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WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

A meeting of the WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL will be held in the COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA on TUESDAY 7 MAY 2019 at 1.00PM.

Sarah Nichols
GOVERNANCE MANAGER

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

BUSINESS

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Conflicts of interest (if any) to be reported for minuting.

3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

4. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

4.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 2 April 2019

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 2 April 2019.

4.2 Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 2 April 2019

(refer to Public Excluded Agenda)

MATTERS ARISING

Subsequent to the meeting, Councillor D Gordon withdrew his attendance to the LGNZ National Conference in July 2019 (refer para 8.3 of minutes).

5. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

5.1 Little Peppertree Preschool Performance
6. ADJOURNED BUSINESS

Nil.

7. REGENERATION REPORTS

Nil.

8. REPORTS


RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report no. 19042059362

(b) Receives the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee Annual Report 2018 (Trim 190429060467)

(c) Circulates the Zone Committee Annual Report 2018 to Community Boards, and Drainage and Water Supply Advisory Groups, for their information.

8.2. **Notice of Motion 4 December 2018: Fireworks Ban Sale and Use**

**Notice of Motion 5 February 2019: Property Maintenance and Nuisance** – Mike O’Connell (Senior Policy Analyst)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190328045254

(b) Notes that The Local Government Act 2002 s145 provides for councils to make bylaws to protect the public from nuisance and maintain public health and safety.

(c) Acknowledges that the Council does not have the ability in law to ban the sale of fireworks as Parliament has specifically legislated for its sale;

(d) Supports Auckland City (and other Councils) in its bid to make a remit to the Local Government NZ July conference seeking the Government to introduce legislation to ban the private sale and use of fireworks;

(e) Notes that Council, through the LGA does have the ability to develop a bylaw to restrict the use of fireworks in public places, but in the first instance seeking a change to the law is more effective, as enforcement of a bylaw would be problematic and its application to private land uncertain;

(f) Authorises staff to develop a draft Property Maintenance and Nuisance Bylaw to address such matters as long grass on undeveloped urban sections and other nuisances, and this draft to be brought to the August District Planning and Regulation Committee meeting for its consideration;

(g) Circulates this report to all Community Boards.
8.3. Joining of Woodend and Pegasus Water Supplies – Colin Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190423058867.

(b) Notes that the project to join the Woodend and Pegasus water supplies is due to be completed for $84,000 less than the original budget allocated of $811,000.

(c) Notes that the project to join the Woodend and Pegasus water supplies is due to be completed ahead of programme, with a completion date forecast of late May 2019 rather than early in new financial year.

(d) Re-allocates $281,500 of the budget currently allocated for the 'Gladstone and Pegasus Raw Water Main' project from the 2019-20 financial year into the 2018-19 financial year.

(e) Removes the remaining $84,000 of budget allocated for the Gladstone and Pegasus Raw Water Main project from the 2019-20 financial year.

(f) Notes that the reason for the above changes is that the project to join the Woodend and Pegasus schemes is to be completed ahead of programme and under budget.

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

8.4. Elected member Code of Conduct Refresh – Sarah Nichols (Governance Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190311029913.

(b) Adopts the 2019 Elected Member Code of Conduct, effective from 7 May 2019. (Trim 190228024595).

(c) Amends Standing Orders section 17, as per Trim 190424059255, enabling the Committee Chair to exclude elected members not directly involved in the Code of Conduct Committee under the same regulations as LGOIMA.

(d) Adopts the 2019 Code of Conduct Committee Terms of Reference (Trim 190424059278).

(e) Circulates a copy of this report to all Community Boards.
9. **HEALTH AND SAFETY**


**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No 190416056804.

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

10. **MATTERS REFERRED**

10.1. **Town Centre feature Lighting and Decorations Terms of Reference and Working Group membership – Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager) and Gerard Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading)**

*(Refer to attached copy of report no. 190403049853 to the Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board meeting of 15 April 2019, and minutes of that meeting, Item 12.4 in this agenda)*

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190403049853;

(b) **Approves** the Terms of Reference for the working group;

(c) **Approves** the formation of the Working Group and membership as recommended by the Board.

10.2. **Good Street Road Stop (for the pedestrianised portion between High Street and the Service Lane) – Vanessa Thompson (Business and Centres Advisor)**

*(Refer to attached copy of report no. 190313032940 to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting of 10 April 2019 and minutes of that meeting, Item 12.3 in this agenda)*

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Initiate** a formal road stop process through Land Information New Zealand and the legal requirements around a public consultation period.
11. COMMITTEE MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

11.1. Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri Youth Council held on 26 February 2019

11.2. Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri Youth Council held on 26 March 2019

11.3. Minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee held on 26 March 2019

11.4. Minutes of a meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee held on 26 March 2019

11.5. Minutes of a meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group held on 1 April 2019

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the information in items 11.1 to 11.5 be received.

12. COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

12.1. Minutes of a meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board held on 3 April 2019

12.2. Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board held on 8 April 2019

12.3. Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board held on 10 April 2019

12.4. Minutes of a meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board held on 15 April 2019

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

13. CORRESPONDENCE

14. MAYOR’S DIARY

14.1. Mayor’s Diary 27 March – 30 April 2019

RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report no. 190424059282.
15. COUNCIL PORTFOLIO UPDATES

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

16. QUESTIONS
(under Standing Orders)

17. URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS
(under Standing Orders)

18. MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

RECOMMENDATION

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Council of 2 April 2019</td>
<td>Confirmation of Minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>Minutes of the public excluded portion of a meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group 1 April 2019</td>
<td>Minutes for Information</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>Report of Kelly LaValley (Project Delivery Manager)</td>
<td>RC185313 DC180134, 79 West Belt Request for Consideration of Development Contributions</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>Report of Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager)</td>
<td>Travel Demand Management Funding</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No</td>
<td>Report of Craig Sargison (Manager Special Projects)</td>
<td>Contract 19/09 Expression of Interest Main Facility Contractor Selection Report and Project Update</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>Report of Craig Sargison (Manager Special Projects)</td>
<td>Draft Heads of Agreement North Canterbury Sport and Recreation Trust for management and operation of the Multi Sports Facility at Coldstream Road.</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>Report of Rob Hawthorne (Property Manager)</td>
<td>Update on Coastal Campgrounds</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>Report of Gerard Cleary (Manager Utilities and Roading)</td>
<td>Ocean Outfall Corrosion Issue – Update and Proposal for Legal Settlement</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a) (g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.10</td>
<td>Memo of Rob Hawthorne (Property Manager)</td>
<td>Civic Accommodation: Indicative Business Case</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.1 – 18.10</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons. To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>In addition: Maintain legal professional privilege</td>
<td>A2(g)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLOSED MEETING**

See Public Excluded Agenda

**OPEN MEETING**

19. **NEXT MEETING**

The next scheduled ordinary meeting of the Council is at 1.00pm on Tuesday 4 June 2019 in the Council Chambers.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA, ON TUESDAY 2 APRIL 2019 COMMENCING AT 1PM.

PRESENT:

IN ATTENDANCE:
J Palmer (Chief Executive), J Millward (Manager, Finance & Business Support), G Cleary (Utilities & Roading Manager), K Simpson (3Waters Manager), L Hurley (Technical Administrator), O Davies (Drainage Asset Manager), K Waghorn (Solid Waste Asset Manager), and S Nichols (Governance Manager).

1. APOLOGIES
Nil.

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Mayor Ayers declared a conflict of interest in relation to Report 8.1 due to being a member of the Museum Trust Board.

3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS
Mayor Ayers acknowledged emergency services and hospital staff as a result of the Christchurch terror attack. The event has directly affected members of our Waimakariri community and staff losing loved ones on 15 March 2019. Mayor Ayers reflected on the traumatic time for our district and Canterbury.

4. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

4.1. Minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on 5 March 2019

Moved: Councillor Barnett  Seconded: Councillor Doody

THAT the Council:

(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Waimakariri District Council held on Tuesday 5 March 2019.

CARRIED

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

The matter was dealt with in the public excluded portion of the meeting.

MATTERS ARISING

Councillor Williams, queried bylaw information anticipated for this meeting, however it was advised that due to resourcing the matter is proposed to be presented for the May Council meeting.

5. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

5.1. David Morgan, representing the Morgan Group, presented viewpoints on development contributions related to in-fill housing developments.
Mr Morgan tabled a copy of his submission and letter submitted to staff at an earlier date. (Trim 190502062434). He commented on development contributions and rates, believing that they are set unreasonably high for in-fill housing and reduces an otherwise commercially viable development for affordable housing in the community, particularly in areas that are already well established with reserves and roading. Mr Morgan commented on in-fill housing having a low impact environmentally in relation to requiring no additional expense to the Council in aspects of infrastructure connections and limited loading on assets of roading, footpaths and reserves.

Mr Morgan spoke of in-fill housing offering a balance of new buyers into existing and established communities and the social benefits of such a development. He was of the belief that the Council should encourage in-fill housing for social, economic and environmental benefits.

Mr Morgan suggested that the development contribution rate should be 50 per cent of the current structure. He compared a 500m² section in Northbrook with development costs to a current Morgan Group development in West Belt.

Councillor Atkinson enquired how the 50% calculation was suggested. Mr Morgan compared other districts such as Horowhenua, Selwyn and outlining Canterbury areas similar to Rangiora, being with easy commuter transport to a major centre.

Councillor Gordon, asked the Chief Executive if Mr Morgan’s comments would be worth submitting and considering as part of the upcoming Annual Plan. J Palmer commented on resource consents on a particular lot and the process required. He also advised that Mr Morgan had raised matters through a deputation that are worthy of consideration by the Council, particularly incentives and viability of in-fill housing, acknowledging there are matters that could be considered through the Annual Plan process. It was advised that development contributions are subject to the current draft Annual Plan consultation, and the Council could acknowledge today’s information as a submission to the Annual Plan. Mr Morgan commented he was satisfied with the submission suggestion.

Councillor Brine referred to paragraph 12 in Mr Morgan’s tabled submission, querying if the comparison was equal (ie apples with apples), acknowledging it may be part of the process. Mr Morgan commented on consideration of similar sized sections rather than expanding resources of the Council.

Mayor Ayers advised that a report regarding a Resource Consent for the Morgan Group’s current development is a separate process and the Council will consider other aspects raised today through the Annual Plan deliberations.

6. ADJOURNED BUSINESS

Nil.

7. REGENERATION REPORTS

Nil.

8. REPORTS

Mayor Ayers suggested considering report 8.1 after the Canterbury Museum deputation later in the meeting. This report was then considered at the end of the meeting at 4.57pm, at which time Mayor Ayers left the room, having declared a conflict of interest.

8.1 Canterbury Museum Trust Board’s draft Annual Plan for the year ending 30 June 2020 – J Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)

Deputy Mayor K Felstead assumed the Chair.
Michael McEvedy, Canterbury Museum Trust Board Chair, Anthony Wright, Canterbury Museum Director and Nigel Tecofsky, Canterbury Museum Finance and Services Manager were present during the report.

M McEvedy thanked the Council for receiving information and consideration of matters that occurred earlier in the meeting (during the public excluded portion of the Council meeting). M McEvedy expressed appreciation for enabling such a frank discussion about the future development of the Canterbury Museum and he stated that the Museum wished to ensure good outcomes and have respect for the funding source.

J Millward presented the report, referring to the legislative references in para 7.2 of the report, noting the contributing Councils. Three contributing authorities were required to agree to effect any change in funding/rating towards the Canterbury Museum. It was advised that there were two opportunities to put the proposals in the public arena through the Annual Plan next year and the Long Term Plan the following year.

J Millward spoke of the need to prioritise capital expenditure, and his recommendation to the Chief Executive to reduce capital works in year two of the Annual Plan by a further 15%, which stemmed from his ongoing concern at the upcoming Standard and Poor's rating and potential effects to the Council.

Councillor Atkinson enquired how many projects that are worth in excess of $1.75m, are not consulted through the Annual Plan or Long Term Plan processes. J Millward advised approximately 20 projects, primarily infrastructure projects, receive increased budgets throughout the year, acknowledging that the Museum funding was a little different from the normal Council projects.

Councillor Stewart enquired if this project was considered different because it is funding an external organisation and the increased costs are a result of the Christchurch City Council reducing their financial contribution. J Millward reflected that the Canterbury Museum Board believe the Robert McDougall building is a part of the overall concept and therefore the funding ratio should be the same over the whole project, acknowledging that the project has changed from the original proposal.

Councillor Williams asked if the Council had received clarity, through independent legal advice on whether the Council has to fund the project or not. J Millward commented on the Canterbury Museum Trust Board 1993 Act, which speaks of operations, capital and development and obligations of the local authorities to contribute to the Museum. To staff knowledge the aspect of the building improvements proposed has not been tested, however believe that it may be likely that a legal opinion would support that view.

Councillor Barnett asked if staff believe this report is wrong in the way it is presented, and sought clarity that the Council is not discussing paying additional funds for the Robert McDougall building but an increase in funding for the Canterbury Museum. J Millward clarified the report was discussing funding under the same mythology as previously, noting that information had always been presented with the Robert McDougall building included within the Museum redevelopment. The difference now is that the project costs had increased and Christchurch City Council had advised the Museum that they were not paying for any additional funding toward the Robert McDougall building.

Councillor Felstead sought clarification on the staff recommendation. Staff advised that the Canterbury Museum were seeking an agreement in principle, noting that the funding would not be provided for another three years and the capital project had already been delayed four-five years. Staff could, at the direction of the Council, ask the other affected Council’s, being Selwyn and Hurunui District’s what their thoughts are, and if they oppose the Museum proposal then a joint submission of all three Councils could be presented. The Council could also seek legal advice. Staff outlined a previous occurrence when Council’s objected to a Museum proposal in 2011 and prior. It was acknowledged that consideration for the affected eleven local authorities to seek a review of the Canterbury Museum Trust Board Act would be a valid request, and that may occur after this matter is finalised.

Councillor Atkinson commented that the Museum Chair had indicated future consideration for both the Canterbury Museum Trust Board Act and the McDougall Trust
Estate Act 1913 to be reviewed together. Councillor Atkinson enquired when the most appropriate time was for the Council to lodge any objection, and if the Acts were to remain, what then becomes the cost. Staff referred to the report and advised that the Museum had indicated likely costs to be in the vicinity of 10-11% increases over the next six years on operating costs. The capital costs had been provided in the projection sheets within the report.

Councillor Gordon enquired if the Council could debate the submission content after this report was considered. Staff advised the Chief Executive and Deputy Mayor would formulate the submission and circulate to the Council in advance of the timeframe, pending any further information.

Councillor Gordon suggested a recommendation wording change.

Councillor Atkinson enquired if it was appropriate it undertake a placeholder submission now, as the Council would not be providing funding for the project for another two years, which enabled community consultation. J Millward outlined a formal objection process, which had occurred with Ashburton District Council several years ago. He reiterated options available to the Council, with the first stage being to agree, or not, in principle to the proposal and/or consider matters through the Annual Plan, noting a caveat in the submission to defer the decision until next year to enable the Council to consult with the community.

Moved: Councillor Gordon Seconded: Councillor Meyer

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 190322038521.
(b) Receives the draft Canterbury Museum Annual Plan for 2019/20.
(c) Delegates to the Deputy Mayor and Chief Executive to circulate a proposed submission to the Canterbury Museum which would be confirmed via a Council workshop prior to 24 April 2019.

CARRIED

Councillor Gordon believed a good discussion had occurred, acknowledging that everyone was concerned at the increased costs proposed and had gained a better understanding of the Canterbury Museum views. Councillor Gordon expressed concerned at the Christchurch City Council not taking their share of responsibility. He commented on the legislative requirements, however was cautious at spending funds on legal opinions at this stage when staff were able to seek additional information. Councillor Gordon believed the cost implications should be part of future Annual Plan considerations with the opportunity to consult with the community. Councillor Gordon reflected on concerns related to the Council’s future credit rating with Standard and Poor’s and appreciated the opportunity to discuss the detail of a submission at a future workshop.

Councillor Meyer reflected on previous issues with the Canterbury Museum Act and the tussle to move forward and support the Museum. Councillor Meyer remarked that members must remember the rate effect in three years’ time with the current rate of $3.90 increasing to $8 per property, cautioning that the matter needs to be given careful consideration when wording the submission.

