed somewhat since the last edition of the standards, with more space being given over to people related activities in libraries and reduced amount of space for collections. This has not changed the total space required.

**Current provision of community facilities and libraries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District wide facilities</th>
<th>Community facilities</th>
<th>Libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cust Community Centre</td>
<td>Cust Domain Pavilion</td>
<td>Rangiora Library (includes Chamber Gallery and CAB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Town Hall</td>
<td>Dudley Park Pavilion</td>
<td>Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre (housing library, museum, service centre, art space and meeting rooms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Town Hall</td>
<td>Fernside Park Pavilion</td>
<td>Oxford library and service centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Eyreton Hall</td>
<td>Kaiapoi Community Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend Community Centre</td>
<td>Lees Valley School Reserve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loburn Domain Pavilion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohoka Domain Pavilion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxford Centennial Building (community leased)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxford Jaycee Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Park Pavilion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora War Memorial Hall and offices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waikuku Beach Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

³ Ibid p37

There are other community halls, not owned by the Council, at Coopers Creek, Sefton, North Loburn, Eyreton, Ohoka and Swannanoa. Libraries and community facilities, including four of the halls not owned by Council, are indicated on the preceding map. In addition there are various sports pavilions with club rooms that may also be used from time to time by community groups which are not shown. A list of these is provided as an appendix.

**Arts and cultural venues**

The district wide facilities above provide venues for theatrical performances, dance and movies (in Rangiora and Oxford). The largest number of people that can be accommodated in the Rangiora Town Hall (the largest council owned venue) is 361 with a further 150 seating capacity suitable for smaller performances. The Baptist Church seats 500 and can be used for bigger gatherings. With larger, purpose built facilities being located within a reasonable driving distance to Christchurch the district is probably well served into the future for this type of community facility.

The Waimakariri District supports a number of local Museums in Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Oxford and Cust and also contributes to the Canterbury Museum. This provision will also be sufficient into the future. Similarly the Council provides two opportunities for the display of art, both by local artists and wider (Rangiora and Kaiapoi) and the Christchurch Art Gallery is relatively close by for an extension of those activities.

It is therefore considered unlikely that additional facilities of this type will be needed in the next thirty years.

**Waimakariri District Plan**

The District Plan provides the objectives, policies and methods, including rules that have been developed to ensure sustainable management of the environment in relation to land use and subdivision. The District Plan defines two key activity areas (Rangiora and Kaiapoi), and the various business, residential and rural zones. While Rangiora and Kaiapoi are defined as the main centres, the Business 1 zones in Oxford, Woodend, Pegasus and Ravenswood are also important secondary centres for business, social, community, cultural and administration activity for those towns. The District Plan seeks to maintain the characteristics of a rural environment while ensuring there is sufficient land for both residential and commercial development.

Through the work underway on the District Development Strategy the Council is engaging with the community to help shape the future of the district. It will provide a spatial framework to guide the growth and may influence changes to the District Plan.

---

Demographics and geography

Population growth

At the 2013 Census 53,905 people were resident in the Waimakariri District. Council has recently upgraded its growth projections\(^6\) and these indicate that by 2048 the district will have grown to between 86,200 and 96,996 residents. The former is the medium growth scenario provided by Statistics NZ and the latter is the WDC Scenario. It is recommended that the "prudent approach for population projections in the Waimakariri District is to use the medium and WDC scenarios as the low and upper bound".\(^7\)

The growth predictions for the towns and rural area is below. A breakdown by towns for the Statistics New Zealand medium projections is not available for 2048 therefore the 2043 projection figure has been used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WDC Scenario</th>
<th>Stats NZ medium growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>17,552</td>
<td>22,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>10,300</td>
<td>12,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend/Pegasus</td>
<td>5,150</td>
<td>7,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>2,206</td>
<td>2,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural including small settlements</td>
<td>24,613</td>
<td>29,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59,820</td>
<td>74,572</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the WDC scenario, Rangiora is projected to have the biggest growth and will account for 31% of the district’s population by 2048. The next biggest growth will occur in Pegasus and Ravenswood and with the adjacent area of Woodend, these areas will account for 12% of the district’s population. Kaiapoi remains the second biggest area of population with 15,132 people and 16% of the population. Although the numbers living in rural areas and small rural settlements are projected to increase the percentage of rural to urban drops from 41% in 2013 to 37% in 2048.

Geographical factors

The area of the district is 2219 km\(^2\). It is bound by the Waimakariri River in the South, the Pacific Ocean to the east, and the north-west is high country and hills, including Mt Oxford, Mt Richardson, Mt Thomas and Mt Grey which dominate the District’s western landscape. A large portion of the

---


\(^7\) Ibid p22
District is fertile flat land, or highly productive rolling downs. Much of the land to the east of Rangiora is reclaimed swamp, which is still subject to poor drainage and occasional flooding.

As noted already the population is largely concentrated in the eastern part of the district in Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, Pegasus, and a number of beach towns and small settlements north of the Ashley River. Oxford in the west of the district is the other main population centre and there are rural residential settlements clustered in Cust, Ohoka, Swannanoa and Mandeville. Travel distances between the main population centres are:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora to Kaiapoi</td>
<td>10.8km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora to Pegasus</td>
<td>10.7km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora to Woodend</td>
<td>7.0km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus to Kaiapoi</td>
<td>11.3km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus to Woodend</td>
<td>4.5km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend to Kaiapoi</td>
<td>6.8km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora to Oxford</td>
<td>35.0km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora to Ravenswood</td>
<td>8.0km</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The travel distance between Rangiora and Kaiapoi to the centre of Christchurch City is 28.6km and 19.7km respectively. Bus services provided by the Canterbury Regional Council link the eastern towns with Christchurch City and one route links Rangiora and Kaiapoi. As part of the government’s urban cycle ways programme a 6.5 km shared path is planned to connect Rangiora to Woodend, and an 8 km shared path is planned to connect Rangiora to Kaiapoi enabling safer cycling for people.

People who live in the rural residential areas expect to drive elsewhere for services. Those living in the town centres also expect to drive but increasingly there is a desire for other forms of transport such as cycling and walking within reasonable distances.
Section 2: A changing world

Community infrastructure
The type of community facility has changed over the years, as the requirements and pastimes of people have changed. At the time the majority of halls were built in the District they needed to accommodate theatrical performances, dances, craft fairs, bring and buy sales and whole of community meetings. Such halls would often have a stage or raised platform, a good sized space with a wooden floor, toilets and possibly a kitchen and smaller room or rooms at the back. The pavilions in domains whilst predominately filling a sporting function, have been used as hall spaces in some of smaller rural communities. Waimakariri District is well served by this type of facility and apart from Pines/Karaki Community hall currently under construction it is not anticipated that there will be any need for this type of facility to address growth.

However, the interests of people have changed over time and there is a need for smaller to medium sized spaces that can accommodate workshops, social activities such as book groups, parent and baby gatherings and group exercise sessions such as yoga. Storage of equipment, possibly shared office space for different community organisations and a well fitted out kitchen is also common. There is a trend for such facilities to be co-located or integrated with other activities which support community well-being such as early childhood centres, health care facilities, libraries, or active recreation spaces. Section 3 discusses this need more fully and identifies possible criteria and where the need is likely to be.

The world of libraries
Libraries and library services have also changed significantly over the past decades moving from being primarily places which provided access to learning and knowledge via the book, to being places where such access is via multiple media channels, including the internet supported by programmes and events that enhance learning and skills. The nature of spaces has changed: more sitting and study space, room for activities and group work, children and youth spaces, café, spaces to create and make things, and room for a variety of technologies, including computers.

The boundary between the traditional library and community space has been blurred. The Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre is one example, housing complementary cultural activities, community spaces and the Council’s customer service centre in the one facility. Increasingly this is the trend across other local authorities in New Zealand and Australia where councils look to maximise the use of the investment in expensive infrastructure.

Libraries are also developing new service delivery models. These include delivering services via online channels (eContent, serendipitous browsing, voice over IP, email, online chat), the use of pop-up libraries, mobile vans and unstaffed service points for part of the time. Auckland Libraries new service model incorporates all of these aspects alongside their physical network of libraries.

Local authority response
A number of local authorities in New Zealand and Australia have recognised these changes and are building integrated facilities as a result. The following five local authorities provide examples of the criteria being used to determine growth needs and the type of facilities being constructed.
**Auckland Council**

The Auckland Council has a road map for how it will invest in community facilities over the next 20 years. The plan covers arts and culture facilities, community centres, libraries, pools and leisure facilities and venues for hire such as community or rural halls. To keep pace with Auckland’s growing and diverse population they are taking a more “holistic, community led approach” to the planning and provision of community facilities which includes considering different models of ownership, design, location and operation of facilities. They want to work in partnership with communities and others to provide integrated and fit for purpose community spaces that are vibrant, welcoming and at the heart of communities.

Their plan provides some criteria for determining provision of facilities in response to growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Centres</th>
<th>Local - small</th>
<th>Local – Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Function</strong></td>
<td>Community development activities including small meetings, co-located working spaces, clubs and social gatherings with activated programming and services.</td>
<td>Community development activities including small and large meetings, social gatherings, recreation, local arts and culture, health and wellbeing with activated programming and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provision approach</strong></td>
<td>Located in local neighbourhoods, walking catchment of up to 15 minutes or 30 minute drive of rural and coastal villages</td>
<td>Serves a catchment of up to 15 minute driving time. Located in metropolitan or town centres and satellite towns. Desirably located within the centre of town.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Identifying gaps** | •Within 15 minute walk from local or town centres  
•Target population threshold 5000-10,000 | •Within 15 minute drive from metropolitan areas, key town centres  
•Target population of 20,000 plus |
| **Rural** | •Within 30 minute drive of rural centres  
•Target population threshold 5000-10,000 | •Within 15 minute drive from satellite towns  
•Target population of 20,000 plus |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Libraries</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Function</strong></td>
<td>Access to information and technology, programming and events, display of library collections, informal gathering spaces</td>
<td>As for local plus specialist services such as heritage and research, meeting space, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provision approach</strong></td>
<td>Maintain a level of 41m² per 1000 population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identifying gaps</strong></td>
<td>Capacity testing based on 41m²/1000 of local catchment population, including capacity of neighbouring libraries and maximum distance of 30 minutes travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural</strong></td>
<td>Respond to population growth of 10,000 in a rural area</td>
<td>Respond to population growth of population growth of 10,000 in a rural area and 30,000 in a metropolitan centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

In 2007 Christchurch City Council developed The Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy (UDS) and the Strengthening Communities Strategy which provide insight into their approach to providing community facilities. With the disruption of the earthquakes many local facilities and libraries have had to be rebuilt or significantly repaired.

An update of the UDS in August 2016 has as one of its strategic goals that “people and communities have equitable access to a range of integrated community infrastructure, facilities and services, including education, health, sport and recreation and core council services”. In consultation processes since 2007 one of the things people have asked for is neighbourhood centres and hubs that provide facilities and services at a local level. Christchurch has classified facilities as metropolitan, suburban, neighbourhood and rural but it does not appear to have developed any quantitative criteria for determining when additional facilities might be needed to accommodate growth. It has probably been too busy regenerating infrastructure destroyed or damaged by the earthquakes.

Christchurch, however, has been building community hubs with libraries at the centre, for the past sixteen years when the South Library, Learning Centre and Service Centre was built. Their latest community hub at Halswell, Te Hapua, houses the library, swimming pool and recreation spaces, meeting spaces and a café. The Libraries 2025 Facilities Plan identified criteria for prioritising proposed library facility developments as:

- Meets future growth needs where there are gaps that will complement existing facilities and identifies
- Preference for shared costs (land, capital and/or operational) while retaining ownership of the assets and its maintenance
- Locations of proposed developments have good connectivity with identified activity centres and/or major destinations, and public transport, walking and cycling routes.
- Developments display design innovation and best industry practice,
- Preference is given to developments that are: economically sustainable, located with other community facilities, accommodate changing library, social and technology trends, and provide for further expansion.

The earthquakes intervened but Christchurch is still working to this plan and two new libraries that were identified in the plan (Aranui and a replacement library at Halswell) have been completed. Once the new Central Library is complete the network will consist of 1 Central library and 19 suburban and neighbourhood libraries. A possible new library in Belfast is indicated but not yet

---


committed to. Although the Council has no formal criteria for the level of provision of library space the network, once central is complete, provides between 60m² and 63m² per 1000 population.

Christchurch City Libraries works on a 2km ‘buffer’ for its suburban libraries and a 1km buffer for its neighbourhood libraries. In theory this means that most of the city’s residents are within 2km of a library, although in the northwest, because of the boundaries prior to amalgamation in 1989, there is some overlap of library catchments.

**Hutt City Council**

The Hutt City Council plans to redevelop many of its facilities over the next 30 years with a particular focus on recreation and community hubs. These hubs will “provide multiple facilities at an appropriate level for the needs and size of the communities they serve … [which] households increasingly expect in their community” ¹¹. Hutt City sees these as rejuvenating the city and making it a more attractive place for people to live.

Their plan includes providing community hubs at six local centres plus the Civic Centre. The first of these at Taita, the $12 million Walter Nash Centre, has five multi-purpose courts, a new library, fitness centre, meeting spaces and a café. Four of the proposed hubs serve communities of less than 10,000 population; the other two between 16 and 18,000 population. The strategy notes that “generally hubs require a population base of 5000 and will be dependent on the extent of Council and other funding, and potential commercial partnerships”.