Councillor Atkinson stated he was accepting of the motion, but expressed disappointment at the additional cost of $1.75m being presented by the Museum at today’s meeting. Councillor Atkinson expressed a desire to research legal opinion, believing there was an arguable aspect in relation to the building linkages. Councillor Atkinson expressed concern at Christchurch City Council withdrawing full funding due to affordability and the need to spread ratepayer funding, and posed the question; why should Waimakariri not consider the same response.
Councillor Stewart remarked she would be interested in the views of both Selwyn and Hurunui District Councils. Councillor Stewart accepted the motion, remarking that the Museum proposal was fundamentally different from what has been presented in the past. Councillor Stewart posed the question of why should this Council be responsible for the Robert McDougall building and/or link owned by another entity (being Christchurch City Council), and would welcome further clarification.

Councillor Williams was supportive of the questions being asked and the current motion. Councillor Williams reflected on hearing conflicting information from presenters and was concerned at the large monetary amount involved. He believed there were many unanswered questions that required a legal response and the Council was not at the stage of having all the information to make a balanced decision.

Councillor Barnett agreed with many of the comments made, reiterating that the report purpose related to the long term life of the Canterbury Museum and reflected on the functionality of the Robert McDougall building. Councillor Barnett remarked that while the Council was supportive of the Museum, it was a matter of how the campus enhancement is paid for that is the main issue. Councillor Barnett expressed disappointed with central government and the tourism sector for lack of financial support, remarking on the importance for all the Canterbury Councils to stand together as they all experienced earthquake related debt. Councillor Barnett stated she wanted to support the Museum, however would need more information over the next year. Councillor Barnett remarked that the Council was committed to the capital rebuild project, but not committed to the scale of the rebuild. Councillor Barnett rhetorically queried if there are other options available as the other Canterbury Councils cannot afford the additional Museum costs alongside their own capital programmes. She remarked that this Council had already cut capital projects and reassessed affordability as they were conscious of the need to be careful with ratepayer funding. Councillor Barnett was supportive of the current motion.

Councillor Doody posed the question to members related to the need to consider District history being stored in a safe and secure site which the Robert McDougall project enables that to occur, which is an aspect that should not be lost sight of.

Councillor Brine expressed surprise at the way information had been delivered by the Museum, however he accepted the way the ‘ducks lined up’ and believed the Museum should have better anticipated the Council feedback. Councillor Brine agreed with Councillor Doody’s comment related to preserving the District artefacts and history. Councillor Brine reflected on the initial proposal to enhance the Canterbury Museum with a $100m budget that had grown to the current $190m, as a result of the project being placed on hold and momentum being lost due to a range of factors, including several earthquakes.

ANZAC Day Services 2019 – S Nichols (Governance Manager)

The report was taken as read.

Moved: Councillor Atkinson Seconded: Councillor Blackie

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No 190218018037.

(b) Appoints Mayor Ayers and Councillors Blackie, Gordon, Meyer, Atkinson and Williams to attend the Kaiapoi RSA Dawn Parade at 6.30am Thursday 25 April 2019 and lay a wreath.

(c) Appoints Mayor Ayers and Councillors Stewart, Atkinson, Gordon and Meyer attend the Kaiapoi Anzac Day parade at 10am Thursday 25 April 2019 and lay a wreath.
(d) **Appoints** Mayor Ayers and Councillors Barnett, Brine, Atkinson, Gordon and Williams to attend the Rangiora Anzac Day parade at 11.30am on Thursday 25 April 2019 and lay a wreath.

(e) **Appoints** Councillor Barnett and Brine to attend the RSA service at the Rangiora High School at 9.30am on Thursday 25 April 2019 and lay a wreath. Noting that the wreath is laid in conjunction with a Rangiora-Ashley Community Board member.

(f) **Appoints** Councillor Felstead to attend the Oxford Anzac Day parade on Thursday 25 April 2019 at 9.30am and lay a wreath.

(g) **Appoints** Councillor Doody to attend the Cust and West Eyreton Anzac Day parade held at the Cust Community Centre on Thursday 25 April 2019 at 10am and lay a wreath at Cust.

(h) **Appoints** Councillor Doody to attend and lay a wreath at the West Eyreton wreath laying service at 11am (following the Cust Parade).

(i) **Appoints** Councillor Williams to attend the Fernside Anzac Day parade on Thursday 25 April 2019 at 10am and lay a wreath. Noting that the wreath is laid in conjunction with a Rangiora-Ashley Community Board member.

(j) **Appoints** Mayor Ayers and Councillors Gordon, Stewart, Atkinson, Barnett and Blackie to attend the Tuahiwi Anzac Day parade Thursday 25 April 2019 at 2pm on and lay a wreath.

(k) **Appoints** Mayor Ayers and Councillor Doody and Felstead to attend the 11am Ohoka Anzac Day service on Wednesday 24 April 2019 at Ohoka Hall, Mill Road and lay a wreath.

(l) **Appoints Mayor Ayers and** Councillor Gordon, Meyer and Williams to attend the Sefton Anzac service on Wednesday 24 April 2019 at 6pm and lay a wreath.

(m) **Appoints** Councillors Barnett, Blackie, Stewart and Atkinson to attend the Woodend Anzac service on Wednesday 24 April 2019 at 6pm and lay a wreath.

(n) **Notes** Mayor Ayers will lay a wreath at both the Kaiapoi and Rangiora Services on behalf of the people of Zonnebeke, Belgium.

(o) **Notes** the Community Boards will be represented and lay wreaths at Kaiapoi, Rangiora, Oxford, West Eyreton, Cust, Ohoka, Fernside, Tuahiwi, Rangiora High School, Woodend and Sefton Services.

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

CARRIED

8.3. **LGNZ Annual Conference Attendance – S Nichols (Governance Manager)**

The report was taken as read.

Moved: Councillor Barnett Seconded: Mayor Ayers

THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190311029916.

(b) **Approves** Councillors Felstead and Gordon attending the Local Government New Zealand Conference on 7, 8 and 9 July 2019 in Wellington, accompanying the Mayor.

CARRIED

9. **HEALTH AND SAFETY**

The report was taken as read. J Palmer commented on the measles outbreak and information that had been circulated to staff to heightened awareness. He also commented on the Christchurch terror attack and ongoing support provided to staff.

Councillor Doody, queried reports of measles at a local school and an upcoming event. J Palmer advised that the Council is not advised any information formally, other than what is known through the community or media. The Medical Officer of Health had commented on large public gatherings and the associated increased risk factor.

Moved: Councillor Felstead   Seconded: Councillor Doody
THAT the Council:
(a)  Receives report No 190320037255.
(b)  Notes that there are no significant Health and Safety issues at this time, and that WDC is, so far as is reasonably practicable, compliant with the PCBU duties of the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015.

CARRIED

10. MATTERS REFERRED
10.1 Stockwater Race Bylaw Review 2019 – L Hurley (Technical Administrator) and O Davies (Drainage Asset Manager)
(Referred to report no. 190219018655 from the Utilities and Roading Committee meeting of 19 March 2019. Note that this recommendation from the Utilities and Roading committee was amended at the meeting, from that in the report.)

O Davies spoke to the report, noting the Bylaw is due for its ten yearly review, however staff recommend minor changes only and therefore it does not require the full special consultative procedures. He noted the main changes proposed include stock access, spraying and removal of cleanings and blockages from flood flow paths.

Staff advised there was a proposal to update the Stockwater Race map including electronically on the website, therefore enabling it to be a living document. Staff are aware of changes to bylaws that would involve more significant changes and a Special Consultative Process (SCP) such as health and safety issues for private owners maintaining water races on Council owned roads, as staff are currently investigating the Council undertaking the work and charging property owners for the service. It is proposed to undertake background work and bring recommendations to the Council within two years.

Councillor Doody reflected that when the stockwater race area is widened by Waimakariri Irrigation Ltd (WIL) and the entrance ways into a property is wider than the stockwater race, enquiring if there was any procedure to stop soil being gauged out by stormwater ie boulders. O Davies commented on two issues; one being when a stockwater race turns into a stormwater race, and questions on what are the rights and responsibility of property owners, which is something the next phase involving the SCP process would look at in the future. Secondly regarding widening of stockwater races is a matter to be addressed with an individual property owner and again the detail would be considered through the next phase of work.

Councillor Stewart, enquired if during the next phase of work, including the SCP, the matter of environmental benefits related to leakage and a potential change in rates would be addressed. O Davies acknowledged it would potentially affect rating charged to properties and therefore users and the wider community would need to be consulted through an SCP process. The matter is being raised through the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee. K Simpson confirmed that matter would be included in the SCP process, as would fencing of waterways. Staff had noted the recommendation from
Waimakariri Water Zone Committee to the Regional Council (Ecan), acknowledging the scope of the review is not limited to decisions of Council today.

Moved: Councillor Stewart    Seconded: Councillor Gordon

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report no. 190219018655.

(b) **Notes** that a review of the Stockwater Race Bylaw 2007 has been undertaken and it has been confirmed that there is a need for a Stockwater Race Bylaw.

(c) **Notes** that minor changes to the Stockwater Race Bylaw 2007 and associated policies, as identified by tracked changes in attachments i, iii, iv & v, have been made for clarity purposes and to update references.

(d) **Instructs** staff to make final edits to the document to insert the word “written” before “permission” throughout the Bylaw document.

(e) **Adopts** the Waimakariri District Council Stockwater Race Bylaw 2019.

(f) **Adopts** the revised Stockwater Race Closure Policy, Stockwater Race Pond Policy and Planting of Trees and Shrubs alongside Stockwater Races Policy.

(g) **Notes** that the staff will bring back the Stockwater Race Bylaw for the Utilities & Roading Committee to consider reviewing it within two years.

(h) **Circulates** this report to the Council’s Community Boards for their information.

CARRIED

Councillor Stewart was supportive of today’s motion and looked forward to a Special Consultative Procedure occurring within the next two years. Councillor Stewart commented on Waimakariri stock races being unique, not only in delivering stockwater but as an irrigation race and has environmental benefits related to the recharge of groundwater, which is significant in the current climate. Councillor Stewart also acknowledged farmers charged with irrigation efficiencies and commented on how leaky water races have a negative effect. Councillor Stewart remarked on the ongoing challenges, including current costs bore by property owners and balancing the wider benefit to the whole district.

Councillor Gordon reflected on the Committee discussions, appreciating why the bylaw is not going for public consultation at this current time, and acknowledging the matter will be open for a wider public consultation within the next two years.

10.2 **Croquet Club Loan Deferral and Council Funding Contribution for Croquet lawn Extension – C Brown (Manager Community and Recreation)**

*(Referred to report no. 190221020363 from the Community and Recreation Committee meeting of 26 March 2019.)*

There were no questions from members.

Moved: Councillor Gordon    Seconded: Councillor Barnett

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190221020363.

(b) **Approves** the loan repayments for the Community Loan of $42,000 provided to the Rangiora Croquet Club being deferred for a further three years from April 2018 until April 2021.
Notes that deferring the loan for a three year period allows sufficient time for the Rangiora Croquet Club to complete the development of two additional full size greens which are required to allow for current and future club membership.

Considers as an annual plan submission a grant of $25,000 for the Rangiora Croquet Club for the development of two new croquet greens for the 2019 / 20 financial year.

CARRIED

Councillor Gordon reflected on positive discussions at the Committee meeting, acknowledging the Croquet Club’s stronger position, having increased their membership, and now needing additional greens to serve that membership growth. The Club accept the loan is required to be repaid and believe that the increased membership will assist with contributing to repaying loans, along with grant from Croquet Canterbury and fundraising efforts. Councillor Gordon was supportive of the recommendation, having seen the Club put a lot of work into the greens. He believed this was an example of an ideal partnership between the Council and an active club, acknowledging the Annual Plan submission would be a matter for another discussion later in May.

Councillor Barnett reminded members that today is simply about deferring the loan, and that the readjustment of timing would provide for the active club to be in a stronger position to pay back the loan in the future. She reiterated comments of Councillor Gordon.

Councillor Williams was supportive of the motion, on this occasion as the club was proactive and growing, but cautioned the Council to be aware of future loans to sporting organisations and assessing the ability to pay loans back. He remarked that in some cases a loan may be a burden to a club that may not be able to be repay in the longer term and it may not always be appropriate to support clubs in those circumstances.

Waste Bylaw Terms and Conditions - S Collin (Infrastructure Strategy Manager)

(Referred to report no. 190218018503 presented to the Solid and Hazardous Waste Working Party meeting of 26 March 2019.)

K Waghorn provided a brief overview of the report and changes proposed.

Councillor Barnett enquired how was the information being communicated to the retirement villages and rest homes about the possibility of aggregation of services.

K Waghorn advised that as an enquiry for bins was received by such an organisation, then staff work individually with that organisation as to how the Council can assist them with a Council provided service.

Moved: Councillor Brine Seconded: Councillor Doody

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190218018503.

(b) Adopts the Waimakariri District Council Revised Kerbside Collection and Waste Collection Points Use Terms and Conditions (Trim 180706075490).

CARRIED

Councillor Brine stated matters had been well discussed at the Working Party meeting and this would enable aspects to be tidied up and matters continue to progress.

Councillor Doody reflected on the recent waste presentation at the Oxford A&P Show, which appeared to be very popular with attendees.

11. COMMUNITY BOARD MINUTES FOR INFORMATION

11.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board held on 7 March 2019
11.2 Minutes of a meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board held on 11 March 2019

11.3 Minutes of a meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board held on 13 March 2019

11.4 Minutes of a meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board held on 18 March 2019

Moved: Councillor Atkinson Seconded: Councillor Williams

THAT the information in items 11.1 to 11.4 be received.

CARRIED

Councillor Felstead reflected on the recent Oxford-Ohoka Community Board visit to Canterbury Landscapes operation at Diversion Road, in which a very informative and positive meeting occurred.

Councillor Gordon reflected on the recent Youth Council presentation to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board, with a subsequent submission proposed for the Annual Plan.

12. REPORTS FOR INFORMATION

12.1 Activity on the Kaiapoi River – Simon Hart (Business and Centres Manager)

(Referred to report no. 190306027166 from the Kaiapoi–Tuahiwi Community Board meeting of 18 March 2019.)

There were no questions from members.

Councillor Blackie stated that while the Board supported the proposal, some members held some concern for potentially creating a bureaucratic process, and had held a discussion with the Chief Executive, which included some recommendations on the next steps forward. Councillor Blackie believed the house boat proposals and businesses such as the River Queen were matters to be dealt with separately, whereas the current staff proposal had put the two different types of activity under the one aspect. Councillor Blackie advised that control of the river, vetting and selection systems are yet to be considered as matters of land/water ownership and controls require further discussions with a number of stakeholders, including the Runanga and Environment Canterbury.

Councillor Meyer stated matters were an ongoing work in progress.

Moved: Councillor Blackie Seconded: Councillor Meyer

THAT the Council

(a) Receives report 190306027166 for information.

CARRIED

13. CORRESPONDENCE

Nil.

14. MAYOR’S DIARY

14.1 Mayor’s Diary 26 February – 26 March 2019

Mayor Ayers advised of an additional meeting that occurred on 22 March in relation to the operation of the West Oxford Hotel.

Moved: Councillor Felstead Seconded: Councillor Atkinson
THAT the Council:

(a) **Receives** report no. 190321037562.

CARRIED

15. **COUNCIL PORTFOLIO UPDATES**

15.1 **Iwi Relationships – Mayor Ayers**

The Council were awaiting feedback and confirmation of the rescheduled Hui date, anticipated to be held in May.

A Reuben had commented at the recent Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group meeting about the Kaiapoi development area and the need to advance planning for the project, including utilising knowledge from outside the district.

15.2 **Canterbury Water Management Strategy – Councillor Stewart**

Councillor Stewart provided an overview of two recent workshops that discussed the process of translating the intent of the upcoming Plan Change and also commented on the Canterbury Regional Plan. Councillor Stewart provided an update on various work programmes and Regional Council timetables over the coming years.

Councillor Stewart commented on a new proposal related to the new Ashley Estuary protection zone, which was not part of the ZIPA and proposes more restrictions on farming close to the estuary and coastal area.

Councillor Stewart commented on the Runanga views and consideration of culturally significant aspects in relation to proposed Plan Changes, potential effects on some property owners, noting that further discussions would be occurring at Environment Canterbury over the coming weeks.

Councillor Stewart commented on nitrate protection areas and a mapping process, noting issues associated with Lees Valley, difficulties with fencing setbacks and protecting waterways.

Councillor Stewart advised that a refresh of Zone Committee members would occur through August and September 2019. Also the current Zone Chairperson, David Ashby, will be stepping down at the time of the refresh programme.

Councillor Stewart reported that arsenic had been detected in private wells in the vicinity of the Lower Camside Road. Further water testing was occurring and an update was anticipated at the next Utilities and Roading Committee meeting. Councillor Stewart expressed the need to be proactive, acknowledging that the water was sourced from private wells.