**Kapiti District Council**

Kapiti District Council advised that they are in the final stages of completing a comprehensive community facilities strategy, the first draft of which is due in late March or early April 2017. The strategy is intended to inform what facilities the district has, including council owned, and those owned by government or NGO groups that are available for public use. This strategy includes sporting and physical recreation facilities, community centres but excludes libraries. It outlines their current and projected demographics and indicates whether there are gaps in provision, or certain areas that lack facilities while others are over provisioned. In doing this work Kapiti advised that they did not find any officially recognised standards or agreed criteria around community centres, or community meeting space as is the case for sporting and recreational facilities.

**City of Wanneroo Council**

The City of Wanneroo in Western Australia has been experiencing significant growth and the population is expected to double by 2036 to around 350,000 people with most of the growth occurring in the northern coastal region. The city is one of the northern most in the greater Perth conurbation.

The city provides 25 community centres, youth centres, club rooms and recreation centres and four libraries for their current population of approximately 150,100. Two of their libraries are co-located with other activities (a museum, café, art space, volunteer office and council service centre).

However, none could be considered community hubs in the same way as Hutt City is conceptualising. However, as part of the Northern Coastal Growth Corridor plan\textsuperscript{12} Wanneroo has developed a set of population based criteria which drive the development of new facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITY</th>
<th>RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose hard courts (6-10 Courts)</td>
<td>1:35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Open Space (Active)</td>
<td>1:50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1:60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Recreation Centre (3-6 Courts)</td>
<td>1:75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centre</td>
<td>1:100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Centre</td>
<td>1:120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Gallery</td>
<td>1:150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Activity Nodes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf Life Saving Club</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose hard courts (2 Courts)</td>
<td>1:25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Open Space (Active)</td>
<td>1:25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1:35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Recreation Centre (1-2 Courts)</td>
<td>1:30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centres</td>
<td>1:35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Gallery</td>
<td>1:47,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Activity Nodes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf Life Saving Club</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centres</td>
<td>1:7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Open Space (Active)</td>
<td>1:7,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building on that framework, a report on libraries in Wanneroo indicated that the distance from a library should be between 5 – 15 kilometres with no more than 10 Kilometres in built up suburban areas. It also noted that where possible good public transport, rail or bus needed to be in place with sufficient parking for those that drive.

**Insights**

While this is only a sample of five local authorities they provide some pointers for Waimakariri District in developing its own set of criteria. The factors are a mix of catchment population (whether that is rural or suburban), distance to travel, and the availability or otherwise of good public transport.

Christchurch City, Hutt City and Auckland are also looking to maximise use of their facilities by bringing community, cultural, library and recreational activities into community hubs.

\textsuperscript{12} Northern Coastal Growth Corridor Community Facilities Plan: final report. City of Wanneroo, December 2011
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Section 3: Framework for growth

Library requirements
Waimakariri District currently has three libraries serving a population estimated in 2016 as 59,820.

Rangiora Library
Rangiora Library is a standalone building which houses the library, the library administration for the district and the Chamber gallery, a small meeting room and Citizens’ Advice Bureau (CAB) in the former Council building. The building was extended in 1997 and the extension designed by architects Skews Hey and Ussher. The total area of the library is 1265m² and the gallery, CAB and meeting rooms are 150m² giving a total area of 1415m².

Kaiapoi Library
The Kaiapoi Library is part of the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre. In 2011 Council opted to build a library, Council Service Centre, an art space and the Kaiapoi Museum to serve the combined populations of Kaiapoi, and surrounding small beach towns, plus Woodend and Pegasus. The building was designed by Warren and Mahoney and the total area of the building is 1892m². The breakdown of the space in the Ruataniwha Centre is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collections</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s area</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning area</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circulation functions</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workroom</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circulation areas</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal library space</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total = 62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of common space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Library space</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oxford Library
In Oxford the library and Council service centre has been rebuilt. The total area is 347.5m² with the library occupying 273.5m².

In summary the amount of current library space is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Library</td>
<td>1265m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi Library</td>
<td>1182m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Library</td>
<td>273.5m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2720.5m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levels of service standard
LIANZA Public library standards recommend that there should be 70m² per 1000 population of library space. Christchurch City libraries has adopted a standard of 60-63m² and Auckland is considerably less at 41m² per 1000 population. It is recommended that the Waimakariri District...
Council aligns itself with Christchurch City and calculates its requirement for the District’s population on 60m² per 1000 population.

Using this measure we can calculate the expected space requirements for the total population as follows:

Table: Library space in m² for total population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WDC Scenario</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Stats NZ Medium</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>2043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>17,552</td>
<td>22,516</td>
<td>30,063</td>
<td>18,075</td>
<td>20,650</td>
<td>23,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>10,300</td>
<td>12,217</td>
<td>15,132</td>
<td>11,810</td>
<td>13,395</td>
<td>14,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend/Pegasus</td>
<td>5,150</td>
<td>7,914</td>
<td>12,116</td>
<td>5,290</td>
<td>7,715</td>
<td>11,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>2,206</td>
<td>2,796</td>
<td>3,693</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td>2,390</td>
<td>2,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural including small settlements</td>
<td>24,613</td>
<td>29,128</td>
<td>35,992</td>
<td>23,525</td>
<td>27,195</td>
<td>31,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59,820</td>
<td>74,572</td>
<td>96,996</td>
<td>60,890</td>
<td>71,345</td>
<td>83,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 60m²/1000</td>
<td>3589m²</td>
<td>4474m²</td>
<td>5820m²</td>
<td>3653m²</td>
<td>4281m²</td>
<td>4985m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not all the rural population will access a physical library. We have therefore discounted the rural population and assumed that only 65% of people will access a physical library.

Table: Library space in m² for rural population calculated at 65%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WDC Scenario</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Stats NZ Medium</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>2043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>17,552</td>
<td>22,516</td>
<td>30,063</td>
<td>18,075</td>
<td>20,650</td>
<td>23,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural at 65%</td>
<td>7,872</td>
<td>9,316</td>
<td>11,512</td>
<td>15,291</td>
<td>17,677</td>
<td>20,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25,424</td>
<td>31,832</td>
<td>41,575</td>
<td>30,666</td>
<td>38,327</td>
<td>43,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 60m²/1000</td>
<td>3146m²</td>
<td>3950m²</td>
<td>5172m²</td>
<td>3072m²</td>
<td>3710m²</td>
<td>4325m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current amount of library space is 2720.5m². It is clear by 2028 there will be a shortfall in the amount of library space available. This can be further broken down by the current catchment areas. For the purposes of calculation we have allocated the rural population based on the same ratio as the population in the WDC scenario.

Table: Library space in m² for Rangiora and surrounding rural population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WDC Scenario</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Stats NZ Medium</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>2043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>17,552</td>
<td>22,516</td>
<td>30,063</td>
<td>18,075</td>
<td>20,650</td>
<td>23,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural at 65%</td>
<td>7,872</td>
<td>9,316</td>
<td>11,512</td>
<td>15,291</td>
<td>17,677</td>
<td>20,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25,424</td>
<td>31,832</td>
<td>41,575</td>
<td>30,666</td>
<td>38,327</td>
<td>43,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 60m²/1000</td>
<td>1,525m²</td>
<td>1,910m²</td>
<td>2,495m²</td>
<td>1,536m²</td>
<td>1,761m²</td>
<td>2,008m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current size</td>
<td>1,265m²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,265m²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table: Library space in m2 for Kaiapoi, Woodend and Pegasus and surrounding rural population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WDC Scenario</th>
<th></th>
<th>Stats NZ Medium</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiapoi</td>
<td>10,300</td>
<td>12,217</td>
<td>15,132</td>
<td>11,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural at 65%</td>
<td>4,063</td>
<td>4,808</td>
<td>5,942</td>
<td>3,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodend/Pegasus</td>
<td>5,150</td>
<td>7,914</td>
<td>12,116</td>
<td>5,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural at 65%</td>
<td>3,047</td>
<td>3,606</td>
<td>4,456</td>
<td>2,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22,560</td>
<td>28,545</td>
<td>37,646</td>
<td>23,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 60m2/1000</td>
<td>1,354m2</td>
<td>1,713m2</td>
<td>2,259m2</td>
<td>1,434m2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current size</td>
<td>1,182m2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: Library space in m2 for Oxford and surrounding rural population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WDC Scenario</th>
<th></th>
<th>Stats NZ Medium</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>2,206</td>
<td>2,796</td>
<td>3,693</td>
<td>2,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural at 65%</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>1,485</td>
<td>971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,222</td>
<td>3,998</td>
<td>5,178</td>
<td>3,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 60m2/1000</td>
<td>193m2</td>
<td>240m2</td>
<td>311m2</td>
<td>190m2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current size</td>
<td>273.5m2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oxford Library is of sufficient size to cater to the population whichever scenario comes about. However, Rangiora Library is too small now and Kaiapoi Library will not cater sufficiently for the growing population in Woodend, Pegasus and the new area of Ravenswood in ten years’ time.

**Community centre requirements**

As noted previously the amount of community hall space and venues for hire is sufficient, even when growth in rural areas and small communities is taken into account. None of these areas is projected to have growth of a significant nature, or to have business zones that would warrant additional community facilities other than what is provided for by community halls or sports pavilions and facilities.

However, the growth in the two key activity areas of Rangiora and Kaiapoi, and the towns of Oxford, Pegasus, Ravenswood and Woodend may justify additional facilities or community hubs, where none exist currently. As already noted the trend is towards Community Hubs, which incorporate meeting space, kitchen, office/administration space, storage and activity space often collocated along with other council, community, library or recreation facilities. The size of the spaces is dependent on the needs to be accommodated and who the other partners are in a shared facility. Possible commercial partners might include health centres, early child care centres or suitable retail spaces such as pharmacies and bookshops. If the population warrants a full library service then this should be an integral part of any community hub.
Levels of service standard

As far as we have been able to determine there are no standards for the amount of space for community meeting purposes, as there are for sporting facilities and libraries. We have therefore calculated the space required for a neighbourhood facility to be used by community groups and clubs for recreation, learning, small meetings, visiting speakers, and associated activities. This includes activities such as indoor bowls, gymbaroo, chess clubs and book clubs. More active recreation such as badminton and basketball are catered for by sports facilities and indoor courts.

To service a population of 2500 plus the following is required:

- One large room that will accommodate up to 40 people in workshop mode, or 80 people in theatre style seating;
- A smaller room with more comfortable seating that will be available for smaller meetings such as book groups;
- A small kitchen with tea, coffee and food heating facilities – not a commercial kitchen;
- Sufficient toilets to cater for the maximum occupancy, including accessible toilet and baby changing facility;
- Storage for collapsible tables and chairs, and for community group materials and equipment.

The required space for such a facility is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Space (m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large room</td>
<td>115-145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller room</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets x 3 including accessible</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>60-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation/lobby</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total space</strong></td>
<td><strong>260-330</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A plan outline for space requirements to accommodate 80 people theatre style is attached as an appendix.

Possible Criteria

The analysis of the requirements for library services and community centre facilities above suggests a number of criteria or trigger points which can be applied in response to growth in the district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
<th>Town centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Provide space for meetings, clubs (such as book clubs, indoor bowls, etc)</td>
<td>• Provide space for meetings, clubs (such as book clubs, indoor bowls, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and social or community gatherings</td>
<td>and social or community gatherings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Space for library programmes to be delivered on a regular basis</td>
<td>• Co-located/integrated with other community and recreational activities,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access to internet connected computers</td>
<td>including cafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Book kiosks or access to physical media by library card</td>
<td>• Staffed library service operating as a branch library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Activate programmes and events (both Council and community initiated)</td>
<td>• Access to internet connected computers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Provision approach**
- Located adjacent to business zone or shops

**Population trigger**
- Population 2,500

**Service standard**
- 260-330m² minimum size (community centre)

**Distance**
- Within 10-15 minute walk from local centre, or 5-10 minute drive
- Within 15 minute drive from rural dwellings

- Located adjacent to business zone or shops, preferably including a supermarket

- Population of 10,000 (library)
- Population of 20,000 (additional community facilities)

- 60m² per 1000 population (library)

- Within 10-15 minute drive from anywhere in the catchment population
- Within 30 minute drive from rural dwellings
- Minimum of 5 km from another town library

These criteria need to be applied in conjunction with the other criteria already in place in the WDC Policy Council’s role in the provision of community facilities. As noted earlier, they do not include sporting and physical recreation facilities which are separately identified.

**Impacts of adopting criteria to address growth**

**Library service**

The new Oxford Library will cater for the growth in population projected for Oxford including the surrounding areas to 2048. No additional service will be needed in the west of the district.

Rangiora and the surrounding catchment will require additional library space. The preferred option would be to extend the existing library by 1000-1200m² preferably within the next 5 years. This would provide for more spacious and comfortable reading areas, quiet study space, a stack district collection, a learning centre and meeting room and event space. It may also provide space for new partners such as public print production services, for example. The current library is well positioned in the centre of the town and most residents in the expanded town will live within a 3 km radius of the library. Given the compact nature of the town, and its centralized shopping area one larger library to service the town and its surrounding catchment is considered the best option.

The population in Woodend, Ravenswood and Pegasus is projected to be between 11,105 – 12,116 by 2048 plus the rural and small town areas that will use this area for shopping. A bigger Rangiora library and the existing Kaiapoi Library can probably provide the services for these areas for the next ten years. However, as the total population grows additional library space will be needed. One option would be to build a library to service the combined area of Woodend, Ravenswood and Pegasus.

Two possible locations for an additional library are Pegasus or Ravenswood. They each have advantages. Ravenswood will have a business zone alongside which a community hub, including a library could be located. Pegasus residents are likely to travel to the supermarket and use the library whereas Woodend and Ravenswood are less likely to go to Pegasus for library services on their own. However, Ravenswood is only 8km from Rangiora whereas Pegasus is around 11km from either Rangiora or Kaiapoi. There are also natural barriers of the state highway which provides a degree of separation for Pegasus residents. Further work would be needed to determine the better location.
but a facility of between 500-750m² of library space plus additional space for other services such as a café, meeting rooms etc is indicated, depending on where it is sited.

The extension to Rangiora and the proposed building of a new facility in Ravenswood/Pegasus should serve the projected population until 2048.

Until such a facility is needed, library services to Pegasus could use a self-help service model. This would mean library resources are available via a dispensing machine, or a library card access only area. Library staff based in either Rangiora or Kaiapoi could deliver programmes at regular times, e.g. one morning a week a baby time session, another day a digital technology class. Access to Wi-Fi and computer technology could also be provided.

**Community centres**

The only town which does not currently have any space for community meeting is Pegasus. Rented space is currently being secured to provide a 150m² for community use. By 2018 the population of Pegasus is projected to be 2512 and a more permanent community centre of between 260-330m² as outlined above, would be appropriate. This space could be used by community groups in the town, and the meeting spaces could be used by libraries to deliver programmes or other services such as JP access from time to time as noted above.

Ravenswood is the other new community that may require a community centre. By 2048 Ravenswood is projected to have a population of 3722 and it may well require a community centre similar to that for Pegasus. Whether it would need the self-service library services is debatable given its distance from other libraries.

Rangiora’s population is expected to double by 2048. If we applied the criteria above additional community facilities may be needed in one or more of the new subdivisions to cater for community use. There is already some indication that it is difficult for community groups to access suitable space for their activities.

**Conclusion**

The proposed criteria, if adopted will provide a trigger for Council in looking ahead to plan for new community facilities. Each facility will still require a needs assessment, a review of options for addressing the need and a business case that provides Council with the information necessary to make sound decisions.
Recommendations
Is recommended that the Waimakariri District Council:

1. Adopts the criteria for determining the appropriate community centre and library developments as follows:
   - 60m² per 1000 population for library facilities (rural population discounted to 70% of total)
   - A trigger population of 10,000 in an urban population for a library
   - A minimum distance of 5km between libraries
   - A minimum of 200m² for a community centre
   - A trigger population of 2500 for a community centre
   - A trigger population of 20,000 for additional community facilities

2. Amends its policy on the Council's role in the provision of community facilities to include the criteria outlined above. These criteria are the ‘triggers’ that alert Council to the need for future facilities which are then assessed against the other criteria already in place to determine the feasibility of and best option for a new facility.

3. That based on the criteria above, extend the Rangiora library by 1000-1200m² within the next 5 years to cater for growth. Given the compact nature of the town and the centralised shopping one library facility will be sufficient to service Rangiora and its surrounding catchment.

4. Provide a 260-330m² community centre in Pegasus when the population reaches 2500 (within the next three years).

5. Do a more in-depth needs assessment for the community facilities at Pegasus/Ravenswood and provide a library and community facility of between 500-750m² in ten years to meet the growing population

6. Undertake a needs assessment for additional community facilities in Rangiora.

Appendices

Appendix 1: List of halls and clubroom available in the district

Baptist Church Hall, Rangiora
Blue Skies Conference and Training centre, Kaiapoi
Eyreton Hall
Gladstone Park - Rugby Club rooms
GP Hall Oxford (Partly owned by Council)
Kaiapoi High School - School Hall
Mandeville Sports Club – Club rooms used as hall space
Maria Andrews Clubrooms
McAlpines North Canterbury Pipe Band Hall, Rangiora
North Canterbury Netball Centre
Northbrook Museum and Rossburn Receptions Function centre
Northern Bulldogs Rugby League Club - Club rooms used as a hall
Ohoka Hall
Pines/Karaki Community Hall (under construction)
Rangiora A&P Showgrounds
Southbrook Sports Club - Club room used as a hall
Tuahiwi Hall Marae

Appendix 2: plan for meeting room
This is the minimum size to accommodate 80 people theatre style. It does not allow for a centre aisle.
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COUNCIL’S ROLE IN THE PROVISION OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES

1 Introduction

This policy proposes to establish a consistent approach to the Council’s involvement in the provision of community facilities in the Waimakariri District. Community facilities are defined, for the purposes of this policy, as community buildings, pavilions, halls, including the car park and any structures associated with the carpark or building, such as bollards, rubbish bins, gardens, trees and signs.

Concurrent to the development of this policy is the development of a recreation master plan for the District. That plan will address the location of new community facilities in relation to levels of population growth in the District. This policy supports that plan by outlining the intent of the Council in providing the facilities considered by the plan, and explains how the Council broadly intends to meet the expectations of the community in providing facilities that address increasing demand.

Community facilities are the buildings and amenities that support communities, groups, families and individuals to meet their social needs, make the most of their potential and achieve community wellbeing. The Council provides facilities to cater for meetings and events of civic importance, as operating bases for social service groups, and places for people to meet for recreation, sporting and other social purposes. Some facilities may also contribute to community identity, particularly in rural areas, or be historically significant.

This policy explains how, and the extent to which, the Council is and will in future be involved in the provision of a range of community facilities in the District. The policy outlines the circumstances where the Council may consider developing new and/or upgrading its existing facilities. It outlines the criteria which it will consider when making the funding decisions associated with these new or improved amenities.

The policy also outlines situations in which the Council may consider supporting other non-Council facilities on private land, supporting externally funded facilities on Council land, or entering into public/private partnerships to enable the provision of new facilities.

2 Policy Context

The policy provides for Council involvement in a range of community facilities. These are:

A) District Wide Facilities. These are large multi-purpose performing arts venues, sports venues, or town halls that cater for a wide range of activities and are capable of drawing visitors from across or outside of the District. The Council provides these District Wide Facilities to make available large meeting, performance or sporting areas for general use, where groups can gather, socialise, network, compete or entertain, and where clubs can rehearse and perform. These facilities encourage development of new skills within the community, provide options for local entertainment and assist the District to retain its cultural and recreational talent and initiative. They also retain
COUNCIL’S ROLE IN THE PROVISION OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES

some of the spending capacity that is available for social purposes within the District, and provide opportunities for social and cultural development.

B) Community Meeting Facilities. These are venues that provide space for regular or casual use by community groups, and for some local social service providers as the office space from which they base their operations. The purpose of Council providing meeting room venues is to provide areas for social service groups and agencies to perform their functions, assist clients, and develop networks that draw valuable services and resources into the community. These groups can effectively target and address social issues in the District using the community meeting spaces as their operating base. These spaces also provide opportunities for passive recreation by clubs or groups involved in arts, crafts, cultural or other passive recreation activities.

C) Sports Pavilions. These buildings are primarily designed to provide changing and toilet facilities to support those sports codes that use Council sports grounds for active forms of recreation. Pavilions may also incorporate function or meeting rooms for use by the club/s using the sports-ground. Many sports pavilions are designed to cater for multiuse. Competition level pavilions are those attached to premier sports grounds, and include kitchen facilities, function rooms, changing rooms and toilet facilities. Local sports club pavilions include a meeting room and may include basic kitchen facilities, toilets and changing rooms.

The Council recognises that there are a number of externally owned facilities in the District that serve a similar function to the Council facilities. For instance, various externally owned facilities provide meeting places and support community gatherings. These facilities may include church and school halls, and club buildings. The policy takes into account the function of these external buildings when considering the type and level of Council’s involvement in its provision of facilities.

3 Policy Objective

The objective of this policy is to provide a consistent basis for the Council’s involvement in providing new (or upgrading existing) community facilities. The contributions that the Council makes to various facilities and the organisations that operate within them need to be applied fairly and transparently across the various activities and groups which request this form of assistance. The basis by which the Council makes these decisions needs to be reasonable and equitable, in order to demonstrate to ratepayers that community facilities are provided in response to assessed community need, and to provide criteria that can be consistently applied in a range of circumstances.

The policy frames Council involvement in community facilities provision in a way that enhances the social benefits of its involvement, which provide incentives for the multi-use of venues and which promote collaboration among supporters of new venues and upgrades. The policy also encourages those groups developing new venues to plan for general community use of a proposed facility where possible. The policy encourages future proofing.
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by focusing Council involvement in proposals that provide sufficient space to cater for projected population growth and change of use over time.

The Council aims to achieve a network of facilities configured to best suit community needs, reflect the dynamic and shifting nature of our communities, located in close proximity to growing population hubs, near town centres or within areas with a compatible land use.

4 Policy Statement

The policy statement is divided into sections which outline the form of Council involvement in provision of different types of facilities. These categories are

A. District Wide Facilities (performing arts venues, sports venues and town halls)
B. Community Meeting Facilities
C. Sports Pavilions

Section 4.1 addresses the Council’s role in providing new facilities.

Section 4.2 of the policy outlines how the Council will support externally owned or externally funded facilities.

Section 4.3 of the policy outlines the Council’s approach to upgrading its facilities.

Section 4.4 of the policy proposes the criteria that the Council will consider when making decisions on which facility proposals to fund.

The policy implementation approach outlines how a network of facilities that are fit for purpose will be achieved.

Policy Implementation Approach

1) Before considering a Council investment in a new facility the Council will:
   • Work with external facility providers to encourage better community access to non-Council facilities
   • Develop partnerships and/or provide funding support to enhance community access to external facilities and to assist these facilities to become better fit for purpose

2) To rationalise existing Council facilities the Council will:
   • Regularly review the usage arrangements for existing facilities to ensure they are most appropriately meeting community needs and expectations, and where appropriate, change the classification and use of a facility to provide the best usage in relation to need or demand
   • Over time, demolish damaged, less well maintained or earthquake risk older facilities that are underutilised or are not fit for purpose, or that
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- are poorly located in relation to current or projected future population growth, or where there are sufficient existing facilities available to address community need, and consider sale of the land
- Consider sale or lease of obsolete facilities that are no longer used for the intended purpose or that are not fit for purpose, where the facility is in a safe condition, has been adequately maintained, is not an earthquake risk, and has some remaining useful life

3) When investing in new Council facilities Council will:
- Prioritise Council expenditure on projects that improve safety of existing facilities, and/or that provide maintenance and improvement of existing Council facilities in relation to their level of current use and/or future projected population growth
- Directly invest in new Council owned facilities only where evidence is provided of a clear community need and existing capacity of relevant Council and non-Council facilities is fully utilised
- Consider contributing to new facilities or improvements to facilities in areas where population growth is anticipated or growing community demand is demonstrated
- Ensure that new facilities will be located in areas that are easy to find and are easily accessible including by public transport, vehicle and by walking or cycling.

4.1 Councils Role in Providing New Community Facilities

4.1.1 District-Wide Facilities (Performing Arts & Indoor Sports Venues & Town Halls)

The Council provides performing arts, major sporting and town hall facilities capable of drawing visitors from across and outside of the District. These may be used primarily for large scale social, sporting, recreation, or performance events and activities, including large indoor performances.

The Council provides the land and venue for these facilities. It subsidises their use by the community through covering most of the ongoing operating costs. The Council provides district wide facilities for use by all district residents, provided these facilities generate a significant social or cultural benefit and strengthen district communities.

These facilities are provided by the Council in situations where it is not considered viable for the private sector to provide the same standard of multiuse facility at a rate that would encourage regular ongoing participation or meet specific community requests for particular forms of usage. The Council may provide district wide facilities when there are no alternative private sector facilities (such as large church or school halls or club rooms) available for general community use that would serve the required purpose.
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The Council will consider providing up to 100% funding for new town halls, indoor sports venues or performing arts venues that meet the relevant criteria in section 4.4 of this policy, if supporters of proposed new facilities are able to demonstrate they can meet any fundraising target for the venue that may be specified by the Council.

The Council, in considering whether to provide additional district wide facilities, will take into account the likely frequency and regularity of use of a proposed new venue. The Council will assess new venue proposals against a target for the projected use of the venue of at least 10% of District residents in any one year (e.g. over 5,000 different people would be projected to use the proposed facility in any one year); and of at least 1000 individual visits per week on average.

The Council will require any new district-wide facilities that are developed to make a significant contribution to the network of civil defence or post disaster function buildings.

The Council may consider the provision of commercial kitchens within district-wide facilities.

4.1.2 Community Meeting Facilities (for Passive Recreation or Social Services Support)

The Council provides community meeting spaces to create areas for groups and organisations to gather for regular meetings, to perform their regular functions, or for casual use. These venues either provide the office space for activities which will benefit the wider community, or are widely available for general community use.

As with district wide facilities, the Council also subsidises the use of community meeting spaces by the community. These venues are only provided where they generate a significant social or cultural benefit. Additional community meeting spaces will only be provided by the Council in situations where there are no alternative private sector venues available that are fit for purpose.

The Council will consider whether to provide up to 100% funding for new community meeting facility proposals that meet the relevant criteria in Section 4.4 of this Policy, to serve a predominantly social service, volunteer or community support function, or that meet the needs for meeting spaces for recreation, arts, crafts, or cultural clubs or groups. These facilities are widely available for use by all people in the community.