Councillor Williams reflected on the recent West Coast situation with river pollution from a nearby rubbish tip, enquiring about the old rubbish tip behind the Ashley stop bank. G Cleary commented on the Ashley River and the high level of protection from the Ashley River stopbank.

15.3 **International Relationships – Deputy Mayor Felstead**

Councillor Felstead advised, as the Chair of the Passchendaele Advisory Group, that it was meeting regularly. Two wreathes would be laid at the Kaiapoi and Rangiora ANZAC Services on behalf of the people of Belgium.

The Enshi Working Group would be meeting in the near future for its first meeting to discuss ongoing sister-city relationship matters.

15.4 **Regeneration (Kaiapoi) – Councillor Blackie**

Councillor Blackie advised that a working party had been set up to progress the Mahinga Kai area.
Councillor Blackie advised the first round of tendering for dredging work on the Kaiapoi River had been rejected, and the tender would be re-advertised later in the week following reconsideration of information received from the first round.

Councillor Stewart enquired if staff were advancing the resource consent simultaneously with other processes related to the dredging work. It was advised that was the case.

16. QUESTIONS
Nil.

17. URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS
Nil.

18. MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Moved: Mayor Ayers  Seconded: Councillor Felstead

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the Public Excluded portion of a meeting of the Council on 5 March 2019</td>
<td>Confirmation of minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>Report of Chris Brown (Manager Community and Recreation)</td>
<td>Community Facilities Provision</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.1 – 17.2</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons. To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

CLOSED MEETING
The public excluded portion of the meeting occurred from 3.22pm to 4.56pm.

19. NEXT MEETING
The next scheduled meeting of the Council is at 1.00pm on Tuesday 7 May 2019 in the Council Chambers.
There being no further business, the meeting closed at 5.37pm.

CONFIRMED

____________________________
Chairperson

____________________________
Date
1. SUMMARY

1.1 The purpose of this report is to present Council with the Waimakariri Zone Committee Annual Report 2018.

1.2 As a joint committee of Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council, the Zone Committee is required to report annually. This is done on a calendar year basis.

1.3 The 2018 Annual Report includes the following highlights:

- The committee has completed a suite of recommendations in the Zone Implementation Plan (ZIPA) that include non-statutory actions for on-ground outcomes, and drafting instructions to form the basis of plan changes to the Land and Water Regional Plan and the Waimakariri River Regional Plan;

- The allocation of $65,710 of Immediate Steps biodiversity funding;

- The engagement of the younger generation farming community through the Next Generation Farming Group;

- The commencement of a 3 year infiltration trial aimed at reducing nutrients in the Silverstream.

Attachments:

i. The Waimakariri Water Zone Committee Annual Report for 2018 (TRIM 190429060467)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No.190424059362

(b) Receives the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee Annual Report 2018
(c) Circulates the Zone Committee Annual Report 2018 to Community Boards, and Drainage and Water Supply Advisory Groups, for their information.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The Waimakariri Zone Committee is a joint committee of Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council, established to implement the Canterbury Water Management Strategy, and was formed in partnership with Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu and Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga. Zone Committees are required to report annually.

3.2 Membership of the Zone Committee is set out on page 4 of the Annual Report 2018.

3.3 Refreshment of the community members of the Zone Committee is scheduled for May/June 2019, with expressions of interest being called in May, and a refreshment workshop of candidates scheduled for 10 June 2019.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1 Both Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council adopted the Zone Committee’s Zone Implementation Plan Addendum (ZIPA) in December 2018. The ZIPA provided the drafting instructions for Environment Canterbury’s proposed Plan Change 7 to the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan, and Plan Change 2 to the Waimakariri River Regional Plan.

4.2 Pre-consultations are being undertaken under clause 3 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991, and were received by Waimakariri District Council on 15 April 2019. This Council has until 15 May 2019 to respond to the schedule 1 consultation.

4.3 It is important to note that in this phase of plan development, Environment Canterbury is undertaking targeted pre-notification consultation with select parties. Public consultation will occur after the notification of both proposed plan changes (anticipated to be mid-2019).

4.4 About draft Plan Change 7 to the Land and Water Regional Plan (LWRP)

The three parts of Plan Change 7 are outlined below:

- Omnibus Part A – includes changes to a number of Region-wide sections of the LWRP, and to the Ashburton sub region.

- Orari-Temuka-Opihi-Pareora (OTOP) Part B – primarily includes changes to the OTOP sub region section of the LWRP.

- Waimakariri Part C – primarily includes changes to the Waimakariri sub region section of the LWRP.

4.3 About draft Plan Change 2 to the Waimakariri River Regional Plan (WRRP)

Plan Change 2 to the WRRP amends various chapters of the WRRP, and associated planning maps.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1 Groups and Organisations

The Zone Committee have engaged a range of industry groups through the Science Stakeholder Advisory Group which has included Dairy NZ, Beef and Lamb, Federated Farmers, Fish and Game, Whitewater NZ, and the Canterbury District Health Board.

5.2 Wider Community
Community and consent holder views have been gleaned through targeted engagement meetings on N targets at Kaiapoi (18/7/18), Oxford (19/7/18), and Rossburn (25/7/18); draft ZIPIA public engagement at Rangiora (1/10/18), Oxford 3/10/18 (x2), Ohoka Market (5/10/18), and Rossburn (11/10/18). Community Boards assisted with draft ZIPIA feedback for Rangiora/Ashley (1/10/18), Kaiapoi/Tuahiwi (2/10/18), Woodend/Sefton (2/10/18), and Oxford/Ohoka (4/10/18).

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

Council’s preferred option in response to the ZIPIA is set out in the 2019/20 draft Annual Plan Consultation Document, and proposes a budget of $305,000 per annum.

6.2. **Community Implications**

There could be many landholders whose livelihoods will be impacted by a change in their consents to take surface and ground water. The extent of this impact from the proposed Plan Change 7 to the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan, and the Proposed Plan Change 2 to Waimakariri River Regional Plan, is currently being assessed.

6.3. **Risk Management**

The range of potential risks includes the risk of nitrate leaching to groundwater, the risk of declining surface water quality, the risk of negatively impacting on the District’s economy from reduced water take consents, and the risk of stream depletion from surface water and groundwater takes.

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

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**

Section 63 of the *Resource Management Act 1991* requires Regional Councils to prepare Regional Plans to carry out its functions. Section 30(1)(c)(ii) and (iii) includes a regional Council’s functions as the maintenance of the quality and quantity of water in water bodies.

The *Environment Canterbury (Transitional Governance Arrangements) Act 2016* saves the vision and principles of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy in Schedule 3. This act will be repealed on 19 October 2019.

Future CWMS targets for 2025 and 2030 are embodied in the Fit for the Future work programme, which is scheduled to be considered by the Canterbury Mayoral Forum on 24 May 2019.

7.3 **Community Outcomes**

- People have wide-ranging opportunities for learning and being informed;
- There is a healthy and sustainable environment for all.
7.3. **Delegations**

N/A

Geoff Meadows, Policy Manager
Community action key to improving fresh water

Throughout 2018 the Waimakariri Water we all have a part to play when it comes to Zone Committee has focused on reflecting reducing our environmental footprint. the views of the wider community in our final version of the Zone Implementation Programme Addendum (ZIPA), which was received by both Environment Canterbury and the Waimakariri District Council in December 2018.

We’re not waiting for the Plan Change to come into effect to make changes; instead we’re actively working together with industry partners, farmers, environmental groups and the wider public to create real change through on the ground actions.

We’ve held 60 community meetings, workshops and feedback sessions over the last Projects such as the joint ECan-WIL two years and it’s clear that we must reduce infiltration trial and the zone committee’s our impact on the environment to improve ongoing support of the Ashley Rakahuri Waimakariri’s water quality and quantity. Rivercare Group’s outstanding efforts to enhance the environment for braided river No matter where we live or how we use our birds show what can be achieve when we land, we all need to work together to create the move forward together towards a better changes we want to see for future generations. future for our waterways. With around 350 farms and 3500 small blocks

Key achievements 2018

- The committee has produced a challenging suite of ZIPA recommendations, based on some difficult decisions. The result is a document that seeks improved environmental outcomes that will restrict further intensification in land use, and set challenging targets to achieve over time.

Twelve lifestyle block owners and farmers on Easterbrook Road have teamed up to restore 1.8 kilometre waterway which flows from a springhead near the Number Four Drain to Fernside Road. The group received $9,710 of Immediate Steps funding from the Waimakairi Zone Committee for the purchase or native plants, plant guards and maintenance.
• The emergence of leadership through this year’s ZIPA engagement, from the likes of the Next Generation Farming Group, demonstrates what’s required to achieve the community outcomes at the heart of the zone committee’s work.

• The committee allocated $65,710 of Immediate Steps biodiversity funding across 3 projects in 2018 – Easterbrook Road Community Planting, Kānuka remnant project (near Eryeton), and the Dagnum dryland project (near Burnt Hill).

• A partnership between Waimakariri Irrigation Limited, a landowner, and ECan led to the successful start to a 3 year infiltration trial aimed at developing a cost-effective solution to reducing nitrates in the Silverstream.

Waimakariri Water Zone Committee

Delivering the community's vision for freshwater

The Canterbury Water Management Strategy (CWMS) puts finding solutions for freshwater management in the hands of the community, with support from councils, Ngāi Tahu, and others. The strategy sets out freshwater goals and targets to deliver the community’s vision for freshwater.

“To gain the greatest cultural, economic, environmental, recreational and social benefits from our water resources within a sustainable framework both now and for future generations.”

Each of the ten community-led water zone committees work collaboratively to develop freshwater recommendations to ensure council plans give effect to these goals and targets.

Within each target area there are several specific time-bound targets to be achieved and these are monitored and reported on to ensure progress is being made.
The target areas are shown below – read some of the stories about what is being done in the zone to deliver on these on the next page.

**CWMS Targets**

A stream walk app has been used to map over 12 kilometres of Silverstream and its tributaries to provide a broader understanding of the waterway’s ecosystem. Environment Canterbury principal biodiversity officer Jason Butt and a colleague gathered a wealth of data during the two weeks they spent mapping Silverstream from Silverstream subdivision through to the springhead east of the Eyre River diversion.

“We collected data on macrophytes (aquatic plants), sediment, vegetation and fish species. Gathering this information gives us an understanding of what sort of management practices could improve the health of the stream.”

Jason says the stream walk app provides consistency and allows scientists to compare data in the future.

“In a few years when we return, we can revisit points of interest along the stream and see if actions we’ve taken have resulted in better outcomes for the stream because we have the original data at our fingertips.”

North Canterbury zone manager Andrew Arps says the stream walk app is an excellent tool which supports ongoing projects to improve Silverstream’s water quality.

“We’re protecting and enhancing springheads through fencing and riparian planting. We’re also working with landowners to create wetlands in an area of under-utilised farmland. This will help resolve high nitrate levels at the upper reaches of Silverstream while restoring critical biodiversity values.”

This project addresses the priority catchment of Silverstream, which is a key focus area for the zone committee due to elevated nitrate levels in the stream. It also provides an insight into ecosystem health and biodiversity.

| Environment Canterbury Biodiversity Officer, Jason Butt, using a stream walk app to gather data at Silverstream Reserve. |   |
Infiltration trial could solve Silverstream’s nitrate issues

A three-year infiltration trial being carried out by Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri Irrigation Limited (WIL) aims to reduce Silverstream’s nitrate levels by introducing more water into the stream.

The trial is operating on a WIL shareholder’s farm using a trench connected to an irrigation race which receives water from the Browns Rock intake of the Waimakariri River. The trench, which is located seven kilometres east of Silverstream, is 1.5 metres deep and 150 metres long.

Environment Canterbury senior hydrogeologist Zeb Etheridge says initial results from the first eight weeks of the trial are promising.

“We knew within the first week that it was a really good infiltration location as we’re getting at least 80 litres of water per second into the trench.

“We’ve also recorded a drop from 9-10 mg/L to 4.5 – 5mg/L of nitrate at the piezometer located next to the trench which is really positive.”

This project furthers the zone committee’s commitment to achieving the targets of improving ecosystem health and biodiversity, along with water use efficiency.

Community feedback key to improving waterways

People attending a drop-in session at the Ohoka Farmers Market received a ribbonwood/manau seedling for sharing their thoughts on the Waimakariri Zone Committee’s draft recommendations for solving water management issues. These sessions were part of several rounds of engagement hosted by the Zone Committee from April to October in 2018.

Attendees provided feedback on the draft Zone Implementation Programme Addendum (ZIPA) which covers topics such as: reducing nitrate, phosphorus and sediment losses, managing environmental flows and improving ecological and cultural values.

Concerns raised by residents included: low flows in the Ashley/Rakahuri River, cows accessing local streams, assistance for farmers to reach new nitrate limits, access to clean rivers and streams for safe swimming and recreation, and high nitrate levels at Silverstream and in groundwater. Attendees were pleased to see on-the-ground action being taken to improve local streams and rivers but believed more needed to be done to reverse the damage to Waimakariri’s waterways.

North Canterbury zone manager Andrew Arps says it’s great to see locals getting involved in the process and they will have a further opportunity to provide submissions on the Waimakariri Plan Change when it is notified in mid 2019.

Lifestyle block owners keen to protect environment

Michelle and Daniel Power moved to their Swannanoa lifestyle block to provide daughters Jess and Ashlee with a rural lifestyle.
Swannanoa couple Daniel and Michelle Power have gained a fresh insight into best management practices for their lifestyle block during a lifestyle block environment project run by the Waimakariri Zone Committee.

There are over 3500 lifestyle blocks in Waimakariri, and while they are not significant contributors to water quality issues in the area, collectively they do have an impact on the environment.

The pilot project covered topics such as animal welfare, riparian planting, waterways, pasture growth, feed requirements and fertiliser use.

Daniel and Michelle were reassured to discover that their regular soil testing programme is helping them to get the best use of their 20-acre block.

“One thing we’re doing differently now is graphing all of our soil test results so we can see if there are any trends developing over time.

“Soil testing makes sense because it gives you the facts you need to make decisions about what to use on your land.”

This project advances the zone committee’s goals of everyone doing their bit in meeting environmental limits and promoting water use efficiency.

Zone Committee, as listed below, David, Claire, Sandra, Judith, Carolyne, Grant, Michael, Gary, Cameron

Future challenges and opportunities

Having completed the ZIPA recommendations by the end of 2018, the committee is focused on priority ZIPA recommendations to advance actions on the ground in the zone. These priorities will include engagement on catchment management planning in select sub-catchments, the monitoring of water quality, an action plan for biodiversity, and ongoing support for projects such as the Silverstream infiltration trial.

Continuing to engage with the community is another priority in 2019, particularly with groups like the Next Generation Farming Group. Having committed to extensive community engagement on the ZIPA, and the community outcomes it is focused on, it is important to continue this engagement if the community outcomes are to be achieved.

In mid-2019 the plan change based on the ZIPA recommendations will be notified with another round of public submissions on this plan change to follow this year.

The zone committee will also go through a ‘refresh’, this refresh was deferred to allow the current committee members to focus on their task of preparing the ZIPA recommendations by the end of 2018. The refreshed zone committee will take on the challenge of implementing these next recommendations and advance a solutions programme over the 3 years towards achieving the ZIPA’s community outcomes.

Zone description

The Waimakariri Zone boundaries are similar to those of the Waimakariri District Council. The zone lies north of the Waimakariri River and extends from Pegasus Bay in the east to the Puketeraki Range in the west.

Much of the land to the eastern part of the zone is naturally subject to poor

Key Zone contacts

Andrew Arps - Waimakariri Water Committee Zone Manager
Andrew.Arps@ecan.govt.nz  |  027 554 4007

Murray Griffin - Waimakariri Water Zone Committee Facilitator
Murray.Griffin@ecan.govt.nz  |  027 705 4798
The rivers, streams, lagoons and wetlands have always been important places and a food basket for Ngāi Tūāhuriri. The zone is part of the Rūnanga’s takiwā.

**Zone committee membership**

David Ashby, Chair, Community member

Gary Walton, Community member

Grant Edge, Deputy Chair, Community member

Carolyne Latham, Community member

Michael Blackwell, Community member

Arapata Reuben, Rūnanga representative – Ngāi Tūāhuriri

Cameron Henderson, Community member

Sandra Stewart, Community member

Waimakariri District Councillor

Judith Roper-Lindsay, Community member

Claire McKay, Environment Canterbury

The Waimakariri Water Zone Committee is a community led committee supported by councils. 

fb.com/canterburywater
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1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. Two Notices of Motion have been submitted pursuant to Standing Orders for the purposes respectively of seeking a ban to prohibit sale and use of fireworks within the District, and a bylaw to deal with property maintenance and nuisance matters such as long grass on undeveloped residential sections.