The Council will only consider provision of additional community meeting (and office) spaces in the following circumstances:

- There is no further availability at peak times at all other suitable venues within the ward in which the new venue is proposed to be located, including venues not owned by the Council
- The venue will be of sufficient size to cater for at least 100 people at any one time (where relevant).
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The Council will seek to develop new community meeting spaces where a need is demonstrated within a particular ward in a way that optimises the efficiency of each venue in relation to its projected use. This will be achieved through design and configuration of additional meeting spaces that utilise a number of separate meeting areas with shared kitchen and bathroom facilities, or larger meeting areas with shared amenities either of which can be used by multiple groups or agencies at any one time, or in sequence throughout a week.

Note: The venue may provide either multiple break out rooms (possibly with retractable partition dividers) for separate or shared use by a number of proposed user groups, or a larger conference/function room available for multi-use in accordance with assessed current and future demand. Exclusivity could be established in areas within these facilities although common amenities such as kitchens, bathrooms and some storage spaces may be shared.

The Council will seek written expressions of interest by potential users of proposed new community meeting spaces. The Council will consider proposals for new community meeting space that demonstrate an intended use of the venue for a majority of weekdays in any one year (supporters of the proposed venue will need to demonstrate that significant ongoing usage of the venue is achievable).

A venue that is required for the use of just one club or group will be required to be wholly funded by that group or club.

4.1.3 Pavilions for Active Sport and Recreation

Sports and Recreation Pavilions have the primary purpose of providing changing and toilet facilities for use in preparation for, and changing after sporting and recreation events at Council sports grounds. Priority use of each pavilion is usually established for one or more of the club/s using the associated sports ground.

Competition level sports pavilions on premier sports grounds are generally to a standard that is suitable for hosting functions including regional competitions, and include changing, toilet and kitchen facilities. Local club pavilions attached to community sports grounds cater for formal or informal local sport or recreation activities. These are generally simple buildings with a common meeting space and have very basic kitchens, toilet and changing rooms. Pavilions often include external access public toilets for use by the wider public visiting a sports ground.

With rapid growth in the District, the Council is receiving many requests for it to contribute to, or provide, new sports pavilions for use by one or several sporting codes on a number of Council sports grounds.

The Council’s role in new sports pavilion development is through forming partnerships with local sports clubs. Through these arrangements, the Council may provide funding for external access toilets and changing rooms, together with parking facilities and security arrangements, subject to the criteria in Section 4.4 of this policy. The Council will normally only fund those components of a pavilion that are available for use by the wider public using the sports ground.
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as well as by the sports code/s that would primarily use the pavilion. It is the responsibility of the club/s using the pavilions to provide meeting or function spaces with catering and bar facilities as required.

Sports pavilions are usually only available for use by those sports codes that have an associated use of the sports ground. For this reason the Council does not provide meeting and function spaces for these groups as their usage of their amenities is usually exclusive.

In deciding whether to provide funding for external access toilets and changing rooms, parking and security for a new sports pavilion, the Council will take into account the proposed building configuration of the pavilion. For instance, Council input into building configuration during the design stages reduces the risk of the facility becoming obsolete over time as levels of involvement in a particular code, and levels of use of the associated sports ground, change.

The Council will, through partnership arrangements with sports clubs, seek the inclusion of multi-use pavilions on each premier sports ground in the District that are available for use by all those codes that use that sports ground. Through partnership arrangements it will also encourage inclusion of local multi use pavilions on community sports grounds where they will achieve regular usage and where sufficient demand is demonstrated.

Over time some pavilions that were originally externally funded have been vested in Council as the codes’ use of the facility declines, to ensure that maintenance can continue. The Council will seek to devolve the management of these pavilions it owns, where possible, to a club or Community Trust when that pavilion is just used by one or two codes.

If a sports pavilion is made available for wider community use on a regular basis and continuing wider use is evident, then the Council may consider a contribution to meeting, kitchen or function spaces in sports pavilions, subject to Section 4.4 of the policy.

Where the Council approves the development of a new pavilion on a Council sports ground, as a condition of pavilion development, it may require a contractual agreement with the key pavilion user/s outlining the ongoing financial contribution to be required of all parties, together with any other responsibilities. The contract may specify arrangements in circumstances where one or more of the club/s using the pavilion become unable to meet their commitments. Minimum usage requirements for the pavilion may apply in relation to management arrangements.

4.2 Council Contributions to External Facilities

4.2.1 Contribution to Externally Funded Buildings on Council Land

There are a number of buildings that have been constructed by clubs or groups in the District that are located on Council reserves or sportsgrounds. This policy explains the purpose served by these buildings and outlines the situations in which the Council may consider making an investment to improve these facilities or assist with their maintenance.
COUNCIL’S ROLE IN THE PROVISION OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Within the District, a number of sports codes and other community organisations have constructed pavilions or buildings for their own use, and in some cases, for the shared use of two or more codes or groups, on a Council sportsground or reserve. The sports pavilions are usually of a similar nature and configuration to the Council sports pavilions. Other external buildings may be constructed by clubs or groups that serve a passive recreation, or educational purpose. These facilities were generally developed to provide spaces for meetings for social and recreation purposes, similar to the purpose for the provision of the comparable Council facilities.

In some cases, the club facility has experienced declining usage and support to such an extent that the club may choose to either vest the pavilion or building in Council ownership in order that the facility may continue to be maintained, or allow maintenance of the building to deteriorate over time as usage declines.

In some cases clubs or groups may find themselves unable to fund any required capital upgrades or repairs to their buildings. In recognition of these issues the Council proposes the following policy:

The Council may make a capital contribution to an upgrade to an externally funded facility on Council land in accordance with the criteria in Section 4.4 of this policy, as applicable. The Council is more likely to support a contribution to a venue upgrade where the proponents of that upgrade provide or fundraise a significant contribution to the project costs and make the facility widely available for general use by the community. In addition, the Council normally covers building and resource consent costs for external buildings on Council land.

The level of any Council contribution considered for an externally funded facility is likely to be in proportion to the degree of general public access to the facility that is made available, and/or the degree of benefit to the wider public that is associated with the activity/s undertaken in the facility.

The Council may consider whether the facility should be vested in the Council as an alternative to considering assisting with capital costs incurred by a group in relation to its usage of its facility.

4.2.2 Contributions to Voluntary or Community Organisations

The Council may provide a grant or loan toward a new externally owned facility or proposed facility upgrade (where the owner is a voluntary, or community social service or not for profit organisation or a NGO) for the purposes of meeting a social support, health or safety function for the community in accordance with the applicable criteria in Section 4.4.

In making its decision the Council will consider whether the activity for which the facility is needed should alternatively be funded by the Government as a Government service. The Council will take into account the level of fundraising by the venue proponents in determining...
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its level of investment in any such facility and is more likely to support investment in facilities where some fundraising has been undertaken.

4.2.3 Contributions to Educational/ Recreation or Arts Facilities:

The Council may provide a grant or loan toward a new externally owned facility or proposed facility upgrade for the purposes of meeting a sports, recreational, educational, arts or crafts or cultural need within the community subject to applicable criteria in Section 4.4.

The Council will take into account the level of fundraising by the venue proponents in determining its level of investment in any such facility and is more likely to support investment in facilities where proponents are prepared to contribute the majority of the costs that would be incurred.

4.2.4 Contributions to External Organisations Operating Costs

The Council may also make a temporary, or short term contribution by way of grant, or loan, or a longer term partial operating grant, to an organisation’s operating costs where the organisation operates a privately funded venue on Council land or on its own land, subject to the following:

- Viability of the activity would cease without the Council contribution; and
- The applicant provides a business plan indicating how it will address its funding shortfall in future; and
- The applicant can demonstrate that all other potential funding sources have been fully investigated; and
- The applicant demonstrates ability to repay any loan that may be granted, if applicable; and
- The activity provides for the education of, or provides for the improved physical or mental health of participants or for improved public safety; or
- The funding will assist to meet an identified social, economic or cultural need in relation to population growth.

The Council may consider whether the facility should be vested in the Council as an alternative to considering funding ongoing operating costs of a group in relation to its usage of its facility.

4.2.5 Contributions to Commercial Facilities (e.g. Commercial Cultural Precinct/ Arts Gallery/ Fitness Centres)

The Council may select from the following forms of contribution to a new commercial facility in the District, or an upgrade to an existing commercial facility, where the facility would provide a significant social or cultural benefit to the community (such as a significant contribution to public health or safety, or significant contribution to the network of cultural facilities available within the District):
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- seed funding of the total value of the proposal
- funding by way of a loan to be repaid by the facility proponent
- underwriting of a loan for a new facility or facility cost upgrade

4.3 Upgrading Council Facilities

The Council, when considering whether to fund requested upgrades to any of its facilities, may consider fully funding the following types of improvements (to district wide facilities, community meeting facilities and sports pavilions), subject to the criteria in Section 4.4 as applicable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenity</th>
<th>Council Funding Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security lighting</td>
<td>For all facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved parking facilities</td>
<td>For all facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping of facility grounds</td>
<td>For all facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New public toilets &amp; changing rooms</td>
<td>For all facilities, external access may be provided in some circumstances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded kitchens</td>
<td>For district wide and community meeting facilities only*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded common meeting or function space used by multiple groups</td>
<td>For district wide and community meeting facilities only*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: the Council may choose to stage upgrades to facilities over a number of years

*Sports clubs that have an established sole or multi use of a Council sports pavilion will be required to fully fund those proposed improvements to the venue that have a direct and exclusive benefit to their club/s (e.g. expanded bar area, flood lighting, venue features, expanded meeting areas, new storage or administration areas or other equipment specific to their functioning). The Council will normally only fund improvements to changing rooms, toilets, parking and security features for its sports pavilions, subject to the criteria in Section 4.4.

Groups using district wide or community meeting facilities that have unique storage requirements, functional space requirements, administrative needs or chattels specific to the use of their group within the venue may be required to fully fund these types of upgrades to accommodate their equipment and any other specific requirements.

4.4 Criteria for Council Investment in Community Facilities

4.4.1 General Criteria for Council Funding for Facilities

The Council will consider the extent to which proposals for new community facilities, or facility upgrades, meet each of the following criteria (as applicable) before determining the level of any funding it may provide:
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- Any new facility is designed with the potential to incorporate multiple current and future usage by various groups within the District;
- The wider facility incorporates multiple functional areas including meeting room/conference spaces, storage, administration and other supporting functional areas in relation to assessed demand for facility use as relevant;
- The Council has assessed available space at other facilities across the District which serve a similar purpose (whether owned by Council or externally owned) and there is no further capacity available at peak times at these venues and no opportunity to reschedule existing venue usage to create further capacity;
- For existing facilities, usage or functionality of the venue as a whole would increase if the improvement was made or the proposed improvement would address specific on site safety concerns;
- The projected levels of operating income and expenditure are provided with an outline of how operating costs are intended to be covered. The Council may assess new facility proposals against a target of projected operating cost recovery through direct user fees and charges of at least 10%. The Council will consider the level of cost recovery likely to be achieved for proposals in determining which proposals to support;
- An indication of how long term operating costs will be reduced over time;
- Level of community fundraising achieved and/or ability of proponents to meet any fundraising target which the Council specifies in relation to the proposal;
- Level of anticipated social, economic or cultural benefit to the community from the proposal in relation to a specific cost benefit analysis;
- Level of anticipated corporate and/or other community sponsorship including terms and conditions related to naming or advertising rights as applicable;
- Ownership, operating or management proposals for the venue;
- Ability of proponents to repay any loan that is granted (if applicable) including a contract providing security for the loan if required by the Council;
- The Council will approve the design, colour, materials and siting of any new facility that is approved for location on Council land;
- Supporters of the facility provide a business plan (supported as required by Council analysis) that indicates:
  - Increasing demand for the activities to be accommodated by the proposed venue is clearly demonstrated including by either:
    - undertaking per capita comparisons of rates of participation in the activity/s to be accommodated by the facility within the District with relevant regional and/or national comparisons, or
    - comparing per capita levels of access or proximity (in km) to the type of facility that is proposed with regional and/or national comparisons, as applicable; and
  - Why existing venues are not adequate to meet current demand (examples of existing venue usage figures must be provided);
  - An assessment of the suitability of the proposed location/s;
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- An assessment of the proposed management structure for the venue and how space will be allocated among potential users and how usage will be maximised over time;
- How the facility will improve the physical health or safety of those using the venue, and contribute to the development of new skills or education of facility users;
- How the facility will meet identified social, economic or cultural needs of the District in relation to population growth.

The level of any Council contribution will be considered on a case by case basis taking into account the above criteria. Any contribution made is likely to be greater for projects that provide a high degree of social benefit, including projects that enhance public health or safety, or that enable widespread public use including use by multiple groups with diverse activities in the community.

4.4.2 Criteria for Land and Access Arrangements

In any situation where the Council invests in an external facility (that it does not own, or that it will own, but that is located on private land) the following is a condition of its contribution to or development of the facility:

1) The Council may require first option of the purchase of the land and/or facility from the owner at any time the owner sought to sell the land and/or facility. The sale price for the land/facility, if the Council wished to purchase, would be based on its rating valuation at the time the sale was considered.