1.2. Legal advice confirms the Council does not have the ability to ban the sale of fireworks because a Council bylaw cannot be inconsistent with the laws of New Zealand. Additionally, Section 6 of the *Hazardous Substances (Fireworks) Regulations 2001* provides for the sale of fireworks from 2 November to 5 November each year.

1.3. The Council could implement a ban through a bylaw to restrict the use of fireworks in public places. The Police already can apply enforcement powers in public places through the *Summary Offences Act 1981* s35 “Setting off or throwing fireworks”. Banning fireworks use on private land is much less certain; see Attach iii)

1.4. Auckland Council intends to approach the government seeking a law change to ban the public sale of fireworks. A remit to the LGNZ conference is expected to this effect.

1.5. A bylaw addressing issues around property maintenance and nuisances could be developed to help manage the nuisance effect of long grass on sections. FENZ manages fire risk from this circumstance. Other legislation such as the *Health Act 1956* has provisions for managing nuisance such as vermin harboured in long grass nuisance but this does not completely manage the nuisance effects.

1.6. Current legislation does not provide an infringement regime for such bylaws. In the absence of owner cooperation, compliance is through a District Court prosecution.

**Attachments:**

i. Notice of Motion December 2018 meeting
ii. Notice of Motion February 2019 meeting
iii. Legal advice from Corcoran French of December 2018 (TRIM 181205142872)
2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190328045254

(b) **Notes** that The Local Government Act 2002 s145 provides for councils to make bylaws to protect the public from nuisance and maintain public health and safety.

(c) **Acknowledges** that the Council does not have the ability in law to ban the sale of fireworks as Parliament has specifically legislated for its sale;

(d) **Supports** Auckland City (and other Councils) in its bid to make a remit to the Local Government NZ July conference seeking the Government to introduce legislation to ban the private sale and use of fireworks;

(e) **Notes** that Council, through the LGA does have the ability to develop a bylaw to restrict the use of fireworks in public places, but in the first instance seeking a change to the law is more effective, as enforcement of a bylaw would be problematic and its application to private land uncertain;

(f) **Authorises** staff to develop a draft Property Maintenance and Nuisance Bylaw to address such matters as long grass on undeveloped urban sections and other nuisances, and this draft to be brought to the August District Planning and Regulation Committee meeting for its consideration;

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

3. **BACKGROUND**

**Fireworks**

3.1 Council heard the following Notice of Motion at the December 2018 meeting, for Council staff to investigate options and the legality of banning the sale / use of fireworks in the District.

3.2 Notice of Motion in full:

Councillor Paul Williams submitted a notice of motion pursuant to Standing Order 26.1 for the 4 December 2018 meeting of the Waimakariri District Council.

Moved: Councillor Williams  Seconded: Councillor Gordon

**THAT** the Council resolves to:

(a) **Approve** Council staff investigating the options and legality to ban the sale and use of fireworks in the Waimakariri District.

(b) **Approve** Council staff, should such a ban be possible, investigating options on how approved operators/individuals could be approved/licenced.

(c) **Requests** that staff report back to the Council’s March 2019 meeting.

(d) **Notes** that should the reports indicate that the banning of fireworks is possible the Council would want any such bans in place as soon as it was possible.

(e) **Further notes** that the Council will be supportive of licensed fireworks displays by approved operators.

**CARRIED**  Against: Councillor Doody
3.3 Uncontrolled or inappropriate ly operated fireworks can place an increased risk to people’s wellbeing and property and cause sleep disruption and anxiety. Animals are also especially vulnerable to physical effects and trauma. Flow-on effects include the stress and pressure placed upon the fire service and the health system that is the result of fireworks accidents and incidents.

3.4 On private property, fireworks are permitted provided they do not cause injury or alarm to any person in a public place under section 35 of the Summary Offences Act 1981. Council officers can also address excessive noise under sections 326-328 of the Resource Management Act 1991, for example, fireworks set off late at night.

3.5 The Animal Welfare Act 1999 creates offences for cruelty to animals, in particular ‘causing the animal, to suffer, by any act or omission’. Pet owners could also lodge a claim in the Disputes Tribunal for veterinary bills for care of a pet.

3.6 Legal advice from Corcoran French was obtained in December 2018 and details of Auckland Council’s Public Safety and Nuisance Bylaw 2013 provisions were also obtained which include:

(a) Auckland current clause 6(3)(b) restricts the use of fireworks ‘in any other place’ (i.e. private land), however, the Council is looking to remove this clause because they consider the Police can adequately address this issue using the Summary Offences Act 1981.

(b) Auckland Council’s proposed change to its Nuisance Bylaw states: Fireworks, flares, explosive materials (1) A person must not set off any firework, flare or any other explosive material in a public place, unless the relevant authority has given prior written approval. (2) Firework means an object containing hazardous substances with explosive properties.

(c) The ban being sought came about as part of Auckland Council’s consultation on proposed changes to its Public Safety and Nuisance Bylaw 2018 in November/December 2018. Public feedback, between October and December 2018, showed that nearly 90 per cent (of approximately 8,000 submissions received) supported a ban on the sale of fireworks to the public for private use.

(d) Following consultation, in February 2019, Auckland Council has agreed to proceed with a request to Government to introduce legislation to ban the private sale and use of fireworks after overwhelming support from residents. There has been a clear shift in public opinion with many people now preferring public fireworks displays that mark, for example, New Year and Matariki, to private sales.

(e) Key themes from public feedback additionally showed there were concerns for the safety of people and animals (68%), the amount of noise (35%), the stockpiling and use of fireworks after Guy Fawkes Night (27%) and a preference for public fireworks display only (23%).

(f) A national ban would significantly reduce the number of complaints received about the discharge of fireworks on private property, allowing police and council resources to be better utilised elsewhere. Auckland Council intends to approach the government this year seeking to ban the public sale of fireworks in response to the related harm and injury to people and animals and associated pressure placed on the council, police and emergency and medical services.

3.5 Hauraki District Council’s Public Safety Bylaw also outlines restricted conduct in public places regarding the discharge of fireworks. Its bylaw states: Except with the prior written permission of the Council, no person shall in any public place: set off
fireworks or explosive material in or on a public place, or so near thereto in a way that does or is likely to create a nuisance.

Nuisance (long grass on undeveloped sections)

3.6 Council passed a second Notice of Motion, following, on 5 February 2019, for Council staff to investigate a possible nuisance bylaw.

3.7 Notice of Motion in full:

Councillor Dan Gordon submitted a Notice of Motion pursuant to Standing Order 26.1.

Moved: Councillor Gordon Seconded: Councillor Williams

THAT the Council resolves to:

(a) Approve Council staff investigating a possible Property Maintenance and Nuisance Bylaw to cover instances of long grass on undeveloped sections.

(b) Request that staff report back to the Council’s March 2019 meeting on options for such a Bylaw.

(c) Note that in scoping the Bylaw other instances of nuisance may be identified and that such matters be reported back for possible inclusion in the preparation of a draft Bylaw

CARRIED

3.8 Residents periodically express concern to the Council about overgrown sections, particularly in residential areas. Council has some ability to control vegetation on sections under the Health Act 1956. However, in general it has currently limited ability to deal with instances of vacant sections whose upkeep has been neglected following purchase or has been ‘land banked’ with little or no interest from the owners in maintaining them.

3.9 The Council receives complaints about general nuisance, matters that could be incorporated into a nuisance bylaw, e.g. compost heaps, car bodies, timber stacks, and tyre dumps in rural areas. The bylaw could also be widened to include other nuisance matters including the keeping of livestock in urban areas (e.g. roosters). Some councils have developed a bylaw to address general nuisance elements and this is a possibility for Waimakariri District Council.

3.10 The introduction of the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017 has sharply reduced measures available to councils to manage overgrown residential sections. Council only has the power to persuade. With the simultaneous revocation of Forest and Rural Fires Act 1977 provisions, councils can no longer send out a warning notice, take action to mow/cut the overgrown section or recover costs from the landowner. As of July 2018, FENZ (Fire and Emergency New Zealand) can ask an occupier or owner to remove or destroy a potential fire hazard when there is enough flammable material on the land.

3.11 Section 29 of the Health Act 1956 defines the term ‘nuisance’ for a number of situations. While long grass as a nuisance on undeveloped sections is not explicitly defined, Clause 29(c) applies to conditions conducive to harbouring of vermin and Clause 29(q) applies similarly to the breeding of insects. Section 29(o) deems that a nuisance can also be created ‘where any…yard, premises, or land is in such a state as to be offensive or likely to be injurious to health’. Injurious to health is a high threshold and would need to be established over a period.
3.12 Case law (Ball v. Auckland CC (1985) [3 DCR 593]) suggests that the Health Act 1956 would not provide adequate powers for the Council to address the visual effect of long grass on undeveloped sections, as this type of behaviour would not fit the definition of “offensive” or “nuisance”. As well there would need to be good evidence for the Council to conclusively attribute long grass on undeveloped sections to insect or vermin infestations and act accordingly.

3.13 Auckland Council’s Property Maintenance and Nuisance Bylaw 2015 contains Clause 6(1)(b) A person must not allow any private property under their control to become so overgrown with vegetation that it causes or may cause a nuisance. Similarly, South Waikato District Council Property Maintenance and Nuisance Bylaw contains a similar provision, Clause 6.2 A person must not allow any property under their control to become overgrown with long grass or vegetation to an extent that it causes or may cause a nuisance. As far as can be ascertained, these clauses have not yet been invoked by either Council.

3.14 It is worth noting South Taranaki District Council’s approach to long grass management. Under their Keeping of Animals Bylaw 2018, this council allows livestock to graze in urban areas. Clause 15.4 states: A grazing permit will be approved (subject to conditions and Authorised Officer assessment) if written approval from all neighbours directly next to, in front of and behind the sections to be grazed, is received.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

**General**

4.1. Before commencing the process for making a bylaw the Council needs to fulfil Section 155 (1) of the Local Government Act 2002 that states that a local authority must determine whether a bylaw is the most appropriate way of addressing the perceived problem.

4.2. The main issue with a bylaw controlling fireworks or other nuisances is that, as for any bylaw currently in operation, enforcement is cumbersome. The first issue is timeliness. In the example of fireworks in public places, it is unlikely that the compliance officer would be present at the incident, or get there quickly enough in response to a call-out. This would all be exacerbated at night. Enforcement would likely then be taken in hindsight and seeking witness statements to the action has much inherent uncertainty.

4.3. A second issue is there is no facility to issue infringement notices to people breaching a bylaw. Any penalty is achieved through a prosecution at the District Court and is rarely cost effective. The costs incurred of undertaking a prosecution have by experience never been offset by a Court ordered fine.

4.4. There is an option of developing one bylaw that includes the fireworks issue in one public safety and nuisance bylaw. This has an advantage of simplicity for process but, as well as the issues discussed in 4.2 and 4.3, also has a disadvantage of being less focussed, and therefore transparent to the public, to the issues at hand.

4.5. If the Council resolves to instigate a bylaw or bylaws, the timeline, before it had effect, would be a likely minimum of six months from preparing a draft bylaw. The first step would be to authorise a draft bylaw or bylaws for its consideration. If approved the drafts would follow the special consultative procedure of the Local Government Act.
2002 with submissions requested over a consultation period of one month, a hearing
and then approval by the Council of a final document.

Fireworks

4.6. In the case of banning the sale of fireworks, it would appear that a nation-wide
approach of amending a central Government regulation to ban the public sale of
fireworks would be the most appropriate way of addressing the matter.

4.7. Auckland Council is in the process of lobbying central Government to amend Section 6 of the Hazardous Substances (Fireworks) Regulations 2001 and, as advised this month, is likely as part of this process submit a remit to the 2019 LGNZ Conference in July. Dr Mike Reid of LGNZ advised 29 April that although a remit had yet to be received he fully expected one to be submitted. Unless the Government takes these steps, local government has no ability to ban the sale of fireworks because these regulations currently provide for the sale of fireworks from 2 November to 5 November each year.

4.8. In the absence of being able to ban the sale of fireworks, in terms of restricting their use, at its April meeting, Upper Hutt City Council considered whether to restrict the use of fireworks in public places following consultation on their proposed ‘Prevention of Nuisance from Fires and Smoke Bylaw 2019’. In deciding that no changes could be made regarding the sale / use of fireworks, it is indicated that if there is a desire by Council to restrict the use of fireworks in public places, then this council’s Public Places Bylaw would be the most appropriate mechanism to control fireworks.

4.9. In April 2019, it was announced that Porirua and Wellington Councils, and perhaps others in the region, are proposing measures to ban the private use of fireworks. Conceivably, Waimakariri could approach Christchurch City and Selwyn District and propose a similar response, which is nationally consistent in any approach taken to lobby the Government.

4.10. A bylaw to ban the use of fireworks in public places does have some practical issues. As mentioned enforcement is problematic and its Court based enforcement process is slow. The Police power under the Summary Offences Act 1981 is more immediate in effect where a fine of $200 is made to people who “in any public place, sets off or throws any firework or explosive material in such a manner as to be likely to cause injury to, or to alarm, any person.” Another aspect is that a co-ordinated project with neighbouring councils would be more effective and stop any cross boundary compliance issues where people are able to use fireworks in one council but unable in the neighbouring one. In summary, although a bylaw banning use in public areas is a public and clear statement of the Council’s intent, it’s likely that a joined up approach to Parliament with LGNZ would have a more effective outcome across the country.

Nuisance (long grass on undeveloped sections)

4.11. In the case of overgrown sections, in the absence of owner willingness to fix a problem, a bylaw is the most feasible option although the degree of “nuisance” in terms of the Local Government Act is likely to be a point of debate. In the LGA the bylaw would be “protecting the public from nuisance” but it is problematic to establish exactly what a nuisance is at times.

4.12. Other legislation addressing nuisance, such as the Health Act, has thresholds such as “injurious to health” and rely on a trigger such as vermin infestation. It doesn’t
address the effect on the amenity of a neighbourhood. FENZ is naturally focussed on the fire risk.

4.13. Some subdivisions have covenants that require owners of undeveloped sections to keep them tidy. A covenant is a civil matter between neighbours and relies on one of the parties taking action to enforce it. It can be an expensive path.

4.14. The Council has itself at times undertaken to have sections cut. This occurred in Pegasus where some absentee owners were difficult to engage and the pragmatic fix was simply to cut the grass. This is not an enduring option.

4.15. Of these options the bylaw approach is the most practical and also enables other nuisances to be bundled together as described in 3.9.

4.16. The issue of not having infringement notices is a significant impediment, however for some elements of a nuisance bylaw an “inspection fee” and cost recovery for mowing could be charged to help cover the costs of administering the bylaw or encouraging compliance.

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1. Views of the community have been obtained with the gathering of a petition in early 2019 calling for the ban of the sale of fireworks. While the Council periodically receives feedback on fireworks from the public, it has to date not received a petition. If the Council proposes a bylaw approach, community views would be canvassed through the special consultative procedure of the LGA.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

Financial Implications

6.1. Aside from the cost of developing bylaws which is staff time, legal review and consultation costs totalling in the order of $10,000 to $15,000, ongoing costs would include the need for compliance staff to follow up on complaints, which could require call-out after hours in the case of fireworks, and the legal costs in enforcing a bylaw through the District Court. Currently, a single prosecution would cost of the order of $15,000 - $20,000.

Community Implications

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

Health and Safety

6.3. Banning the sale of fireworks would reduce the health and safety risk to people and animals. Taking improved action against general nuisance matters will address health, safety and aesthetic concerns.
7. CONTEXT

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

7.2. Legislation
Section 145 of the Local Government Act 2002 empowers the Council to make a bylaw for its district to protect, promote and maintain public health and safety. Police can apply enforcement powers under the Summary Offences Act 1981. Council also has some ability to control vegetation on sections under the Health Act 1956 and has some powers to control noise under the Resource Management Act 1991.

7.3. Community Outcomes

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

- The Council makes information about its plans and activities readily available.
- The Council takes account of the views across the community including mana whenua.
- The Council makes known its views on significant proposals by others affecting the District’s wellbeing.
- Opportunities for collaboration and partnerships are actively pursued.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA, ON TUESDAY 4 DECEMBER 2018, COMMENCING AT 1PM.