2) A contract would be required to define the following:
   - usage agreements for the facility and access across the associated land
   - timeframes by which review of land ownership provisions would be initially considered

5 Links to legislation, other policies and community outcomes

The policy gives effect to the following Waimakariri community outcomes:

- Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality
  - There is a wide variety of public places and spaces to meet people’s needs
  - The range of community and recreation facilities meets the changing needs of our community.

A separate policy is currently being developed proposing streamlined fees and charges for the use of Council facilities. This policy is titled “Proposed Charges for Council Owned Facilities” and can be applied to the use of all of the facilities which are owned by the Council.
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6 Adopted by and date

Adopted by Council on 23 January 2012.

7 Review

This policy will be reviewed every three years and is next due for review in July 2015.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: GOV-01-11 / 171107120563

REPORT TO: Community and Recreation Committee

DATE OF MEETING: 21 November 2017

FROM: Craig Sargison, Manager Community and Recreation

SUBJECT: COMMUNITY TEAM FUNDING

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is for the Council to consider the level of financial support it provides to the Community Team.

1.2. The report discusses the services that the Team currently provides and also reflects on the declining level of funding from Central Government.

1.3. The report proposes three options for Community Team ‘level of service’. It suggests reinstatement of usual level of service provided by the Community Team and notes that staff will be working during the next 12 months to develop formalised Levels of Service for community support for the Council’s consideration.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee recommends that the Council at its meeting on 30 January (LTP):

(a) Receives report No. 171107120563

(b) Approves the Community Team being staffed at a level of 5.65 FTE funded from rates which was the staffing level in 2016/17.

(c) Notes that external funding is anticipated of $80,000 which will fund project delivery

(d) Approves a rating contribution of $709,551 for the Community Team being included in the Draft Annual Plan

(e) Notes that staff will continue to work closely with Central Government Agencies and will keep Council informed of any further potential partnering opportunities.
3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. Background and changing approach to Community Development:

3.1.1. The Waimakariri District has been accredited to the World Health Organisation approved ‘International Safe Community’ model since 1999, when it was the second community in New Zealand to achieve such status.

3.1.2. Maintenance of Safe Community Accreditation requires that “…communities must meet the following six indicators in line with International Safe Community criteria:

1. Leadership and Collaboration: demonstration of leadership by a coalition or group focused on improving community safety.

2. Programme Reach: the range and reach of community safety programmes operating throughout the community/region, including an indication of the extent to which they are based on proven or promising intervention strategies.

3. Priority Setting: demonstration of programmes that target and promote safety for high risk/vulnerable groups and environments.

4. Data Analysis and Strategic Alignment: analysis of available safety (injury, crime, violence and safety perception) data for your community/region and how they align with established national/regional priorities and action plans.

5. Evaluation: outline of expected impacts and how they are being measured or evaluated.


Demonstration of community engagement with relevant sectors of your community/region and on-going participation in local, national and Pan Pacific Safe Communities Networks is required.

3.1.3. In the early days of accreditation there was a very close partnership with Central Government agencies but the emphasis from Central Government was focusing on communities “needs”. Once “needs” were identified funding could be sourced to satisfy or address the identified “need”.

3.1.4. This method of community development had the high risk of thinking of community members and associated organisations as passive “clients” – recipients of assistance largely determined through “needs analysis” often conducted by people external to the community they were dealing with.

3.1.5. An outcome of this form of “development” was the creation of communities/groups who were focused on their own “inadequacies”, lacked confidence and it created dependency on the assisting agency.

3.1.6. This former approach to community development has been replaced by a strength’s based approach that is an enabling form of community development that understands what a community has the potential to be.

3.1.7. With the rapid development of Waimakariri District there are some individuals or “communities” who speak of a “loss of a sense of community” or of no longer knowing their neighbours.
3.1.8. A well acknowledged writer, Peter Block published a book in 2009 entitled: “Community: the structure of belonging” and the following is an excerpt from that work:

“Community is about the experience of belonging. We are in community each time we find a place where we belong. The word belong has two meanings. First and foremost, to belong is to be related to and part of something. It is membership, the experience of being at home. ... The second meaning of the word belong has to do with being an owner: Something belongs to me. To belong to a community is to act as a creator and co-owner of that community. What I consider mine I will build and nurture. ... The work of building community then is to seek in our communities a wider and deeper sense of emotional ownership; it means fostering among all community citizens a sense of ownership and accountability and to provide structural ways to create the experience of belonging.”

3.2. “The Waimakariri Way”: Creating and Maintaining Strong, Connected Vibrant Communities

3.2.1. The Waimakariri District Council Community Team works under the umbrella of the Waimakariri District Council to facilitate an evidence-based, community-led approach to foster safe, resilient communities so that “Waimakariri is a District where people are thriving.” Waimakariri District Council Community Development Strategy 2015-2025

3.2.2. Through its various working parties, project coalitions and steering groups, the Community Team has established and maintains an in-depth working knowledge of the Waimakariri District and the physical, socio-economic and environmental factors that affect the quality of life of our residents. Collectively partnering with well over 300 community, business, education, government and non-government stakeholders, the Community Team facilitates a community-led approach in three key outcomes areas:

- Safe Communities:
- Inclusive Communities
- Empowered Communities

3.2.3. Local responses are collaboratively developed in line with the internationally recognised ‘Spectrum of Prevention’. This applies a broad spectrum approach to creating safer more resilient communities; therefore increasing the likelihood of a sustainable impact.

3.2.4. The International Safe Communities model has proven that a locally informed, collaborative community-led approach provides the most effective and sustainable outcomes in creating safe, connected, resilient communities.

3.2.5. Local facilitation is essential in identifying and facilitating best practice models to effectively address priority issues and opportunities. These things don’t just happen; they need someone to pull the strings, make the connections and facilitate action. Such functions sit outside the capacity (and often capability) of already stretched service providers.

3.2.6. Waimakariri District Council Community Team measure and report both quantitative and qualitative results, utilising the Results-based Accountability (RBA) framework and is part of the national Safe Community Foundation Results Based Accountability pilot.

The alignment of the Waimakariri response with regional strategies and central government priorities ensures that wider research and proven resources and models are applied to planning for local responses. Examples of such regional alignment include our active member in the Health Greater Christchurch Steering
group, which acts as the Health and Communities committee under Resilient Greater Christchurch, in which Waimakariri are a strategic partner.

3.2.7. As illustrated below Central Government, regional and local alignment translates into increased reach and return on funder investment as more stakeholders are brought into community-led, collaborative responses.

Typically return on funder investment translates into at least double the dollar spend in terms of in-kind or volunteer hour contribution from stakeholders involved in a collaborative response to addressing a community priority.

Figure 1: Correlation between Central Government Priorities, Regional Strategies and the local, Waimakariri District Council Community Team, response

3.3. Priorities and staffing

3.3.1. The table on the following page summarises the key priorities for the Community Team and show the range of key partners and local and regional networks used for delivery.

3.3.2. This Community Development approach as summarised in the table translates into increased reach and return on funder investment; with a broad range of stakeholders work together toward achieving desired community outcomes. I.e. safe, inclusive, empowered communities.
## COMMUNITY RESILIENCE COORDINATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
<th>Safe Communities</th>
<th>Inclusive Communities</th>
<th>Empowered Communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOCUS</strong></td>
<td>Safe Relationships</td>
<td>Personal Resilience and Wellbeing</td>
<td>Safe Environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRIORITIES</strong></td>
<td>Families Youth Peers (bullying)</td>
<td>Alcohol-related harm Addiction Suicide risk</td>
<td>On-line safety DIY Children Older people Rural Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MECHANISM FOR DELIVERY</strong></td>
<td>Police, Aviva and other Women’s Refuges, Schools, Preschools, Victim Support, CDHB, NGOs operating in the local health and social support sectors, local business, MSD, Rata Foundation, Safe Community Foundation of New Zealand, ACC, North Canterbury Children’s Teams</td>
<td>Residents Associations, Community Boards, Volunteer Canterbury, Together Hurunui, Canterbury University, Office of Ethnic Affairs, Chamber of Commerce, DIA, emerging leaders in community, Oxford Community Trust, Vision West, Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council, Resettlement Services</td>
<td>Leadership Lab, Community Mentors, Enterprise North Canterbury, MSD, Hope Trust, Wellbeing North Canterbury, Community Trust, Person to Person Help Trust, Eco Educate, MYD, Rata Foundation, Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council, Hurunui District Council Local business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KEY REGIONAL &amp; NATIONAL NETWORKS SUPPORTED</strong></td>
<td>1.5 FTE</td>
<td>2 FTE</td>
<td>0.75 FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total staff resourcing</strong></td>
<td>5.65 FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff**
- Facilitators: 1.5 FTE
- Admin: 0.5 FTE
- Leadership: 1 FTE

Total staff resourcing = 5.65 FTE
3.4. Funding Provision

3.4.1. Traditionally Council has contributed around $550,000 to funding the work of the Community Team with around $300,000 coming from external sources of which Government Department funding was the most significant contributor.

3.4.2. In recent times this has become very much a piecemeal arrangement. While acknowledging the need and the crucial value of community-based facilitation, funders across the spectrum are increasingly focusing on project funding only.

3.4.3. With an increasingly project-delivery only focus, funders expect that TLAs will fill the gap in facilitating a collaborative local response to priorities in community safety; being well networked across the community and seen as a neutral party.

3.4.4. Council received advanced warning from the Ministries of Health and Justice of the non-availability of funding a few years ago and the Ministry of Health, recognising the impact of the earthquakes on North Canterbury did provide a special one off extension of the contract with the Council which finished at the end of June 2017. - Waimakariri District Council was the only District in the country to receive such funding.

3.4.5. Staff advised Council of this during 2016; and for the 2017/18 Annual Plan staff noted in a report to Council that there was sufficient carry forward surplus to cover reduced hours for community safety initiatives. However this would exhaust that surplus and the funding for ongoing support would need to be addressed as part of the LTP process.

3.5. Level of Service

3.5.1. There are a growing number of NZ territorial authorities accredited as Safe Communities. Currently 26 Communities across New Zealand hold this status. Waimakariri District is due for its reaccreditation in 2018.

3.5.2. Central Government has a focus on “investing for outcomes” and an underlying expectation that this well be established collaboratively. A key focus of reaccreditation is continuing evidence of wide ranging collaboration and involvement of target communities in the design and delivery of services. The accreditation panel looks for evidence that communities understand and take ownership of issues facing them, and are exercising autonomy in the design and delivery of services and programmes.

3.5.3. Our Community Team are the people who do provide facilitation of local individuals and groups to identify and facilitate best practice models that effectively address priority issues. Such functions sit outside the capacity of already stretched service providers who are also not funded for a wider facilitation role in the community.

3.5.4. There is, however, as far as we are aware, no NZ territorial authority who has defined levels of service for community development (including community safety)

3.5.5. One of the areas of development we are proposing to undertake during 2018 calendar year is some draft levels of service for discussion with the Council and the Community.

3.5.6. For that reason in the Draft LTP we have not proposed any increases in service provision aligned with population projections.
3.6 **Staffing Options**

3.6.1 **Option A:** Reinstatement of 2016/17 staffing levels (5.65 FTE)

The reinstatement of Safe Community Facilitation staffing levels to 2016/17, when Central Government funding provision was in place would allow us to address those key areas identified as priorities for our Community in terms of meeting International Safe Community criteria as detailed in the table in 3.3 of this report. It would also ensure that a quality ‘all of community’ approach could be applied to the reaccreditation process.

This is the favoured option. It would mean that Waimakariri District continued to be recognised as a ‘Leader at a National Level’, with respect to being a safe, inclusive and empowered community. It would also be aligned with the commitment of the new Minister for Local Government who has signalled commitment to the reinstatement of the four well-beings into the definition of Local Government.

3.6.2 **Option B:** Continuation of 2017/18 staffing levels (5.15 FTE)

With the cessation of central government funding, staffing levels were reduced by 0.5FTE, so that an historic surplus could cover salaries to meet project funding contract commitments for suicide prevention and family violence.

While the current, temporarily reduced, level of staffing has been managed as a bare-minimum for the 2017/18 year, it does not allow us to effectively address three key areas that have been identified as leading causes of harm in our District.

- Alcohol and drug related harm, rural safety and child safety.

Failure to address these could adversely impact on our reaccreditation as an International Safe Community, in that we risk not being able to meet Safe Community Criteria # 3. “**Priority Setting: demonstration of programmes that target and promote safety for high risk/vulnerable groups and environments.**”

3.6.3 **Option C:** Reduction in Staffing

Removal of the provision of facilitation for a collaborative approach to addressing priorities in community development and safety would likely result in the loss of our International Safe Community Status, due to our not being able to meet International Safe Community criteria; making it unlikely that Council could deliver on its Community Outcome that “**There is a safe environment for all.**” It would also affect our alignment with Healthy Greater Christchurch, the Health and Wellbeing committee under Resilient Greater Christchurch.

Furthermore, this approach would remove crucial elements of cross-team collaboration to address key community development and youth development issues around the wellbeing of our residents; particularly young people. E.g. Suicide Prevention, where youth are a key statistic. Many of the established stakeholder relationships associated with the addressing of such issues would be lost.
3.6.4. Funding for 2018/19

The table below details the Council contribution related to Options A, B and C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option A:</th>
<th>Option B:</th>
<th>Option C:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost of Service</td>
<td>$789,551</td>
<td>$746,551</td>
<td>$601,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner contribution</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous LTP provision</td>
<td>$561,760</td>
<td>$561,760</td>
<td>$561,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>$147,791</td>
<td>$104,791</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REQUESTED COUNCIL CONTRIBUTION FROM RATES</td>
<td>$709,551</td>
<td>$666,551</td>
<td>$561,760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

a. The anticipated cost of service for 2018/19 is expected to be $789,551 under options A and B; and $601,760 under Option C

b. The anticipated contribution from our partners for the year for project costs is $80,000 under options A and B and $40,000 under option C

c. Council contribution from rates for the 2017/18 financial year is $550,107

d. In the 2015 LTP the budgeted contribution from Council rates for 2018/19 is forecast for $561,760.

3.7. The Management Team/CE has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. The views of the community will be sought through the Long Term Plan Process but the work of the Community Team appears to be appreciated across the District.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. Option A - Reinstatement of usual staffing levels to 5.65 FTE. This would relate to a Council contribution of $709,551 a difference of $147,791 against the 2018/19 LTP budget allocation. This would ensure that key community safety and wellbeing issues are properly addressed, in line with our status as an International Safe Community. Waimakariri District’s reaccreditation review is due in 2018.

5.2. Option B - Continuation of reduced staffing levels at 5.15 FTE. This would relate to a Council contribution of $666,551 a difference of $104,791 against the 2018/19 LTP budget allocation. This would retain minimal provision of community safety facilitation. However it would also put us at risk of not being able to properly fill our obligations as an accredited International Safe Community.

5.3. OPTION C – Retention of Status Quo $561,760, as budgeted. This would result in the removal of Waimakariri Districts International Safe Community Status and remove crucial elements of across-team collaboration to address key community development and youth development issues around the wellbeing of our residents. E.g. Youth Suicide.
5.4. The following table summarises the funding for each option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option A: $ 789,551</th>
<th>Option B: $ 746,551</th>
<th>Option C: $ 601,760</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cost of Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner contribution</td>
<td>$ 80,000</td>
<td>$ 80,000</td>
<td>$ 40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous LTP provision</td>
<td>$ 561,760</td>
<td>$ 561,760</td>
<td>$ 561,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>$ 147,791</td>
<td>$ 104,791</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REQUESTED COUNCIL</td>
<td>$ 709,551</td>
<td>$ 666,551</td>
<td>$ 561,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRIBUTION FROM RATES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Government Act

6.3. **Community Outcomes**
The work of the Community Team aligns with the following Council Community Outcomes:

- There is a safe environment for all
- There are wider ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making by local, regional and national organisations that affects our District.
- People are friendly and caring, creating a strong sense of community in our district.
- People have wider ranging opportunities for learning and being informed.
- Our community’s needs for health and social services are met
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. The purpose of this report is to formalise the discussions held at the Regeneration Steering Group staff briefing session held on Monday 6 November 2017 regarding the Regeneration high-level budget expenditure forecasts and the associated timeframes, and to summarise the current budget provisions included within the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan (LTP) for the District Regeneration Activities.

1.2. An additional budget provision of approximately $10.5M would be required in order to fully implement the Recovery Plan land uses and activities, based on current high level estimates, over and above the current budget provisions (established in 2015 Long Term Plan).

1.3. This report also provides an update on current expenditure on the Kaiapoi Wharf Marine Precinct & Riverbanks programme, and the budget provisions within the draft 2018-2028 Long Term Plan (LTP) for the remainder of this programme.

1.4. Based on currently approved budget provisions for the Kaiapoi Wharf Marine Precinct & Riverbanks programme, there is an anticipated shortfall of approximately $450,000 in the existing budgets in order to fully deliver the programme. This additional budget, along with re-apportionment of the existing planned expenditure, is included in the proposed draft 2018 Long Term Plan budget.

1.5. Separate standard commentaries to the finance budget spreadsheets have been prepared. Those commentaries refer to this report for further detail.

1.6. Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery programme works within the Regeneration areas are covered in separate reports by the Infrastructure Recovery Programme Manager.

**Attachments:**

i.
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group recommends:

THAT the Council at its Long Term Plan meeting 30 January – 1 February 2018:

(a) Receives report No. 171109121919.

(b) Approves the budget for the Regeneration programme; noting that the proposed budget requests an additional $10,497,000 of funding in order to deliver the programme as outlined in this report, with a total programme value of approximately $18,381,000 expenditure.

(c) Notes that the overall Regeneration programme estimate and the timing of some key projects has changed since the last update in May/June 2017.

(d) Approves the budget for the Kaiapoi Wharf Marine Precinct & Riverbanks programme, which, after allowance for some reapportionment of existing budget components, includes an increase of approximately $450,000 over currently approved budgets, with some changes in the planned timing of expenditure.

(e) Notes that the overall Kaiapoi Wharf Marine Precinct & Riverbanks programme budget estimate and the timing of some key projects has changed since the last update in November 2017 (Trim: 171026116121[v2]).

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. **Background – District Regeneration Implementation Programme**

3.1.1. The Waimakariri Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan (the ‘Recovery Plan’) sets out the agreed long-term uses for the five regeneration areas in Kaiapoi, The Pines Beach and Kairaki to facilitate recovery from the impacts of the Canterbury earthquake, which include new parks and reserves, walking and cycling tracks, Community BMX track, a dog park, provision for heritage and Mahinga Kai activities, mixed-use business areas, roads and infrastructure sites, and rural activities.

3.1.2. A provision of $6M, with further approximate $0.7M allowance for inflation, spread over 8 years, was allowed for within the 2015-2025 Long Term Plan (LTP), for the purposes of implementation of the land uses and activities within the Regeneration areas. This budget provision was made before the Draft Recovery Plan had been prepared, and before the land uses and activities had been confirmed.

3.1.3. A further $0.57M provision for operating expenditure was made in the 2015-2025 LTP. This was to cover operating and maintenance costs for the temporary 3 Waters provisions within the residential red zone.

3.1.4. The Draft Recovery Plan noted that the $6.7M 2015 LTP provision was not sufficient to deliver all of the land uses and activities in the Recovery Plan, and that further budget would need to be sought through future LTP processes.

3.1.5. An interim budget update report (Trim: 170615061135) was provided to the Regeneration Steering Group in July 2017 and the Council in August 2017. This identified an approximate potential $9M shortfall in existing budgets, in order to implement all the land uses and activities from the Recovery Plan.
3.1.6. A further staff briefing on the District Regeneration budget expenditure was provided to the Regeneration Steering Group at the meeting of 6th November 2017. This is discussed further in section 5.8.

3.1.7. The District Regeneration Activity is closely related to a number of other Council projects/initiatives, such as:

- Kaiapoi Wharf Marine Precinct and Riverbanks programme
- Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery programme
- KTC 2028 (Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan review) project
- District Plan Review
- District Development Strategy
- Natural Hazards Plan Change

A brief overview of some of the key complementary projects is provided in the following sections.

3.2. **Horizontal Infrastructure (Roading and Utilities)**

3.2.1. Of the allied projects, the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery (EIR) Programme has an immediate direct interaction with the District Regeneration Implementation Programme. The balance of works yet to be completed within the EIR programme are generally those projects that are physically located within the Regeneration areas. These projects had their commencement deferred until there was more certainty around the proposed land uses in the Regeneration areas from the Crown issue and gazettal of the final Recovery Plan, which occurred in December 2016.

3.2.2. The EIR programme has a separate budget provision of approximately $41.1M. This budget is managed and reported separately, and not covered further in this report.

3.2.3. The EIR programme was scoped prior to the Recovery Plan development. The general principles adopted in the EIR programme was to decommission all redundant roads and services in the regeneration areas, unless required to serve remaining private properties (or utilities). Roads and utilities remaining were programmed to have earthquake damage repairs undertaken e.g. Courtenay Drive.

3.2.4. Where elements of the roading and utilities work within the regeneration areas sit outside of the scope of the EIR programme scope, these must be budgeted for with in the District Regeneration budgets. This includes such items as:

- Upgrades to Cass Street and Jollie St for accessing the Kaiapoi East Sport and Recreation Reserve e.g. resurfacing, narrowing, parking, change in purpose and level of service and appearance
- Upgrades to Charles St
- Retained road access to Askeaton reserve
- Dealing with Mainpower and Chorus assets above/below ground
- Network provisions / upgrades for future Regeneration land uses – e.g. in particular the mixed use business areas. This also needs to be factored against potential development contributions, depending on how the mixed-use business areas are developed.
3.3. **Kaiapoi Wharf, Marine Precinct and Riverbanks**

3.3.1. The Kaiapoi Wharf Marine Precinct & Riverbanks programme also has a separate budget provision, but is managed by the District Regeneration core project team and overseen at a governance level by the Regeneration Steering Group. The wharf, marine precinct and riverbank projects are all very closely related (and in close proximity) to the Regeneration areas, and are therefore managed collectively. The original Wharf and Riverbanks programme also includes budget provisions for the upgrade of Murphy Park, the new rowing precinct, recreation precinct (Trousselot Park), wharf area works, pontoons and Riverview terraces, and general riverbanks walkways repairs and upgrades.

3.3.2. An overview of the Kaiapoi Wharf, Marine Precinct and Riverbanks programme budget was provided in a report to Council on 20 June 2017 regarding procurement options for construction of the proposed Riverview Terraces (Trim:170526053941[v1]).

3.4. **Kaiapoi Town Centre and Mixed-use business areas**

3.4.1. A portion of the District Regeneration programme budget will contribute to the KTC2028 project (Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan refresh), due to the new mixed use business areas within the Regeneration area boundaries, which essentially form new extensions to the defined Kaiapoi Town Centre boundaries.

3.4.2. Some of the costs associated with the KTC2028 project, where funded from the Regeneration budgets, will potentially be recoverable at some stage in the future when the land is developed and/or on-divested from Council to others.

3.5. The Management Team/CE has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. Community views were sought through the development of the Waimakariri Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan, with extensive consultation undertaken.

4.2. The Draft Recovery Plan included high-level cost estimates for the land uses and activities shown within the plan, on an activity / area basis. This identified a projected shortfall of approximately $9.4M, based on the programme scope and high level estimates at the time.
5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

**District Regeneration**

5.1. **Existing Council Budget Provision – District Regeneration**

5.1.1. Existing Council budgets include funding for a number of the land use proposals in the Draft Recovery Plan, but not all.

5.1.2. The Draft Recovery Plan and 2015 LTP also outlined provisions for Roading and Infrastructure works yet to be completed within the regeneration areas. These are covered under the separate Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery Programme reports and are not reproduced in this report.

5.1.3. The 2015 LTP provision for anticipated land use activities was broken down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Red Zone Recovery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenspaces $6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation provision $766,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Red zone Recovery</strong> $6,766,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: **2015 LTP Red Zone Recovery Budget provision**

In addition there is $0.57M allocated for temporary red zone recovery maintenance for 3 waters assets.

5.1.4. The Draft Recovery Plan included tables of high level expenditure estimates for most of the key land uses and activities.

5.1.5. The current Annual Plan 2017/18 has a budget provision of approximately $2.1M for the current financial year activities. Based on the latest planned activities schedule and cost estimates, this is expected to be expended by year end, with no expected requirement to bring forward nor carry-over budget to the following years.

5.2. **Financial Reporting Basis**

5.2.1. Where capital works are subject to a cost share agreement with the Crown, or grant funding from external agency, or NZTA subsidy; then the capital works are reported at gross cost estimate, with the revenue from Crown cost-share agreements, grant funding or subsidies shown as income in line with financial policy. Examples of these revenue items are:

- Crown cost share of land maintenance contracts – during the term of the interim lease (until June 2017)
- NZTA subsidies for upgraded/reconfigured roads providing key access into the new land uses/activities
- Portion of previously approved Christchurch Appeal Trust grant funding, reapportioned from Kaiapoi Wharf Marine Precinct & Riverbanks programme to the Regeneration programme (for Community BMX reinstatement).

5.2.2. Where new infrastructure capital works or upgrades are undertaken within the Regeneration areas, and these are not already included within the EQ Infrastructure Recovery Programme budgets (for example the upgrades/improvements to retained roads); then these are reported as follows:

- Cost estimate for the roading project is included within the District Regeneration programme budget estimates, at gross cost estimate based on an outline level of service provision.
- Reduction is made within the Earthquake Infrastructure Recovery programme budget, to allow for the deletion of the road decommissioning element (including any Crown cost share element)
- The Crown cost-share is no longer applicable.

5.2.3. Due to differing reporting and presentation basis, the regeneration staff budget estimates summary are not directly comparable to the finance spreadsheets (particularly for operational expenditure), although the operational and capital works subtotals are in line with each other as are the specific capital works projects allowances.

5.3. **Crown Cost Share arrangements**

5.3.1. An existing cost share agreement is in place between WDC and the Crown, setting out terms of potential cost sharing arrangements for removal of redundant infrastructure. This primarily offsets the work being undertaken as part of the EIR programme.

5.3.2. As part of the land divestment process, the draft terms and conditions of divestment agreement include a provision that the existing cost share agreement will expire and no longer apply. Any outstanding (either not commenced, or not yet completed) works in the EIR programme that were subject to the cost share agreement will be scheduled so that a potential final settlement agreement can be reached with the Crown.

5.4. **Clarifications and Assumptions in Regeneration Budget Estimates**

5.4.1. General clarifications and assumptions used in establishing the District Regeneration budget estimates are:
- The budget provisions are based on high level cost estimates only, prepared by staff
- The projects will generally be delivered to the existing WDC levels of service provisions contained within the existing Activity Management Plan (unless noted otherwise)
- Contingencies have been included in the estimates
- Where existing roads are proposed to be retained with the regeneration areas and are to be upgraded, an NZTA subsidy has been assumed to apply to the funding of the project.