PRESENT:
Mayor D Ayers (Chair), Deputy Mayor K Felstead, Councillors N Atkinson, K Barnett (departed during item 9.5 at 5.25pm), A Blackie, R Brine, W Doody, D Gordon, J Meyer, S Stewart and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE:
J Palmer (Chief Executive), G Cleary (Manager, Utilities & Road ing), C Sargison (Manager Special Projects), K Simpson (3Waters Manager), C Roxburgh (Water Asset Manager), B Rice (Senior Transport Engineer), L Beckingsale (Policy Analyst), G Wilson (Building WOF’s and Earthquake Prone Building Inspector), D Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager – District Regeneration), D Ashby (Chair, CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee) and S Nichols (Governance Manager).

The meeting adjourned at 3.25pm and reconvened at 3.37pm.

APOLOGIES
Moved: Councillor Meyer Seconded: Councillor Gordon

An apology was received and sustained from Councillor Barnett for early departure at 5.25pm.

CARRIED

NOTICE OF MOTION
Councillor Paul Williams submitted a notice of motion pursuant to Standing Order 26.1 for the 4th December 2018 meeting of the Waimakariri District Council.

Moved: Councillor Williams Seconded: Councillor Gordon

THAT the Council resolves to:

(a) Approve Council staff investigating the options and legality to ban the sale and use of fireworks in the Waimakariri District.

(b) Approve Council staff, should such a ban be possible, investigating options on how approved operators/individuals could be approved/licenced.

(c) Requests that staff report back to the Council’s March 2019 meeting.

(d) Notes that should the reports indicate that the banning of fireworks is possible the Council would want any such bans in place as soon as it was possible.

(e) Further notes that the Council will be supportive of licensed fireworks displays by approved operators.

CARRIED

Against Councillor Doody
Councillor Williams explained the Notice of Motion (NoM) resulted from public feedback, acknowledging there is currently discussion occurring around the country on the issue and would like the opportunity for the Council to explore the matter further. Councillor Williams advised there was also a petition circulating in the community organised by Arthur Liddell which he understands would close at the end of January. Councillor Williams commented on examples of damage caused to property, people and animals, and the cost (both financial and social) associated with fireworks. Councillor Williams spoke of feedback he had received from the community in support of banning fireworks, including the SPCA. The NoM seeks for staff to investigate and report back on potential options including a possible bylaw.

Councillor Gordon stated he was supportive of an investigation into the legality of banning fireworks. He reflected on feedback received, acknowledging he personally enjoys public displays. Councillor Gordon reflected on rural living, damage and distress caused to animals and noting that the SPCA was supportive of the proposal. Councillor Gordon acknowledged some feedback was that if the timing of fireworks was limited, it may be a little better to cope with the stress. Councillor Gordon acknowledged that whilst a bylaw may not fix the issues experienced it may assist, as would having any users licenced and a shorter usage period. Councillor Gordon provided examples of District events involving fireworks that people had been informed prior to when the event was occurring such as the Celebration Night held recently in Victoria Park. Councillor Gordon believed public displays could be held in a number of recreation areas within Waimakariri. He acknowledged lobbying central Government could be where energy needs to be spent, however, he stated locally the Council need to take a lead and not wait for the Government.

Councillor Brine enquired if Councillor Williams had approached the local Ministers of Parliament seeking a private members bill and ballot. Councillor Williams, advised he personally had not, but was aware of others asking for such action.

Mayor Ayers stated he had never purchased fireworks but did enjoy public displays. Mayor Ayers had observed the legislation related to Hazardous Substances and referred to regulations rather than legislation. Mayor Ayers remarked that his observation is that public views are changing and believe there is a time for the government to review and change the regulations, however, it does not prevent investigations into bylaws.

Councillor Brine agreed with many of the comments made, reflecting on potential examples that could occur such as The Warehouse not selling fireworks in the Waimakariri but they could be purchased in Christchurch and how you manage people bringing fireworks into the district. Councillor Brine stated he had emotional support for the intent and was supportive of staff investigating matters, however remarked that the bylaw may not be enforceable without additional government regulations.

Councillor Atkinson agreed with many comments, acknowledging WDC bylaws are different to neighbouring councils. He remarked that if this proposal did work it would potentially come down to resourcing and budget for enforcement, through the Police. Councillor Atkinson believed there needs to be pressure put on central government for change, and whilst not personally a supporter of bylaws, believed this action could assist in the process of sending a message to the government.

Councillor Barnett enquired what appeal processes could occur if any such bylaw was introduced. Staff commented that Parliament currently legislates the sale of fireworks and it would be a leap for any bylaw to override legislation.

Councillor Barnett addressed a question to Councillor Williams, referring to a newspaper comment that the Council supports public displays, and whether he is asking ratepayers to fund private functions such as Woodford Glenn. Councillor Barnett stated she felt nervous supporting the motion as she believed it was a waste of staff time, and referred to the Auckland City Council example. Councillor Barnett stated she was unable to see the positive effect in this district as people could purchase in neighbouring districts, however it may be different if Canterbury banned fireworks. Councillor Barnett stated she would vote against the motion, believing it to be window dressing. Councillor Barnett remarked that she would like to see the
matter before the Annual Plan as there would be a cost involved in enforcement aspects; reflecting on the enforcement issues with the North Pegasus Bay Bylaw. Councillor Barnett commented that personally she would like to see a ban on smoking in the district for a variety of reasons but knows that legislation does not allow for such a matter, hence her earlier comments that she believes this proposal is wasting time, which would be better spent lobbying central government. Councillor Barnett acknowledged the public support for such a proposal.

Councillor Doody stated she was not in favour of the motion because of the issues of imposing on people and freedom of choice. Councillor Doody stated people need to take responsibility for their own actions and people can decide to purchase fireworks or not. Councillor Doody remarked that she was not against staff looking into the matter further, however believed that until central government undertakes change in legislation and regulation, progressing the matter at a local level is a waste of time.

Councillor Williams stated he does not support any commercial display being funded by ratepayers. He commented on the positive aspects of the recent promotion night. He was aware that the Auckland City Council had not yet completed their investigation and would be watching with interest the outcomes. Councillor Williams acknowledged the bylaw could not be currently enforced, but believed that if it stopped 85% of activity, then that would be an improvement as he believed the public would self-police. He accepted it is not practical to stop the sale of fireworks in Waimakariri and acknowledged the need to lobby central government, however considered this action as a step in the right direction.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA, ON TUESDAY 5 FEBRUARY 2019 COMMENCING AT 1PM:

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

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

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

8. **APOLOGIES**
Nil.

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

Moved Councillor Gordon seconded Councillor Williams

**THAT the Council resolves to:**

(a) **Approve** Council staff investigating a possible Property Maintenance and Nuisance Bylaw to cover instances of long grass on undeveloped sections.

(b) **Request** that staff report back to the Councils March 2019 meeting on options for such a Bylaw.

(c) **Note** that in scoping the Bylaw other instances of nuisance may be identified and that such matters be reported back for possible inclusion in the preparation of a draft Bylaw.

**CARRIED**

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

Councillor Gordon commented on an Auckland City Council Bylaw (Public Safety and Nuisance Bylaw 2013) outlining aspects that were similar to what he was seeking. Councillor Gordon reflected on media commentary over the past few months, and growing concern for the Port
Hills area. Councillor Gordon queried if other areas of nuisance could be scoped during the consultation phase such as overhanging trees and noise nuisance in residential areas. He believed the status quo, where there is no ability to act, is frustrating for both the community and the Council, and therefore deemed this proposal worthy of consideration by the Council. Councillor Gordon stated that this Notice of Motion seeks staff to investigate and scope matters to be considered at a future meeting and sought the support of fellow councillors.

Councillor Williams echoed the comments made by his colleague.

Councillor Felstead queried whether the purpose of the proposal was more related to residential sections as he was concerned about the implications for rural properties. He asked if recommendation (a) could be amended to read “undeveloped residentially developed sections”. Councillor Gordon advised that he would prefer to leave the recommendation broad at this stage, and await staff feedback.

Councillor Felstead stated he was supportive of the proposal, as he believed that with the changeover of enforcement to FENZ has left a gap in responsibilities and legislation that needs to be covered.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Councillor Doody commented on tussocks planted as roadside landscaping which could be considered, a fire risk if they are not tended properly as they can become a fire risk. In his right of reply Councillor Gordon reflected on how matters were efficiently dealt with prior to the FENZ legislation. He stated that nothing has been promised to residents but he is seeking an investigation into options following much feedback from members of the community who rightly expect an elected member to bring up such matters. The motion does allow other nuisance aspects to be considered. If the council decide to take the next step then community consultation would occur and further consideration given before any bylaw is implemented.
3 December 2018

Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440

Attention: Nick Harrison

Dear Nick,

FIREWORKS BYLAW ADVICE

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

Summary

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Additional Comments/Conclusion

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

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

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

Yours faithfully

CORCORAN FRENCH

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

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

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

OUTCOMES SOUGHT AND BYLAW RESPONSE IN 2013
- To ensure that public places are safe and accessible, to minimise nuisances, and where appropriate, use a bylaw rather than relying on other legislation or non-regulatory approaches.
- Both Auckland Council and Auckland Transport bylaws prohibit use of fireworks in a public place unless approved by council; and where set off from any other place, to prohibit nuisance or endangerment to any person, property, dog or other animal in a public place.
- Powers to enforce the bylaw include: seizure of property (s164 to 168 LGA), cost recovery for damage (s176 LGA), ability to request names and addresses (s178 LGA).
- Penalties for bylaw breaches include a maximum $20,000 court fine (s242 LGA), a maximum $500 court fine and a further $50 court fine per day for continuing offences (s56 Health Act).

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

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

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

BYLAW EVALUATION

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

Bylaw effective / efficient?
✓ Bylaw acts as a deterrent to most people letting off fireworks in a public place when part of a wider approach to increase public awareness about the ban, and support for public displays.
✗ Enforcement is challenging and resource-intensive. Council does not have capacity to respond to all complaints at peak times, and offenders flee, cannot be identified, or resume activity once officers leave.
✗ Bylaw may force fireworks onto private property which is a concern but has not been quantified.
✗ The part of the bylaw about letting off fireworks from any other place is not used by council officers and:
  - duplicates Police powers (s35 Summary Offences Act 1981) for which the penalty is a $200 court fine.
• creates health and safety risks for Council officers that Police are better trained to address, and for which the Police have the power of arrest (s39 Summary Offences Act 1981)
• the reference to animals in Clause 6(3)(b) is ultra vires\(^4\) and not enforceable. Council does not have a statutory power to protect animals from fireworks.

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

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

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

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

**Section 160(1) Local Government Act 2002 recommendation:**
• A bylaw about the use of fireworks in public places remains appropriate to address nuisance and safety issues. However, a bylaw about issues in public places from fireworks in other places is not appropriate. It duplicates Police powers, creates health and safety risks for officers, and contains ultra vires provisions.
• The current bylaw form about fireworks in other places is not appropriate for reasons stated above.
• The current bylaw does not give rise to any unjustified implications under the New Zealand Bill of Rights 1990.

### OPTIONS

#### Option 1: Status quo – Retain wording and implementation
- Fireworks ban in public places.
- Bylaw about fireworks set off in other places not enforced
- Police respond to incidents of injury or alarm to people in public places from fireworks set off in any place.
- Noise control responds to noise complaints.

**Effectiveness and efficiency:**
✓ Will deter people from letting off fireworks in a public place.
✗ Enforcement challenging and resource-intensive.
✗ Retains bylaw provision about fireworks on other places that is not used by Council officers, duplicates Police powers, and contains ultra vires provisions.

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

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

#### Option 2: Amend wording to remove provisions about fireworks set off in other places (RECOMMENDED)
- Fireworks ban in public places.
- Police respond to incidents of injury or alarm to people in public places from fireworks set off in any place.
- Noise control responds to noise complaints.

**Effectiveness and efficiency:**
✓ Will deter people from letting off fireworks in a public place.
✗ Enforcement challenging and resource-intensive.
✓ Removes bylaw provision about fireworks on other places that is not used by Council officers, duplicates Police powers, contains ultra vires provisions.

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

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

#### Option 3: Revoke bylaw
- Fireworks allowed in public places.
- Police respond to incidents of injury or alarm to people in public places from fireworks set off in any place.
- Noise control responds to noise complaints.

**Effectiveness and efficiency:**
✗ Increase in the use and issues from fireworks in public places.
✗ May increase demands on limited Police resources to respond to safety issues in public places.
✗ Public criticism of Council from removal of public places ban.

**Bill of Rights Implications:**
N/A

**Fit for future:**
✗ Increase in the use and issues from fireworks in public places.
✓ Removes inappropriate provision about fireworks in other public places.

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

**Section 160(3) Local Government Act 2002 recommendation:**
The bylaw should be amended (Option 2) to retain the ban on fireworks in public places but remove clause 6(3)(b) about fireworks on other public places. Clause 6(3)(b) is not used, duplicates Police powers, and contains ultra vires\(^4\) and not enforceable. Council does not have a statutory power to protect animals from fireworks.

\(^4\) Decisions or actions outside the lawful powers of a person or body
Council may make a bylaw about the use of lifesaving equipment to address public nuisance, public health and safety, offensive behaviour, or use of public places under the Local Government Act 2002 (s145, s146).

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

To ensure public safety, minimise nuisance, and manage the use of land, assets, or structures on parks and beaches.

Auckland Council bylaw prohibits interference with lifesaving equipment, warning devices, or notices on a beach.

Powers to enforce bylaw include seizure of property (s164 to 168 LGA), cost recovery for damage (s175 LGA), and ability to request name and address (s178 LGA).

Penalties for bylaw breaches include a maximum $20,000 court fine (s242(4) LGA).

Park rangers have not used the bylaw, in part due to a lack of training.

Council community facility maintenance team replaces or repairs damaged lifesaving equipment.

Council maintenance team reports rare incidents of removal of life preservers, but other related equipment such as ropes are often removed and must be replaced.

No complaints data, but interference with lifesaving equipment witnessed by 9 per cent of Aucklanders surveyed. Of those, 95 per cent considered the issue a significant safety risk.

No related issues reported by Harbormaster or Auckland Transport on wharves.

No enforcement. Limited ability to identify offenders.

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

Still an issue requiring a bylaw response?

✓ This is an issue of low frequency but high potential impact that regulation can help address.

✗ Feasible regulatory alternatives exist, but require a higher threshold of behaviour:
  - The Local Government Act 2002 (s232) provides an offence to wilfully, maliciously or negligently interfere with any Council property. Penalties include a maximum $20,000 court fine (s242(1) LGA).
  - Police can address wilful damage or removal of warning devices under Summary of Offences Act 1981 which carry a maximum penalty of a three month prison term or a maximum $2,0000 court fine (s11, s12).

Bylaw effective / efficient?

✗ Bylaw not used. Offenders difficult to identify unless “caught in the act”. Damage is instead repaired/replaced.

✗ Applies only to beaches, and excludes equipment, devices and notices in other public places (e.g. Hunua Falls). Data not available on location, but some could potentially be located on parks or roads.

Bylaw clearly written?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause 1.2, 3 &amp; 5 Demesne</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of the Council or a Council controlled outdoor place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The person must not set off fireworks in a public place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 3, 8 &amp; 9 Demesne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extinguishing already set off fireworks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where inflammation or explosion of fireworks is likely to cause a danger to the public, injury to any person or damage to any property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council or a council controlled outdoor place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of the Council or a Council controlled outdoor place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The person must not set off fireworks in a public place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 2, 8 &amp; 9 Demesne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extinguishing already set off fireworks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where inflammation or explosion of fireworks is likely to cause a danger to the public, injury to any person or damage to any property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council or a council controlled outdoor place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of the Council or a Council controlled outdoor place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The person must not set off fireworks in a public place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 3 &amp; 5 Demesne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of the Council or a Council controlled outdoor place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The person must not set off fireworks in a public place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 3 &amp; 5 Demesne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of the Council or a Council controlled outdoor place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The person must not set off fireworks in a public place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
➤ In which places are there controls on recreational fishing/set netting activities?
The Ministry for Primary Industries has restrictions on Auckland’s west coast, and Auckland Council restrictions apply on Arkles Bay, Omaha Beach, Te Haruhi Beach, Army Bay and on all regional parks.

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

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

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

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

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

8A Fish offal

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

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

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

9A Graffiti

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

9B Lifesaving equipment, warning notices, and warning and emergency device

Related information about matters addressed in other regulations
Section 232 of the Local Government Act 2002 enables Council to address wilful or negligent damage or interference and damage with the above property.
1. SUMMARY

1.1 The project to join the Woodend and Pegasus water supplies is forecast to be completed ahead of programme, and for less than the budget allocated. This has triggered the need to amend the project budget.