5.4.2. Levels of service allowed for are provisional (as noted above); these will be confirmed via the development of the Reserves Master Plan in early 2018. An outline level of service summary has been developed and assumed in the meantime.

5.4.3. The extension of Charles Street to serve as the new access to Askeaton reserve (as shown in Recovery Plan maps) has been deleted in favour of retaining Cass Street with a reduced level of service. This results in a net saving to Council (when considered across the combined District Regeneration and EIR programmes) of approximately $400,000 due to not having to fully decommission Cass Street, or build a completely new replacement road. In line with the reporting basis above, the cost of retaining and modifying Cass Street for this purpose is included within the Regeneration programme cost estimates and budget.

5.4.4. Some projects are spread over multiple years, due to construction duration, staging of construction, and respective staging of design and construction.
5.4.5. The budget estimates are based on current expectations around land use and scope, including assumptions around key items such as sports fields layouts based on early discussions with sporting clubs such as Kaiapoi softball and Rugby League around their intentions.

5.5. **Specific Inclusions in Regeneration Budget Estimates**

5.5.1. Some specific Inclusions within the District Regeneration programme budget estimates include:

- WDC costs associated with the development of the Recovery Plan (in the 16/17 financial year)
- WDC share of interim maintenance costs for full financial year 17/18
- Provision for WDC contribution to Mainpower and Chorus redundant assets removal
- Provision for preparation of mixed-use business area strategy as part of KTC2028 review
- Provision made for public toilets and changing rooms of the Sport and Recreation reserve, in line with Council policy
- Provisional allowance for bulk earthworks ($450k) and contaminated land remediation ($200k over 2 years)
- Provisional allowance to allow for the set-up of interim leases
- Rates payments on regeneration area land
- Repair and upgrade/improvements of retained roads within regeneration areas;
  - Charles Street Upgrade (Jones-Jollie)
  - Cass Street Upgrade (Jones-Sports Reserve)
  - Jollie Street Upgrade (Charles-Cass)
  - Cass Street (Eastern) retention as road access to Askeaton boat ramp.

5.5.2. Provisions made for WDC and third parties utilities decommissioning, bulk earthworks and contaminated land are generally included in the current (17/18) financial year, with only a limited provision made accordingly in the 2018 - 2028 LTP.

5.5.3. Where the retained roads are subject to repair and/or improvements; these have been assumed to be eligible for NZTA subsidy of 51% under the low-cost low-risk roading programme. This NZTA subsidy is shown as a revenue item.

5.5.4. The development of the Community BMX track in Kaiapoi East is included at expected gross cost estimate. A provision was included in previous years within the $2M CEAT funding which is reported under separate significant activity and tracked along with the Kaiapoi Wharf Marine Precinct and Riverbanks programme. For this Long Term Plan, the CEAT funding and ledger has now been split, with the $310k Community BMX provision included in the Regeneration programme budget as revenue, with a commensurate reduction in the riverbanks budget reported under wharf projects.
5.6. **Specific Exclusions in Regeneration Budget Estimates**

5.6.1. Some specific exclusions in the District Regeneration budget estimates include:

- No provision for physical development costs or development contributions for the mixed-use business areas
- No provision for any new Charles Street extension to Askeaton Boat Ramp (net $400k saving to Council if this is omitted in favour of alternative Cass St option)
- Kaiapoi South general car parking
- Additional public conveniences beyond sports ground areas and Mahinga Kai
- Transport interchange
- Raven Quay, Hilton Street Upgrades
- Gray Crescent Reserve playground renewal/upgrade (this is covered in Greenspace budget future years provision)
- Cycle training track development
- Askeaton Boat Ramp improvements.

5.6.2. No provision has been made for development of the Kaiapoi West sport and recreation reserve area, since the Kaiapoi Croquet Club have elected not to shift from their current location. Without any other specific formal recreation land use identified for this area, this will be maintained as basic open spec for informal recreation, at the current level of service. Land within Murphy Park will be made available for the Croquet Club planned green expansion.

5.6.3. A separate provision within the Wharf Marine Precinct and Riverbanks programme budget allows for some associated upgrade to Murphy Park to allow for Croquet Club retaining their current location, and associated changes to the Rowing Precinct.

5.6.4. At this stage, no share of financial return with the Crown has been included in the budgets, as the anticipated lease income costs will not offset the anticipated lease establishment and administration costs in the near term. Therefore any full lease income is shown as WDC revenue.

5.6.5. Maintenance beyond end of 17/18 year is not included; this is allowed for within greenspace budgets from 2018/19 year onward, including appropriate provision for adjustments to maintenance grades as new areas are developed from bare land to end-uses.

5.6.6. No lease income is included in the proposed budgets, due to uncertainty around lease establishment.

5.6.7. No proceeds from sale of mixed use business land are included in the proposed budgets. In order to make land saleable, a significant investment in development and improvement in the land would likely be required first, which would be unlikely to pay for itself. Development of the mixed-use business areas will possibly need to be developer led or via a Public Private Partnership means to make mixed use business land development feasible. This will be discussed further in the future revised Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan document.
5.6.8. No provision has been made for the Car and Boat Trailer Parking Kaiapoi East 
(previous allowance $1.6M). Greenspace Activity Management Plan and 
budgets allow for interim annual maintenance of the boat ramp and manoeuvring 
area at Askeaton Reserve.

5.7. **District Regeneration Programme Staging and Timing**

5.7.1. The proposed outline timing of key enabling and capital works projects is shown 
in Table 2:

*Table 2: Regeneration Summary of Key Project Timeframes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current &amp; Previous Projects</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>Already done:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Red Zone Recovery Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18 Working on:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Land Divestments (including subdivisions and re-zoning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reserves Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan 2028 Refresh (incl. mixed use business areas master-plans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water and Sewer rebuilds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiapoi East new key roading link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Courtenay Downs road rebuild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiapoi Food Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decommissioning Redundant roads and utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bulk earthworks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LTP 2018 Short term**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018/19 Planned Developments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater projects (Beswick catchment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and ecological linkages (staged)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports fields and changing facilities commencement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community BMX track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leases establishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor caravan park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Management Plan updates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019/20 Planned Developments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater projects (Fieldwick catchment &amp; others)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and ecological linkages (staged)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports fields and changing facilities completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road rebuilds/improvements (Charles, Jollie, Cass)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage &amp; Mahinga Kai (planning/design)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020/21 Planned Developments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage &amp; Mahinga Kai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and ecological linkages (staged)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LTP longer term (next LTP cycle)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2021/27 Planned Developments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage &amp; Mahinga Kai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and ecological linkages (staged)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planned Developments:

Memorial Gardens

5.7.2. The proposed timing of works includes some key interrelationships between projects, for example:

- The general re-levelling of the regeneration areas is proposed to be done in a bulk earthworks package – to form land to approximate final profile to suit desired finished levels and the stormwater strategy and new catchment and drainage principles
- Decommissioning of redundant utilities will be undertaken early in the programme to provide clear sites where appropriate
- Roads decommissioning, and roads upgrades (outside of the EIR programme), are linked to allied to the new land uses capital projects, and considering ongoing access for residents and for construction access
- Stormwater management area construction timing is coordinated with the bulk earthworks stage and subsequent development of dog park, community BMX and sports fields
- Bulk earthworks also to take into account other allied projects in consideration of soil budgets, to minimise the need for import or disposal of soils from within and adjacent to the regeneration areas (e.g. dredge spoil, infrastructure works).

5.7.3. The Recreation and ecological linkages will develop in stages, and are delivered to varying levels of services. Some linkages will initially develop to a lower level of service with upgrade to higher level of service in future years.

5.7.4. Some key timing changes since the previous interim budget update in May/June 2017:

- Dog Park and Community BMX projects are now deferred to 2018/19 (after utilities decommissioning and bulk earthworks/stormwater)
- Motor caravan park deferred to 2018/19
- Heritage and Mahinga Kai, Memorial Gardens and Boat Trailer parking deferred to later years
- Kaiapoi East sports field planned for completion for summer 2019 sports season.

5.8. District Regeneration Forecast Expenditure and Budget Breakdown

5.8.1. A summary budget breakdown of project estimates is shown in Table 3 and Table 4 overleaf (Figures in ’000’s)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LTP 2018-2028 Years</td>
<td>(000)</td>
<td>(000)</td>
<td>(000)</td>
<td>(000)</td>
<td>(000)</td>
<td>(000)</td>
<td>(000)</td>
<td>(000)</td>
<td>(000)</td>
<td>(000)</td>
<td>(000)</td>
<td>(000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff, Maintenance, Recovery Plan</td>
<td>$625</td>
<td>$638</td>
<td>$649</td>
<td>$644</td>
<td>$398</td>
<td>$407</td>
<td>$414</td>
<td>$423</td>
<td>$433</td>
<td>$442</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants, Rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital works</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor development costs</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area-wide land / earthworks / infrastructure</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road upgrades</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$1,660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation &amp; Ecological Linkages (separate breakdown)</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$555</td>
<td>$422</td>
<td>$117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Forest - Contribution to the Trust</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Park and Community BMX</td>
<td>$510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing Fields</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Home Park</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car &amp; Boat Trailer Parking Kaiapoi East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage &amp; Mahinga Kai</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Operational and Capex) – incl inflation</strong></td>
<td>$625</td>
<td>$2,092</td>
<td>$4,882</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$740</td>
<td>$756</td>
<td>$772</td>
<td>$423</td>
<td>$433</td>
<td>$442</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Spend (by year end)</td>
<td>$625</td>
<td>$2,717</td>
<td>$6,646</td>
<td>$11,528</td>
<td>$12,629</td>
<td>$13,368</td>
<td>$14,125</td>
<td>$14,897</td>
<td>$15,320</td>
<td>$15,753</td>
<td>$16,195</td>
<td>$18,381</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Summary of District Regeneration Revenue and Budget (year by year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22</th>
<th>22/23</th>
<th>23/24</th>
<th>24/25</th>
<th>25/26</th>
<th>26/27</th>
<th>27/28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LTP 2018-2028 Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(000) (000) (000) (000) (000) (000) (000) (000) (000) (000) (000) (000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEAT funding contribution to BMX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(transfer from Rec EQ Recovery/Wharf)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offset from EQ Infrastructure Recovery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZTA Subsidy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$38</td>
<td>$310</td>
<td>$770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure less income/transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$625</td>
<td>$2,054</td>
<td>$3,619</td>
<td>$4,112</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$740</td>
<td>$756</td>
<td>$772</td>
<td>$423</td>
<td>$433</td>
<td>$442</td>
<td>$2,186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cumulative)</td>
<td>$625</td>
<td>$2,679</td>
<td>$6,298</td>
<td>$10,410</td>
<td>$11,511</td>
<td>$12,250</td>
<td>$13,007</td>
<td>$13,779</td>
<td>$14,202</td>
<td>$14,635</td>
<td>$15,077</td>
<td>$17,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortfall (Cumulative) - based on total 2015 LTP budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-$3,644</td>
<td>-$4,745</td>
<td>-$5,484</td>
<td>-$6,241</td>
<td>-$7,013</td>
<td>-$7,436</td>
<td>-$7,869</td>
<td>-$8,311</td>
<td>-$10,497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous Reference as reported to Council July 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Cumulative Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$790</td>
<td>$3,940</td>
<td>$10,130</td>
<td>$12,995</td>
<td>$15,555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously reported Shortfall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-$3,364</td>
<td>-$6,229</td>
<td>-$8,789</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.8.2. The figures in Table 3 and Table 4 have some difference from those presented at the briefing to Regeneration Steering group in November 2017. The figures in this report, in accordance with the LTP finance spreadsheet, now include allowances for:

- IT and accommodation overhead recovery
- Ongoing rates cost provision to 2028
- Inflation provisions.

5.8.3. The existing budgets (set within the 2015 Long Term Plan) will generally be fully expended by the end of the first year of the 2018 long term plan (2018/19 financial year). Additional budget is therefore needed from part-way through year 2 of the 2018 Long Term Plan (i.e. financial year 2019/20).

5.8.4. At the programme completion, based on the clarifications and endorsements within the remainder of this report, including current and previous years expenditure, the total anticipated position is show in Table 5:

Table 5: Summary of Regeneration full programme budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figures at Year 10 of LTP (2027/28 year) - Rounded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure (incl. inflation provision)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less: Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less: Existing Budget (2015 LTP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total budget shortfall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.8.5. The majority of the programme expenditure does occur however by the end of year 3 of the 2018 LTP (2020/21 financial year).

5.8.6. Compared to previous estimate in the report dated July 2017, there is approximately $3M of expenditure now deferred year by year, in the first 3 years of the 2018 LTP budget.

5.8.7. In the previous estimate reported in July 2017 there was a total programme estimate of $15.6M, compared to $17.3M in this current forecast.

5.9. District Regeneration Budget – Operational Costs Commentary

5.9.1. General operational costs for the Regeneration programme are broken down into the following categories:

- Staff Labour Costs
- General Operational costs (e.g. phones, printing, advertising, signage, promotional)
- Consultants
- Rates
- Maintenance – both regular maintenance and day-works
- IT overhead recovery
5.9.2. Staff labour costs allow for the District Regeneration Core Project team, including the current team establishment as follows:

- Implementation Programme Manager
- Landscape Planner
- Landscape Architect
- Project Administrator
- Communications and Engagement Advisor (part time)

Some of these staff are on fixed term contracts or secondment from other council departments on fixed term.