1.2 The purpose of this report is to request that Council:


b. Remove the remaining $84,000 of budget from the 2019-20 financial year as this will not be required for the completion of the project.

1.3 In December 2018 a contract was awarded to On-Grade Drainage and Excavation Limited to construct a new raw water pipeline between the Woodend and Pegasus water supply wells, and the Pegasus water treatment plant. This is the final stage of work on the project to join the two water supplies.

1.4 The capital budget for the works is split over the 2018-19 and 2019-20 financial years. It was allocated in this way assuming that the work would not be complete by the end of June 2019, and that the project would be carried over into the 2019-20 financial year.

1.5 Work has progressed quicker than initially expected, meaning that the work is currently forecast to be complete in late May 2019. This means that the majority of the budget allocated for the 2019-20 financial year is required to be spent within the current financial year, with a smaller portion not required at all for the completion of the project.

1.6 Attachments:

i. Nil

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190423058867.
(b) **Notes** that the project to join the Woodend and Pegasus water supplies is due to be completed for $84,000 less than the original budget allocated of $811,000.

(c) **Notes** that the project to join the Woodend and Pegasus water supplies is due to be completed ahead of programme, with a completion date forecast of late May 2019 rather than early in new financial year.

(d) **Re-allocates** $281,500 of the budget currently allocated for the ‘Gladstone and Pegasus Raw Water Main’ project from the 2019-20 financial year into the 2018-19 financial year.

(e) **Removes** the remaining $84,000 of budget allocated for the Gladstone and Pegasus Raw Water Main project from the 2019-20 financial year.

(f) **Notes** that the reason for the above changes is that the project to join the Woodend and Pegasus schemes is to be completed ahead of programme and under budget.

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

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 There is currently work underway to join the Woodend and Pegasus water supplies which is nearing completion.

3.2 Past reports relating to this project are listed below:

- Request to engage contractor – Pegasus to Woodend Transfer Pumps (TRIM reference number 181112133201)
- Request for Approval to Engage a contractor to Removed Trees for the New Woodend Pegasus Water Supply Pipeline (TRIM reference number 180629072244)
- Combining of Woodend and Pegasus Water Supplies - New Water Supply Main Concept Design (TRIM reference number 180322031093)
- Request for Approval to Engage Filtec, Nairn Electrical, and the Water Unit to undertake the Pegasus Filter Conversion (TRIM reference number 171005107863)
- Combining of Woodend and Pegasus Water Supplies – Feedback from Community Consultation (TRIM reference number 160927099778)
- Combining of Woodend and Pegasus Water Supplies – Review and Endorsement of Consultation Programme (TRIM reference number 160628061761)
- Combining of Woodend and Pegasus Water Supplies – Approval to Consult (TRIM reference number 160602052229)
- Combining of Woodend and Pegasus Water Supplies (TRIM reference number 150119006337)

3.3 The final stage of the project is to construct a pipeline to allow all the Woodend and Pegasus wells to pump into the Pegasus water treatment plant, which will treat all the water before pumping out into the Pegasus reticulation, and to the Chinnerys Road water headworks in Woodend.

3.4 It was originally programmed that the pipeline contract which is currently underway would continue beyond the end of June 2019. Therefore, the budget for this phase of the project was split over the 2018-19 and 2019-20 financial years.

3.5 Work has progressed quicker than originally anticipated, with the current programme indicating that the final works will be complete in late May 2019. It is also forecast that the
4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. If no changes are made to the budgets, the current financial year’s budget will be overspent by approximately $280,000 and the next financial year’s budget of $365,500 will not be utilised at all.

4.2. The recommended approach is to bring forward the budget required for the completion of the project this financial year, and remove the remaining budget from next financial year that is not required.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

5.2. The Woodend-Sefton Community Board and Gladstone Park Advisory Group were consulted with during the planning stages of this project.

5.3. **Wider Community**

5.4. The Woodend, Tuahiwi and Pegasus communities were consulted with during the options assessment stage of the wider project, before the decision was made to join the schemes.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

6.2. The following table summarises the current financial status of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Tender Total</th>
<th>18-19</th>
<th>19-20</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Expenditure to Date</th>
<th>Remaining on Contract</th>
<th>Known variations</th>
<th>Fees and Contingency</th>
<th>Total Projected Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone and Pegasus Raw Water Main – LOS (101106.000.5103)</td>
<td>$477,849</td>
<td>$335,850</td>
<td>$255,850</td>
<td>$255,850</td>
<td>$277,699</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$727,158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone and Pegasus Raw Water Main – Growth (101106.000.5105)</td>
<td>$109,650</td>
<td>$109,650</td>
<td>$219,300</td>
<td>$109,650</td>
<td>$277,699</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$727,158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$477,849</td>
<td>$445,500</td>
<td>$365,500</td>
<td>$811,000</td>
<td>$371,459</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$727,158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3. There are two key ways in which actual expenditure is forecast to differ from that budgeted:

6.3.1. The final project cost is expected to be approximately $84,000 less than the total budgeted amount.

6.3.2. All expenditure is to occur within the current financial year, with no expenditure forecast within the 2019-20 financial year.

6.4. **Community Implications**
6.5. This project will have positive impacts on the residents on the Woodend and Pegasus schemes by providing a more reliable level of treatment and a more resilient water supply.

6.6. Risk Management

6.7. With the contract nearing completion, the scope for unexpected events to affect the project significantly in terms of timeframe or budget is limited. There has however been a contingency of $50,000 retained for any such event.

6.8. The key area of risk in terms of the remaining physical works is the cut-in towards the end of this project. This will require a high level of coordination to ensure this is done in a way that is both safe, and avoids any water outages. Specific thought was put into this during the design and tendering stage, and the successful contractor demonstrated a sound methodology as to how this will be achieved.

6.9. Health and Safety

6.10. Health and Safety is being managed through Council’s standard health and safety systems for construction works. There have been no reportable health and safety events during this contract thus far.

7. CONTEXT

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

7.2. Legislation
The Health (Drinking-water) Amendment Act is relevant in this matter.

7.3. Community Outcomes
This report relates to the following community outcomes:
- There is a safe environment for all.
- Core utility services are provided in a timely, sustainable, and affordable manner.

7.4. Delegations
The Council has the delegated authority to adjust or remove budgets.
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1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report seeks to refresh the Elected Member Code of Conduct and associated documents for the Council.

Attachments:

d. Proposed Elected Member Code of Conduct (Trim 190228024595)
ii. Current Elected Member Code of Conduct (Trim 101011037110)
iii. Extract of Standing Orders – sections 17 and 19. (Trim 190424059255)
v. Proposed updated Code of Conduct Committee Terms of Reference. (Trim 190424059278)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Council:

(a) Receives report No. 190311029913.

(b) Adopts the 2019 Elected Member Code of Conduct, effective from 7 May 2019. (Trim 190228024595).

(c) Amends Standing Orders section 17, as per Trim 190424059255, enabling the Committee Chair to exclude elected members not directly involved in the Code of Conduct Committee under the same regulations as LGOIMA.

(d) Adopts the 2019 Code of Conduct Committee Terms of Reference (Trim 190424059278).

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

3. BACKGROUND

3.1. The Council is required by legislation to have a Code of Conduct in place at all times. Amendments to the Code of Conduct (the Code) require a resolution supported by 75% or more of the Councillors present.

3.1 The current Code was adopted by this Council in October 2016. A new Code was proposed at the October 2016 meeting, however the Council chose to adopt a similar
version to the 2013 Code. The Council did note that it would review the 2016 Code later in the term.

3.2 A briefing session was postponed from the 12 March and occurred on 9 April 2019 where the proposed new Code of Conduct was discussed. Feedback from that briefing has been incorporated into associated documents.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1 The recommended Code of Conduct has been based on the Local Government New Zealand template, which has been designed to incorporate recent legislative change, new approaches to good governance and provide better advice for councils having to deal with alleged breaches. The focus has been widened from controlling poor behaviour to promoting an inclusive and positive governance culture. Good governance assists with being trusted and respected and the greater ability to enlist the support of the community and other agencies in the goal of improving outcomes and meeting strategic goals. The Code applies to Councillors in their dealings with each other, Council officers, the public and the media.

4.2 New features of the Code include:
- refinement of the principles including a new principle that highlights the importance of elected members “pulling their weight”;
- simplification of the roles and responsibilities section;
- encouragement for members to participate in activities to build and maintain collaborative and cooperative cultures within the council;
- a new process for investigating and assessing complaints, including a ‘materiality’ test;
- additional guidance on penalties or sanctions;
- clarification that complaints can only be made by members and chief executives; and
- a more empowering and less prescriptive approach.

4.3 The new Code has four objectives:
- to enhance the effectiveness of the local authority and the provision of good local government of the community and district;
- to promote effective decision-making and community engagement;
- to enhance the credibility and accountability of the local authority to its communities; and
- to develop a culture of mutual trust, respect and tolerance between the members of the local authority and between the members and management.

4.4 Alleged breaches

In previous terms where issues have occasionally arisen, an approach seeking early low-level resolution has often proved successful.

4.5 Options
- Retain the 2016 Code of Conduct.
- Adopt the new 2019 Code of Conduct, which is based on the LGNZ best practice. (recommended)
- Refer the Code to a subsequent Council meeting or Council Committee for review.
4.6. **Community Boards**

The Council Code of Conduct is proposed to be presented to the Community Boards during June/July 2019, if adopted by the Council, to ensure a consistent approach to behaviour and the handling of any potential breaches.

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

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

No views have been sought.

5.2. **Wider Community**

No views have been sought.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**

There are no financial implications.

6.2. **Community Implications**

To enhance the credibility and accountability of the local authority to its communities and to develop a culture of mutual trust, respect and tolerance between the members of the Council, staff, media and the community.

6.3. **Risk Management**

The Code promotes a culture of mutual trust, respect and tolerance.

6.4. **Health and Safety**

The Code aids the responsibilities of the Council being a good employer, raising awareness of unacceptable behaviour such as bullying and sexual harassment and outlining the process on potential behavioural breaches.

7. **CONTEXT**

7.1. **Policy**

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

7.2. **Legislation**


7.3. **Community Outcomes**

There is a safe environment for all.

7.4. **Delegations**

Not applicable as the Council is required, by legislation, to have a Code of Conduct operable at all times.

Sarah Nichols
Governance Manager
PROPOSED
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

Elected Member
Code of Conduct

Proposed to be
Adopted on the 7 May 2019
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1. Introduction

This Code of Conduct (the Code) sets out the standards of behavior expected from elected members in the exercise of their duties. Its purpose is to:

- enhance the effectiveness of the local authority and the provision of good local government of the community, and district;
- promote effective decision-making and community engagement;
- enhance the credibility and accountability of the local authority to its communities; and
- develop a culture of mutual trust, respect and tolerance between the elected members of the local authority and between the elected members and management.

This purpose is given effect through the values, roles, responsibilities and specific behaviors agreed in this Code.

2. Scope

The Code has been adopted in accordance with clause 15 of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA 2002) and applies to all elected members, including the elected members of any community boards that have agreed to adopt it. The Code is designed to deal with the behaviour(s) of elected members towards:

- each other;
- the Chief Executive and staff;
- the media; and
- the general public.

It is also concerned with the disclosure of information that elected members receive in their capacity as elected members and information which impacts on the ability of the local authority to give effect to its statutory responsibilities.

This Code can only be amended (or substituted by a replacement Code) by a vote of at least 75 per cent of elected members present at a meeting when amendment to the Code is being considered. The Code should be read in conjunction with the Council’s Standing Orders.
3. Principles

The Code is designed to give effect to the following values:

1. **An elected member will act in the public interest**: elected members will serve the best interests of the people within their community, district or region and discharge their duties conscientiously, to the best of their ability.

2. **An elected member will build public trust**: elected members, in order to foster community confidence and trust in their Council, will work together constructively and uphold the values of honesty, integrity, accountability and transparency.

3. **An elected member will behave ethically**: elected members will not place themselves in situations where their honesty and integrity may be questioned, will not behave improperly and will avoid the appearance of any such behavior.

4. **An elected member will consider matters objectivity**: elected members will make decisions on merit; including appointments, awarding contracts, and recommending individuals for rewards or benefits.

5. **An elected member will show respect for others**: will treat people, including other elected members, with respect and courtesy, regardless of their race, age, religion, gender, sexual orientation, or disability. Elected members will respect the impartiality and integrity of officials.

6. **An elected member has a duty to uphold the law**: elected members will comply with all legislative requirements applying to their role, abide by this Code of Conduct, and act in accordance with the trust placed in them by the public.

7. **An elected member will make an equitable contribution**: elected members will take all reasonable steps to ensure they fulfil the duties and responsibilities of office, including attending meetings and workshops, preparing for meetings, attending civic events, and participating in relevant training seminars.

8. **An elected member will demonstrate leadership**: elected members will actively promote and support these values and ensure they are reflected in the way in which the Council operates, including a regular review and assessment of the Council’s collective performance.

These values complement, and work in conjunction with, the principles of s.14 of the LGA 2002 and the governance principles of s.39 of the LGA 2002.
4. Role and responsibilities

Good governance requires clarity of roles and respect between those charged with responsibility for the leadership of the Council and those responsible for advice and the implementation of Council decisions. The key roles are:

4.1 Elected Members

The role of the governing body includes:

- representing the interests of the people of the district;
- developing and adopting plans, policies and budgets;
- monitoring the performance of the Council against stated goals and objectives set out in its long term plan;
- providing prudent stewardship of the Council’s resources;
- employing and monitoring the performance of the Chief Executive;
- ensuring the Council fulfils its responsibilities to be a ‘good employer’ and meets the requirements of the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015; and
- ensuring that the Principles, Values and Behaviours described in the Council’s Ta Matou Mauri are embodied in all interactions.

4.2 Chief Executive

The role of the Chief Executive includes:

- providing policy advice to the Council and implementing the decisions of the Council;
- ensuring that all responsibilities delegated to the Chief Executive are properly performed or exercised;
- ensuring the effective and efficient management of the activities of the local authority;
- maintaining systems to enable effective planning and accurate reporting of the financial and service performance of the local authority;
- providing leadership for the staff of the Council; and
- employing staff on behalf of the Council (including negotiation of the terms of employment for those staff).

Under s.42 of the LGA 2002 the Chief Executive is the only person directly employed by the Council itself. All concerns about the performance of an individual member of staff must, in the first instance, be referred to the Chief Executive.
5. Relationships

This section of the Code sets out agreed standards of behaviour between elected members; elected members and staff; and elected members and the public.

5.1 Relationships between elected members

Given the importance of relationships to the effective performance of the Council, elected members will conduct their dealings with each other in a manner that:

- maintains public confidence;
- is open and honest;
- is courteous;
- is focused on issues rather than personalities;
- avoids abuse of meeting procedures, such as a pattern of unnecessary notices of motion and/or repetitious points of order; and
- avoids aggressive, offensive or abusive conduct, including the use of disrespectful or malicious language; and
- avoid any form of bullying or sexual harassment.

Any failure by elected members to act in the manner described above represents a breach of this Code.

Please note that nothing in this section of the Code is intended to limit robust debate within the Council as long as it is conducted in a respectful and insightful manner.

5.2 Relationships with staff

An important element of good governance involves the relationship between the Council and its Chief Executive. Elected members will respect arrangements put in place to facilitate this relationship, and:

- raise any concerns about employees, officers or contracted officials with the Chief Executive;
- raise any concerns about the performance or behaviour of the Chief Executive with the Mayor or the chairperson of the Chief Executive performance review committee (however described);
- make themselves aware of the obligations that the Council and the Chief Executive have as employers and observe those requirements at all times, such as the duty to be a good employer;
• treat all employees with courtesy and respect and avoid publicly criticising any employee;
• avoid familiar, aggressive, offensive or abusive conduct towards any employee; and
• avoid any form of bullying or sexual harassment;
• observe any protocols put in place by the Chief Executive concerning contact between elected members and employees;
• avoid doing anything which might compromise, or could be seen as compromising, the impartiality of an employee.

Any failure by elected members to act in the manner described above represents a breach of this Code.

Please note: Elected members should be aware that failure to observe this portion of the Code may compromise the Council’s obligations to be a good employer and consequently expose the Council to civil litigation or affect the risk assessment of Council’s management and governance control processes undertaken as part of the Council’s audit.

5.3 Relationship with members of the public

Given that the performance of the Council requires the trust and respect of individual citizens, elected members will:
• interact with members of the public and all community board members in a fair, respectful, equitable and honest manner;
• be available to listen and respond openly and honestly to community concerns;
• consider all points of view or interests of members of the public and community board members when participating in debate and making decisions;
• treat members of the public and community board members in a courteous manner; and
• act in a way that upholds the reputation of the local authority.

Any failure by elected member to act in the manner described above represents a breach of this Code.
6. **Contact with the media**

The media play an important part in the operation and efficacy of local democracy. In order to fulfil this role the media needs access to accurate and timely information about the affairs of Council.

From time to time individual elected members will be approached to comment on a particular issue either on behalf of the Council, or as an elected member in their own right. When responding to the media elected members must be mindful that operational questions should be referred to the Chief Executive and policy-related questions referred to the Mayor or the member with the appropriate delegated authority. ie portfolio holder or Chair of Standing Committee.

When speaking to the media more generally elected members will abide by the following provisions:

6.1 **Media contact on behalf of the Council**

- the Mayor is the first point of contact for an official view on any issue, unless delegations state otherwise. Where the Mayor is absent requests for comment will be referred to the Deputy Mayor or relevant standing committee chairperson or portfolio holder;
- the Mayor may refer any matter to the relevant committee chairperson, portfolio holder, community board chairperson or to the Chief Executive for their comment; and
- no other elected member may comment *on behalf of the Council* without having first obtained the approval of the Mayor, or his/her delegate.

6.2 **Media comment on a member’s own behalf**

Elected members are free to express a *personal view* in the media, at any time, provided the following rules are observed:

- media comments must not state or imply that they represent the views of the Council;
- media comments which are contrary to a Council decision or policy must clearly state that they do not represent the views of the majority of elected members;
- media comments must observe the other requirements of the Code; for example, comments should not disclose confidential information, criticize, or compromise the impartiality or integrity of staff; and
7. Information

Access to information is critical to the effective performance of a local authority and the level of public trust felt by the public.

7.1 Confidential information

In the course of their duties elected members will occasionally receive information that is confidential. This will generally be information that is either commercially sensitive or is personal to a particular individual or organisation. Accordingly, elected members agree not to use or disclose confidential information for any purpose other than the purpose for which the information was supplied to the member.

Elected members should be aware that failure to observe these provisions could impede the performance of the Council by inhibiting information flows and undermining public confidence in the Council. Failure to observe these provisions may also expose the Council to prosecution under the Privacy Act or civil litigation.

7.2 Information received in capacity as an elected member

Elected members will disclose to other elected members and, where appropriate the Chief Executive, any information received in their capacity as an elected member that concerns the Council’s ability to give effect to its responsibilities.

Elected members who are offered information on the condition that it remains confidential will inform the provider of the information that it is their duty to disclose the information and will decline the offer if that duty is likely to be compromised.

Any failure by elected members to act in the manner described above represents a breach of this Code.

Please note: failure to observe these provisions may impede the performance of the Council by inhibiting information flows and undermining public confidence. It may also expose the Council to prosecution under the Privacy Act and/or civil litigation.
8. **Conflicts of Interest**

Elected members will maintain a clear separation between their personal interests and their duties as elected members in order to ensure that they are free from bias (whether real or perceived). Elected members therefore must familiarise themselves with the provisions of the Local Authorities (Members’ Interests) Act 1968 (LAMIA).

Elected members will not participate in any Council discussion or vote on any matter in which they have a pecuniary interest, other than an interest in common with the general public. This rule also applies where the member’s spouse/partner contracts with the authority or has a pecuniary interest. Elected members shall make a declaration of interest as soon as practicable after becoming aware of any such interests.

If a member is in any doubt as to whether or not a particular course of action (including a decision to take no action) raises a conflict of interest, then the member should seek guidance from the Chief Executive *immediately*. Elected members may also contact the Office of the Auditor General for guidance as to whether they have a pecuniary interest, and if so, may seek an exemption to allow that member to participate or vote on a particular issue in which they may have a pecuniary interest. The latter must be done before the discussion or vote.

**Please note:** Failure to observe the requirements of the LAMIA could potentially invalidate the decision made, or the action taken, by the Council. Failure to observe these requirements could also leave the elected member open to prosecution (*see Appendix A*). In the event of a conviction, elected members can be ousted from office.

If elected members have a non-pecuniary interest in a matter for decision and for which a member of the public may perceive bias this should be carefully considered by the member as to whether it should also be declared. (*see Appendix A for a further explanation*).
9. **Register of Interests**

Elected members will be requested to make a bi-annual declaration of interest at the ordinary Council meeting held in June and December each year. These declarations are recorded in a Register of Interests maintained by the Council and listed on the Council website. The declaration must include information on the nature and extent of any interest, including:

a) any employment, trade or profession carried on by the elected member or the members’ spouse/partner for profit or gain;

b) any company, trust, partnership etc for which the member or their spouse/partner is a director, partner or trustee;

c) the address of any land in which the member has a beneficial interest within the jurisdiction of the local authority; and

d) the address of any land owned by the local authority in which the member or their spouse/partner is:
   - a tenant; or
   - the land is tenanted by a firm in which the member or spouse/partner is a partner, a company of which the member or spouse/partner is a director, or a trust of which the member or spouse/partner is a trustee:

e) any other matters which the public might reasonably regard as likely to influence the member’s actions during the course of their duties as a member (if the member is in any doubt on this, the member should seek guidance from the Chief Executive)

**Please note:** Where a member’s circumstances change they must ensure that the Register of Interests is updated as soon as practicable by notifying the Governance Manager.
10. Ethical behaviour

Elected Members will seek to promote the highest standards of ethical conduct. Accordingly elected members will:

- claim only for legitimate expenses as determined by the Remuneration Authority and any lawful policy of the Council developed in accordance with that determination;
- not influence, or attempt to influence, any Council employee, officer or member in order to benefit their own, or families personal or business interests;
- only use the Council resources (such as facilities, staff, equipment and supplies) in the course of their duties and not in connection with any election campaign or personal interests; and not solicit, demand, or request any gift, reward or benefit by virtue of their position and notify the Chief Executive if any such gifts are accepted. Where a gift to the value of $100 or more is accepted by a member, that member must immediately disclose this to the Chief Executive for inclusion in the publicly available register of interests.

Any failure by elected members to comply with the provisions set out in this section represents a breach of this Code.

10.1 Undischarged bankrupt

In accordance with clause 15(5) of Schedule 7 (LGA 2002) any member who is an “undischarged bankrupt” will notify the Chief Executive prior to the inaugural meeting or as soon as practicable after being declared bankrupt. The member will also provide the Chief Executive with a brief explanatory statement of the circumstances surrounding the member’s adjudication and the likely outcome of the bankruptcy. This Council believes that bankruptcy does raise questions about the soundness of a person’s financial management skills and their judgement in general.

10.2 Disqualification from office

Elected members are automatically disqualified from office if they are convicted of a criminal offence punishable by two or more year’s imprisonment, or if they cease to be or lose their status as an elector or of certain breaches of the Local Authorities (Members’ Interests) Act 1968.
11. Creating a supportive and inclusive environment

In accordance with the purpose of the Code, elected members agree to take all reasonable steps in order to participate in activities scheduled to promote a culture of mutual trust, respect and tolerance. These include:

- Attending post-election induction programmes organised by the Council for the purpose of facilitating agreement on the Council’s vision, goals and objectives and the manner and operating style by which elected members will work.
- Taking part in any assessment of the Council’s overall performance and operating style during the triennium.
- Taking all reasonable steps to ensure they possess the skills and knowledge to effectively fulfill their Declaration of Office and contribute to the good governance of the district or region.

12. Breaches of the Code

Elected members must comply with the provisions of this Code (LGA 2002, schedule 5, s. 14(4)). Any member, or the Chief Executive, who believes that the Code has been breached by the behaviour of an elected member, may make a complaint to that effect. All complaints will be considered in a manner that is consistent with the following principles.

12.1 Principles:

The following principles will guide any processes for investigating and determining whether or not a breach under this Code has occurred:

- that the approach for investigating and assessing a complaint will be proportionate to the apparent seriousness of the breach complained about;
- that the roles of complaint, investigation, advice and decision-making will be kept separate as appropriate to the nature and complexity of the alleged breach; and
- that the concepts of natural justice and fairness will apply in the determination of any complaints made under this Code. This requires, conditional on the nature of an alleged breach, that affected parties:
  - have a right to know that an investigation process is underway;
  - are given due notice and are provided with an opportunity to be heard;
  - have a right to seek appropriate advice and be represented; and
  - have their privacy respected.
12.2 Complaints

All complaints made under this Code must be made in writing, making specific reference to any allegation of breach and forwarded to the Chief Executive. On receipt of a complaint from an elected member, member of the public or a staff member, the Chief Executive will consult with the Mayor (or if the complaint is against the Mayor, the Chief Executive will consult with the Deputy Mayor) and undertake a preliminary assessment to determine, prima facie, the level of seriousness, as outlined in this Code of Conduct.

12.3 Investigation, advice and decision

The Code of Conduct Committee, established at the start of each triennium, is responsible for overseeing alleged complaints that are considered material, as outlined in clause 12.4.

The Committee may seek advice from the Chief Executive, Mayor, or whomever it considers would assist it in its decision making.

The process, following receipt of a complaint, is outlined in Appendix B.

12.4 Materiality

An alleged breach under this Code is material if, in the opinion of the Chief Executive and/or Mayor, it would, if proven, bring a member or the Council into disrepute or, if not addressed, reflect adversely on another member of the Council.

An alleged breach under this Code is non-material if, in the opinion of the Chief Executive and/or Mayor, that it does not warrant an investigation then clause 13.3 applies.
13. Penalties and actions

Where a complaint is determined to be material and referred to the Council the nature of any penalty or action will depend on the seriousness of the breach.

13.1 Material breaches

In the case of material breaches of this Code, the Code of Conduct Committee which holds delegated authority to investigate a material breach, may recommend to the Council one of the following:

1. a letter of censure to the member;
2. a request (made either privately or publicly) for an apology;
3. a vote of no confidence in the member;
4. removal of certain Council-funded privileges (such as attendance at conferences);
5. restricted entry to Council offices, such as no access to staff areas (where restrictions may not previously have existed);
6. limitation on any dealings with Council staff so that they are confined to the Chief Executive only;
7. suspension from committees or other bodies; or
8. an invitation for the member to consider resigning from the Council.

The Council, or Code of Conduct Committee, may decide that a penalty will not be imposed where a respondent agrees to one or more of the following:

- attend a relevant training course; and/or
- work with a mentor for a period of time; and/or
- participate in voluntary mediation (if the complaint involves a conflict between two elected members); and/or
- tender an apology.

The process is based on the presumption that the outcome of a complaints process will be made public unless there are grounds, such as those set out in the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA), for not doing so.
13.2 Statutory breaches

In cases where a breach of the Code is found to involve regulatory or legislative requirements, the complaint will be referred to the relevant agency. For example:

- breaches relating to elected members’ interests (where elected members may be liable for prosecution by the Auditor-General under the LAMIA);
- breaches which result in the Council suffering financial loss or damage (where the Auditor-General may make a report on the loss or damage under s.30 of the LGA 2002 which may result in the member having to make good the loss or damage); or
- breaches relating to the commission of a criminal offence which will be referred to the Police (which may leave the elected member liable for criminal prosecution).

13.3 Non-material breaches

Either following the Chief Executive and Mayoral assessment or initial feedback from an independent investigator the breach may be considered non-material. In that event, low level resolution of the matter may be pursued including a meeting of the parties, an apology or other courses of action considered appropriate by the Mayor.

14. Review

Once adopted, a Code of Conduct continues in force until amended by the Council. The Code can be amended at any time but cannot be revoked unless the Council replaces it with another Code (LGA 2002 Schedule 7 s.15). Once adopted, amendments to the Code require a resolution supported by 75 per cent of the elected members of the Council present at a Council meeting where the amendment is considered.

Council may formally review the Code as soon as practicable after the beginning of each triennium. The results of that review will be considered by the Council in regard to potential changes for improving the Code.

15. Disqualification of Elected Members from Office

Elected members are automatically disqualified from office if they are convicted of a criminal offence punishable by two or more years imprisonment, or if they cease to be or lose their status as an elector or of certain breaches of the Local Authorities (Members’ Interests) Act 1968.
Appendix A: Legislation bearing on the role and conduct of elected members

This is a summary of the legislative requirements that have some bearing on the duties and conduct of elected members. The full statutes can be found at www.legislation.govt.nz.

The Local Authorities (Members’ Interests) Act 1968

The Local Authorities (Members’ Interests) Act 1968 (LAMIA) provides rules about elected members discussing and voting on matters in which they have a pecuniary interest and about contracts between elected members and the Council.

A pecuniary interest is likely to exist if a matter under consideration could reasonably give rise to an expectation of a gain or loss of money for a member personally (or for their spouse/partner or a company in which they have an interest). In relation to pecuniary interests the LAMIA applies to both contracting and participating in decision-making processes.

With regard to pecuniary or financial interests a person is deemed to be “concerned or interested” in a contract or interested “directly or indirectly” in a decision when:

- a person, or spouse or partner, is “concerned or interested” in the contract or where they have a pecuniary interest in the decision; or
- a person, or their spouse or partner, is involved in a company that is “concerned or interested” in the contract or where the company has a pecuniary interest in the decision.

There can also be additional situations where a person is potentially “concerned or interested” in a contract or have a pecuniary interest in a decision, such as where a contract is between an elected members’ family trust and the Council.

Determining whether a pecuniary interest exists

Elected members are often faced with the question of whether or not they have a pecuniary interest in a decision and if so whether they should participate in discussion on that decision and vote. When determining if this is the case or not the following test is applied:

“...whether, if the matter were dealt with in a particular way, discussing or voting on that matter could reasonably give rise to an expectation of a gain or loss of money for the member concerned.” (OAG, 2001)
LAMIA – Section 6

“Member of local authority or committee not to discuss or vote on question in which he/she has pecuniary interest;

(1) A member of a local authority or of a committee thereof shall not vote on or take part in the discussion of any matter before the governing body of that local authority or before that committee in which he has, directly or indirectly, any pecuniary interest, other than an interest in common with the public.

(2) For the purposes of subsection (1), where an incorporated company has, directly or indirectly, a pecuniary interest in a matter before the governing body of a local authority or before a committee thereof, a member of the local authority or, as the case may be, of the committee shall be deemed to have a pecuniary interest in the matter, if—

(a) the member or his spouse or partner singly or between them own, whether directly or through a nominee, 10% or more of the issued capital of the company or of any other company controlling that company;

In deciding whether you have a pecuniary interest, elected members should consider the following factors.

- What is the nature of the decision being made?
- Do I have a financial interest in that decision - do I have a reasonable expectation of gain or loss of money by making that decision?
- Is my financial interest one that is in common with the public?
- Do any of the exceptions in the LAMIA apply to me?
- Could I apply to the Auditor-General for approval to participate?

Elected members may seek assistance from the Mayor or other person such as the Chief Executive to determine if they should discuss or vote on an issue but ultimately it is their own judgment as to whether or not they have pecuniary interest in the decision. Any member who is uncertain as to whether they have a pecuniary interest is advised to seek legal advice. Where uncertainty exists elected members may adopt a least-risk approach which is to not participate in discussions or vote on any decisions.

Elected members who do have a pecuniary interest will declare the pecuniary interest to the meeting and not participate in the discussion or voting. The declaration and abstention needs to be recorded in the meeting minutes. (Further requirements are set out in the Council’s Standing Orders.)
The contracting rule

A member is disqualified from office if he or she is “concerned or interested” in contracts with their Council if the total payments made, or to be made, by or on behalf of the Council exceed $25,000 in any financial year. The $25,000 limit includes GST. The limit relates to the value of all payments made for all contracts in which you are interested during the financial year. It does not apply separately to each contract, nor is it just the amount of the profit the contractor expects to make or the portion of the payments to be personally received by you.

The Auditor-General can give prior approval, and in limited cases, retrospective approval for contracts that would otherwise disqualify you under the Act. It is an offence under the Act for a person to act as a member of the Council (or committee of the Council) while disqualified.

Non-pecuniary conflicts of interest

In addition to the issue of pecuniary interests, rules and common law govern conflicts of interest more generally. These rules apply to non-pecuniary conflicts of interest, including common law rules about bias. In order to determine if bias exists or not elected members need to ask:

“Is there a real danger of bias on the part of the member of the decision-making body, in the sense that he or she might unfairly regard with favour (or disfavour) the case of a party to the issue under consideration?”