5.9.3. General staff labour (operational) costs include the following operational activities:

- Recovery Plan development,
- Implementation Framework,
- Divestment Plan/Terms/Transactions,
- Implementation Plan,
- Monitoring Plan,
- Land Management (legal, maintenance, requests, leases, reserve management plan, asset management plans, databases, service requests),
- Team Management,
- Programme Management (Strategy, projects, requests, risks, document control, quality, regulatory approvals/processes, heritage, relationships management, governance),
- EQ Infrastructure Recovery programme inputs
- District Plan Review change inputs
- Project management and in-house design time (where not yet specifically apportioned to capital projects)
- Activities associated with Governance and Strategy, including meetings attendance
- Reporting (e.g. Steering Group, PCG, Council, Ministerial updates, LINZ/DPMC, UDSIC)

5.9.4. Provision has been made for a reduction in staff labour costs from the 2021/22 council financial year, when a large number of the regeneration projects are expected to have been completed and fixed terms and secondments are set to expire.

5.9.5. Other staff time includes services from PDU (in-house consulting services on charge-back basis) including Subdivisions team staff and EIR programme staff; although these costs are generally charged directly to specific projects.
5.9.6. The operational cost allowance for consultants is to cover the non-project specific works where consultants have been employed, generally for “area-wide” assessments and reporting. This includes items such as:

- Cultural values reports & statements
- Area-wide surveys (topographic / ecological)
- Land Divestment surveys (WDC share)
- Geotechnical reports/investigations
- Area-wide archaeological assessments
- Area-wide Archaeological authorities
- Land assessment reports
- Interim Site management plans
- Planning strategy reports
- Property Leasing and interim use
- Terrain modelling
- Horizontal Infrastructure strategy
- Legal advice and reviews

Where possible – these costs will be reapportioned at year end and allocated to specific projects to include in capitalisation.

5.9.7. Rates costs are based on the rates levied by WDC which do show as a cost on the Regeneration ledger, and as income in separate departments, so are effectively a neutral cost. WDC are responsible for paying rates as from the 1st July 2017 when the interim lease agreement was entered into with the crown. The overall rate applied is a special rate that applied from time of progressive Crown red zone land acquisitions and clearances. It is expected that the rating cost will vary over time – as individual lots are progressively amalgamated into larger lots through the course of land divestment, and then again once capital value increases due to progressive improvements made by council during the implementation of regeneration projects. For the immediate purposes of budgeting – an allowance has been made on the current rating cost plus a simple inflation provision. Once projects are completed and handed over, future provision will need to be made in other Recreation department budgets.
5.10. **Risks – District Regeneration**

5.10.1. The budgets are based on a number of assumptions regarding scope and timing.

5.10.2. If there is a significant change of scope (for example Kaiapoi Rugby League do not want to shift, or shift at different time) then the budgets would need adjustment accordingly. Similarly; if other new land uses are added to the scope of the Regeneration programme then the budgets may need to be adjusted accordingly. This will be subject to any future changes in funding of the programme as well e.g. any future grants opportunities.

5.10.3. The current Regeneration programme scope includes a number of minor variations from the Recovery plan, which require Crown approval. Recovery plan amendments already submitted to the Crown, but yet to be formally approved include:

- Reconfigure of road access layout in Kaiapoi East sport and recreation reserve area
- Adjustment to land use boundaries of sports fields area, and memorial gardens, to suit the above road reconfiguration
- Repositioning and re-sizing of stormwater management areas in Kaiapoi East

5.10.4. Other recent minor variations to the Recovery Plan maps, that have yet to be submitted for Crown approval include:

- Removal of Lindsay lane walkway
- Adjustment to Kaiapoi West land use boundary alignment between sports and rec reserve, and mixed-use business.
- New open drain via Kaiapoi East rural area
- Deletion of Charles Street extension
5.11. Existing Council Budget Provision - Kaiapoi Wharf Marine Precinct & Riverbanks

5.11.1. Existing budgets as approved at May 2014, and reported on in January 2015 (Trim 150115005198) are:

| Kaiapoi Wharf Marine Precinct & Riverbanks | $4,580,000 |
| Wharf | $4,580,000 |
| Wharf and Marine Precinct Landscaping | $410,000 |
| Recreation Precinct | $808,000 |
| Murphy Park | $713,000 |
| Rowing Precinct | $70,000 |
| CEAT Riverbanks Enhancement Projects | $2,000,000 |
| **Subtotal Wharf Marine Precinct & Riverbanks** | **$8,581,000** |

5.11.2. These budgets were further broken down into specific projects (in particular the Wharf general budget, and the CEAT Riverbanks enhancement budget), which have been reported against in previous reports, most recently in July 2017 (Trim: 170615061135) and November 2017 (Trim: 171026116121[v2]).

5.11.3. The Wharf budget was initially based on a complete replacement scheme with floating pontoons. The project scope evolved into the projects shown in Table 10; including demolition of the older part of the wharf, removal of the MV Tuhoe berth, strengthening the upstream wharf, and development of riverside terraces and floating pontoons.

5.12. Christchurch Earthquake Appeals Trust grant allocation and expenditure

5.12.1. The $2M Christchurch Earthquake Appeal Trust (CEAT) funding for Riverbanks enhancement projects has been progressively spent over the last 3 to 4 years. The initial breakdown of proposed expenditure is shown in Table 7 (reproduced from January 2015 report).
### Table 7: Original CEAT Riverbanks Funding Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Order Budget Requirements for CEAT Riverbanks Projects</th>
<th>Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cure Boating Club Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop Bank opposite Library</td>
<td>$ 100,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Around new Cure boating Club</td>
<td>$ 190,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informal Recreation Precinct</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMX track</td>
<td>$ 310,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Landscaping</td>
<td>$ 80,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 x bridge Corners</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West Corner (War Memorial)</td>
<td>$ 140,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Corner (Trousselot)</td>
<td>$ 150,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Corner (Library)</td>
<td>$ 20,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Corner (Commercial Precinct)</td>
<td>$ 120,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Riverbanks Walkway</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 640,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boat Ramp</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 250,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 2,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.12.2. The current expenditure to date of the CEAT funding is shown in Table 8:

### Table 8: Current Expenditure of CEAT Grant Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaiapoi Riverbanks Walkways:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trousselot Park / Recreation Precinct</td>
<td>$ 106,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crusher Dust Path to Askeaton</td>
<td>$ 60,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Street</td>
<td>$ 74,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raven Quay</td>
<td>$ 107,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharf Precinct Walkway Reinstatement</td>
<td>$ 152,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Steps / Cure Boat Club area</td>
<td>$ 555,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,056,421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.12.3. Forthcoming expenditure on outstanding projects that CEAT funding applies to (which are budgeted) is shown in Table 9.

### Table 9: Proposed allocation of outstanding expenditure of CEAT grant funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Williams Street corners:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Precinct Walkway (associated with WDC Riverview terraces &amp; boardwalk project)</td>
<td>Design stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West Corner (War Memorial)</td>
<td>Not yet started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Corner (Riverside)</td>
<td>Design stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Identified Projects:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Ramp Pontoon</td>
<td>Design stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community BMX</td>
<td>Not yet started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.12.4. Within the breakdown of expenditure of CEAT funds against individual projects, a number of projects have made use of the general riverbanks walkways provision as they incorporated reinstatement of sections of stop-banks walkways. The recently completed Library Steps & Deck project, and the Wharf-side Civil and Landscaping project have both drawn on part of the riverbanks walkway budget allocation, as well as the $80k general landscaping provision, in order to progress drawdown of CEAT funds.

5.12.5. The expenditure to date on the general riverbanks walkways element (Table 8) has slightly exceeded the original estimate provision (Table 7). For this reason, the remaining provision for the Northeast bridge corner (Riverside) and the Northwest corner (War Memorial) have reduced slightly from previous allowance; roughly by about $7k per project. This is in order to limit total expenditure to within the current CEAT grant amount.

5.12.6. Initially the CEAT funded works were managed financially via a direct invoicing from the various contractors directly to Department of Internal Affairs (DIA). As from December 2016, any outstanding works have been paid directly from WDC to the contractors involved, and WDC then progressively invoice DIA to recover the funds. Each claim or invoice to DIA is accompanied by a report tracking the expenditure to date and the forecast of upcoming expenditure.

5.12.7. As referred to in section 5.5.4 of this report; the $310k provision within the CEAT funding for Community BMX is now transferred to and managed via the Regeneration budget. For this reason it is no longer included in the Riverbanks budget.

5.13. **Kaiapoi Wharf Marine Precinct & Riverbanks Expenditure Forecast and Budget Breakdown**

5.13.1. The latest summary of expenditure and forecasts on the Kaiapoi Wharf Marine Precinct & Riverbanks programme, as at November 2017 is shown in Table 10 overleaf.
Table 10: Summary of expenditure and forecasts for Kaiapoi Wharf Marine Precinct & Riverbanks programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Works</th>
<th>CEAT Funded?</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Cost at Completion</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous scoping, design and consultation fees (repairs and feasibility stages)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$527,707</td>
<td>($527,707)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway Station platform removal, stopbank relocation and old wharf demolition</td>
<td></td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$221,722</td>
<td>$78,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New wharf repair/strengthening</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$56,368</td>
<td>($6,368)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Precinct</td>
<td></td>
<td>$808,000</td>
<td>$897,463</td>
<td>($89,463)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV Tuhoe Wharf</td>
<td></td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$83,423</td>
<td>$216,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharf Side Civils &amp; Landscaping Project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Wharf side siteworks/civil engineering, and Marine Precinct Landscaping (part)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$820,000</td>
<td>$694,115</td>
<td>$125,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Walkway reinstatement from Coastguard to end of tiered boardwalk</td>
<td></td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$12,600</td>
<td>$107,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- General Landscaping</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$ nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping/structures on South Side from Bridge to Cure Boat Club:</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$310,000</td>
<td>$310,000</td>
<td>$ nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- (i.e. part of the current Library Steps and decks contract)</td>
<td>see note 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverbanks Walkway includes riverbanks sculptures (CEAT funded)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$640,000</td>
<td>$666,422</td>
<td>($26,422)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,428,000</td>
<td>$3,549,820</td>
<td>($121,820)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Works to be completed</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Estimate at Completion</th>
<th>Source of Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riverview Terraces and Boardwalk:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tiered Boardwalk/steps from bridge</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>WTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- South East Corner (Commercial Precinct)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floating pontoon from new wharf to Williams St Bridge (to now include river wall works)</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
<td>$2,550,000</td>
<td>Staff/Engcon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community BMX Track</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$310,000</td>
<td>$310,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams St Bridge Western Corners Landscaping Design</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$134,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Ramp (now re-allocated for pontoon 2)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing Precinct &amp; Murphy Park Redesign (now combined)</td>
<td>see note 3</td>
<td>$783,000</td>
<td>$483,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Corner (Trousselot)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,153,000</td>
<td>$5,277,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Estimate at Completion</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$8,581,000</td>
<td>$9,026,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(shortfall)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($3,704,800)</td>
<td>spent to date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes to Table 10:

1. A further $153,000 was expended on this item as part of the wharf side civil and landscaping works, for riverbanks walkway upgrade elements. This sum was now assigned to the $640k Riverbanks budget (CEAT funded) to make use of that available budget.

2. A further $245,000 was expended on this item as part of the library steps project, for riverbanks walkway upgrade elements. This sum was now assigned to the $640k Riverbanks budget (CEAT funded) to make use of that available budget.

5.13.2. There is currently no budget allocation for the following projects:

- MV Tuhoe salvaged artefacts location
- Riverbanks landscaping east of Cure boat club
- Permanent location of the historic railway station

5.13.3. Murphy Park redevelopment originally had a budget provision of $713k. With Kaiapoi Rugby League now shifting to the regeneration areas (assumed), the provision for Murphy Park improvements has been reduced. This is reported in the wharf and marine budgets spreadsheets. The $300k has been removed from Murphy Park budget and reassigned to the other Wharf and Marine precinct projects, and effectively help cover the individual $650k forecast shortfall in the floating pontoon and river wall project.

5.13.4. The $483k Murphy Park budget includes $200k in year 4 of the 2018 LTP; to allow for Murphy Park general making good and carpark repair once the Rugby League club and rowing buildings have shifted.

5.13.5. The 2018/19 budgets have generally allowed for the full cost/budget of the outstanding projects that are ongoing (multiyear), including all previous years expenditure.

5.13.6. Considering works completed to date (including capitalisations where appropriate), and work in progress, the budget provisions for completion of the outstanding projects represent a net total shortfall (on previous budget), or an additional expenditure of approximately $445k.

5.13.7. All Wharf Marine Precinct and Riverbanks programme works are generally completed by the end of the 2018/19 financial year, with the exception of the future provision for Murphy Park repairs. All of the projects in the programme are multi-year projects and span across financial years. Much of the outstanding expenditure will actually be spread over both the 2017/18 and 2018/19 financial years.
6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**
This matter is a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance Policy.

6.2. **Legislation**
Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act 2016
Local Government Act 2002

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

- There is a safe environment for all.
- Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality.

Duncan Roxborough
Implementation Project Manager – District Regeneration