The question is not limited to actual bias, but relates to the appearance or possibility of bias reflecting the principle that justice should not only be done, but should be seen to be done. Whether or not elected members believe they are not biased is irrelevant.

Elected members should focus be on the nature of the conflicting interest or relationship and the risk it could pose for the decision-making process. The most common risks of non-pecuniary bias are where:

- elected members’ statements or conduct indicate that they have predetermined the decision before hearing all relevant information (that is, elected members have a “closed mind”); and
- elected members have a close relationship or involvement with an individual or organisation affected by the decision.

In determining whether or not they might be perceived as biased, elected members must also take into account the context and circumstance of the issue or question under consideration. For example, if a member has stood on a platform and been voted into office on the promise of implementing that platform then voters would have every expectation that the member would give effect to that promise, however he/she must still be seen to be open to considering new information (this may not apply to decisions made in quasi-judicial settings, such as an RMA hearing).
Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

The Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 sets out a list of meetings procedures and requirements that apply to local authorities and community boards. Of particular importance for the roles and conduct of elected members is the fact that the chairperson has the responsibility to maintain order at meetings, but all elected members should accept a personal responsibility to maintain acceptable standards of address and debate. No elected member should:

- create a disturbance or a distraction while another Councillor is speaking;
- be disrespectful when they refer to each other or other people; or
- use offensive language about the Council, other elected members (including community board members), any employee of the Council or any member of the public.

See Standing Orders for more detail.

Secret Commissions Act 1910

Under this Act it is unlawful for an elected member (or officer) to advise anyone to enter into a contract with a third person and receive a gift or reward from that third person as a result, or to present false receipts to Council.

If convicted of any offence under this Act a person can be imprisoned for up to two years, and/or fines up to $1,000. A conviction would therefore trigger the ouster provisions of the LGA 2002 and result in the removal of the member from office.

Crimes Act 1961

Under this Act it is unlawful for an elected member (or officer) to:

- accept or solicit for themselves (or anyone else) any gift or reward for acting or not acting in relation to the business of Council; and
- use information gained in the course of their duties for their, or another persons, monetary gain or advantage.

These offences are punishable by a term of imprisonment of seven years or more. Elected members convicted of these offences will automatically cease to be elected members.
Financial Markets Conduct Act 2013

Financial Markets Conduct Act 2013 (previously the Securities Act 1978) essentially places elected members in the same position as company directors whenever Council offers stock to the public. Elected members may be personally liable if investment documents such as a prospectus contain untrue statements and may be liable for criminal prosecution if the requirements of the Act are not met.

The Local Government Act 2002

The Local Government Act 2002 (LGA 2002) sets out the general powers of local government, its purpose and operating principles. Provisions directly relevant to this Code include:

Personal liability of elected members

Although having qualified privilege, elected members can be held personally accountable for losses incurred by a local authority where, following a report from the Auditor General under s.44 LGA 2002, it is found that one of the following applies:

a) money belonging to, or administered by, a local authority has been unlawfully expended; or
b) an asset has been unlawfully sold or otherwise disposed of by the local authority; or
c) a liability has been unlawfully incurred by the local authority; or
d) a local authority has intentionally or negligently failed to enforce the collection of money it is lawfully entitled to receive.

Elected members will not be personally liable where they can prove that the act or failure to act resulting in the loss occurred as a result of one of the following:

a) without the member’s knowledge;
b) with the member’s knowledge but against the member’s protest made at or before the time when the loss occurred;
c) contrary to the manner in which the member voted on the issue; and
d) in circumstances where, although being a party to the act or failure to act, the member acted in good faith and relied on reports, statements, financial data, or other information from professional or expert advisers, namely staff or external experts on the matters.

In certain situation elected members will also be responsible for paying the costs of proceedings (s.47 LGA 2002).
Appendix B: Process for the determination and investigation of complaints

Step 1: Chief Executive receives complaint

On receipt of a complaint under this Code of Conduct the Chief Executive will:

- acknowledge receipt of a complaint under the Code, and advise steps that will be taken;
- inform the Mayor (or Deputy Mayor if the complaint is against the Mayor);
- inform the respondent that a complaint has been made against them.

Step 2: Chief Executive and Mayor undertake preliminary assessment

On receipt of a complaint the Chief Executive, in conjunction with the Mayor (or Deputy Mayor if the complaint is against the Mayor), will undertake a preliminary assessment to assess, prima facie, whether:

1. the complaint is frivolous or without substance and should be dismissed;
2. the complaint is outside the scope of the Code and should be redirected to another agency or process;
3. the complaint is non-material; or
4. the complaint is material and a full investigation is required.

The Chief Executive and Mayor can also request from the complainant further information/evidence in support of the complaint and, if considered appropriate, may also request a preliminary statement in response from the elected member against whom the complaint is lodged.

Step 3: Non-material breach

Where it is determined the matter to be a non-material (low level) breach, frivolous or without substance the Mayor will inform the complainant and respondent directly; neither of which persons are open to challenge the decision of the Mayor. The Mayor may inform other elected members (if there are no grounds for confidentiality) of the decision.

The Mayor may determine a low level resolution be pursued including a meeting of the parties, an apology or other courses of action considered appropriate by the Mayor (ie attendance of courses or programmes to increase their knowledge and understanding of the matters leading to the complaint). Any recommendations made in response to a non-material breach are non-binding on the respondent and the Council.
Step 4: Complaint is redirected

Where it is determined the complaint is considered outside the scope of the Code and should be redirected to another agency or process or a full investigation is required then the matter will be referred to an independent investigator\(^1\) selected from a panel agreed at the start of the triennium.

The Chief Executive will:

- Inform the complainant that the complaint has been referred to the independent investigator, the name of the investigator, and refer them to the process for dealing with complaints as set out in the Code; and
- Inform the respondent that the complaint made against them has been referred to an independent investigator, the name of the investigator and refer them to the process for dealing with complaints as set out in the Code.

Step 5: Material Allegation/Complaint: Code of Conduct Committee Oversees Investigation

If a material allegation/complaint is received the Code of Conduct Committee will receive a report from the Chief Executive and/or Mayor with recommendations as to the approach the Committee may wish to consider.

The Committee will determine the scope and terms of reference of any further enquiry or investigation required.

On completing an investigation of the allegation/complaint, the investigator will furnish the Code of Conduct Committee the full written report of the investigation including conclusions and any recommendations.

On receiving the investigator's assessment the Code of Conduct Committee will:

1. in cases where an investigator determines that an allegation/complaint is frivolous or without substance, inform the Mayor, complainant and respondent directly and inform other elected members (if there are no grounds for confidentiality) of the investigator’s decision; \(\textit{(Refer to Step 3)}\).
2. in cases where the investigator finds that the allegation/complaint involves a potential legislative breach and outside the scope of the Code, forward the complaint to the relevant agency and inform both the complainant and respondent of the action.

---

\(^1\) On behalf of the Council the Chief Executive will, shortly after the start of a triennium, prepare, in consultation with the Mayor, a list of investigators for this purpose of undertaking an investigation and assessment. The Chief Executive may prepare a list specifically for his/her Council, prepare a list jointly with neighbouring councils or contract with an agency capable of providing appropriate investigators, such as EquiP.
Step 6: Actions where a breach is found to be material

The findings and conclusions of the investigator’s report will be reported to the Code of Conduct Committee, and the complainant and respondent will be informed. The Committee will then determine what action should be taken and make a recommendation to the Council.

The Code of Conduct Committee will consider the Chief Executive’s report and/or investigator’s report in open meeting, except where the alleged breach concerns matters that justify the exclusion of the public, such as the misuse of confidential information or a matter that would otherwise be exempt from public disclosure under s.48 of the LGOIMA, in which case it will be a closed meeting.

Before making any decision in respect of the investigator’s report the Code of Conduct Committee, and as necessary, the Council will give the member against whom the complaint has been made an opportunity to appear and speak in their own defence.

Elected members with a direct interest in the proceedings, including the complainant and the respondent, may not take part in the deliberation sections of the proceedings.

The form of penalty that might be applied will depend on the nature of the breach and may include actions set out in section 13.1 of this Code.

The Council notes the Code of Conduct Committee determined at the beginning of the 2016-19 triennium consists of the following panel:

Deputy Mayor Felstead (Chair), Councillor Atkinson, Councillor Brine and Councillor Doody.
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WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

CODE OF CONDUCT

INTRODUCTION

Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002 (the Act) requires each local authority to adopt a code of conduct. Once adopted, all elected members are required to comply with the code.

1. This code of conduct provides guidance on the standards of behaviour that are expected from the Mayor and elected members of the Waimakariri District Council. The code applies to elected members in their dealings with:
   - each other
   - the Chief Executive
   - all staff employed by the Chief Executive on behalf of the council
   - the media
   - the general public.

2. This code does not apply to members of any Community Boards. Boards prepare their own code (substantially similar to this one).

3. The objective of the code is to enhance:
   - the effectiveness of the council as the autonomous local authority with statutory responsibilities for the good local government of the Waimakariri District
   - the credibility and accountability of the council within its community
   - mutual trust, respect and tolerance between the elected members as a group and between the elected members and staff.

4. This code of conduct seeks to achieve its objectives by recording:
   - an agreed statement of roles and responsibilities
   - agreed general principles of conduct
   - specific codes of conduct applying to particular circumstances or matters

5. Elected members are primarily accountable to the electors of the district through the democratic process. However members must note that the Auditor-General may hold them to account for unlawful actions or expenditure or for breaches of the Local Authorities (Members’ Interests) Act 1968.
ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF ELECTED MEMBERS

This part of the code describes the roles and responsibilities of elected members, the additional role of the Mayor and Deputy Mayor, and the role of the Chief Executive.

6. **Elected Members**

Elected Members have declared that:

They will faithfully and impartially, and according to the best of their skill and judgement, execute and perform, in the best interests of the Waimakariri District Council the powers, authorities and duties vested in or imposed upon them as Councillors 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.

Elected members, acting as the council, are responsible for –

- the development and adoption of council policy;
- monitoring the performance of the council against its stated objectives and policies;
- prudent stewardship of council resources;
- employment of the Chief Executive; and
- representing the interests of the residents and ratepayers of the Waimakariri District Council. (On election, the members’ first responsibility is to the district as a whole.)

Unless otherwise provided in the Local Government Act 2002 or in standing orders, the council can only act by majority decisions at meetings. Each member has one vote. Any individual member (including the Mayor) has no authority to act on behalf of the council unless the council has expressly delegated such authority.

7. **Mayor**

The Mayor is elected by the district as a whole and as one of the elected members shares the same responsibilities as other members of council. The Mayor also has the following roles as a –

- presiding member at council meetings. The Mayor is responsible for ensuring the orderly conduct of business during meetings (as determined in standing orders);
- advocate on behalf of the community. This role may involve promoting the community and representing its interests. Such advocacy will be most effective where it is carried out with the knowledge and support of the council;
- ceremonial head of council;
- providing leadership and feedback to other elected members on teamwork and chairmanship of committees; and
- Justice of the Peace (while the Mayor holds office).

The Mayor must follow the same rules as other elected members about making public statements and committing the council to a particular course of action, unless acting in accordance with the rules for media contact on behalf of the council under a delegation of authority from the council.
8. **Deputy Mayor**

The Deputy Mayor must be elected by the members of council, at the first meeting of the council. The Deputy Mayor exercises the same roles as other elected members, and if the Mayor is absent or incapacitated, the Deputy Mayor must perform all of the responsibilities and duties, and may exercise the powers, of the Mayor (as summarised above). The Deputy Mayor may be removed from office by resolution of council.

9. **Committee Chairpersons**

The council may create one or more committees of council. A committee chairperson presides over all meetings of the committee, ensuring that the committee acts within the powers delegated by council, and as set out in the council’s *Delegations Manual*. Committee chairpersons may be called on to act as an official spokesperson on a particular issue. They may be removed from office by resolution of council.

**RELATIONSHIPS AND BEHAVIOURS**

This part of the code sets out the council’s agreed standards of behaviour. Some of the matters described in this part of the code reflect other legislation such as the Local Authorities (Members’ Interests) Act 1968 (refer Appendix 1). The majority of the code is material that the council has decided to include of its own initiative, based on the principles contained in Appendix 2.

10. **Relationships with Other Members**

Successful teamwork is a critical element in the success of any democratically elected organisation. No team will be effective unless mutual respect exists between members. With this in mind elected members will conduct their dealings with each other in ways that –

- maintain public confidence in the office to which they have been elected;
- are open and honest;
- focus on issues rather than personalities; and
- avoid aggressive, offensive or abusive conduct.

11. **Relationships with Staff**

The effective performance of council also requires a high level of cooperation and mutual respect between elected members and staff. To ensure that level of cooperation and trust is maintained, elected members will –

- recognise that the Chief Executive is the employer (on behalf of council) of all council employees, and as such only the Chief Executive may hire, dismiss or instruct or censure an employee;
- make themselves aware of the obligations that the council and the Chief Executive have as employers and observe those requirements at all times;
- treat all employees with courtesy and respect (including the avoidance of familiar, aggressive, offensive or abusive conduct towards employees);
- observe any guidelines that the Chief Executive puts in place regarding contact with employees;
12. **Relationships with the Community**

Effective council decision-making depends on productive relationships between elected members and the community at large.

Members should ensure that individual citizens are accorded respect in their dealings with the council, have their concerns listened to, and deliberated on in accordance with the requirements of the Act.

Members should act in a manner that encourages and values community involvement in local democracy.

13. **Contact with the Media**

The media plays an important part in local democracy. In order to fulfil this role the media needs access to accurate, timely information about the affairs of council. From time to time, individual members will be approached to comment on a particular issue either on behalf of council, or as an elected member in their own right. This part of the code deals with the rights and duties of councillors when speaking to the media on behalf of council, or in their own right.

The rules that apply for media contact on behalf of council are contained within the Council’s policy manual and are generally outlined as:

- Official Council statements may be made by either the Mayor, Deputy Mayor, a committee Chairperson or the Kaiapoi Community Board Chairperson. Elected members are free to express a personal view in the media, at any time, provided the following rules are observed –
  - media comments must not state or imply that they represent the views of council;
  - where an elected member is making a statement that is contrary to a council decision or council policy, the member must not state or imply that his or her statements represent a majority view; and
  - media comments must observe the other requirements of the code of conduct, e.g. not disclose confidential information, or compromise the impartiality or integrity of staff.
14. **Confidential Information**

In the course of their duties members will occasionally receive information that may need to be treated as confidential. This will generally be information that is either commercially sensitive or is personal to a particular individual or organisation.

Elected members must not use or disclose confidential information for any purpose other than the purpose for which the information was supplied to the elected member.

Elected members should be aware that failure to observe these provisions will impede the performance of council by inhibiting information flows and undermining public confidence in the council. Failure to observe these provisions may also expose council to prosecution under the Privacy Act 1993 and/or civil litigation.

15. **Conflicts of Interest**

Elected members must be careful that they maintain a clear separation between their personal interests and their duties as an elected member. This is to ensure that people who fill positions of authority carry on their duties free from bias (whether real or perceived). Members therefore need to familiarise themselves with the provisions of the Local Authorities (Members' Interests) Act 1968 which concerns financial interests, and with other legal requirements concerning non-financial conflicts of interest.

The Local Authorities (Members Interest) Act 1968 provides that an elected member is disqualified from office, or from election to office, if that member is concerned or interested in contracts under which payments made by or on behalf of the local authority exceed $25,000 in any financial year, without the authority of the Audit Office.

- Additionally, elected members are prohibited from participating in any council discussion or vote on any matter in which they have a pecuniary interest, other than an interest in common with the general public. The same rules also apply where the member’s spouse contracts with the authority or has a pecuniary interest. Members must declare their interests at council meetings where matters in which they have a pecuniary interest arise.

If the member is in any doubt as to whether or not a particular course of action (including a decision to take no action) raises a conflict of interest, then the member should seek guidance from the Chief Executive immediately.

16. **Non Pecuniary Interest**

By declaring any non-financial interests in matters before Council, elected members will ensure that an impression is not created that they are using their position to promote a private or personal interest.

For example, interests can arise through the involvement of family of friends in organisations that deal with the Council, and through membership of clubs, societies and voluntary bodies.

17. **Standing Orders**

Standing Orders are a set of rules of debate that provide greater formality in the way that an organisation conducts its meetings. Standing Orders are also a means of recording organisations’ agreed principles of behaviour within meetings.
Elected members must adhere to any standing orders adopted by the council. These standing orders are subject to the same legal requirements as a code of conduct with regard to their adoption and amendment.

18. Ethics

Waimakariri District Council seeks to promote the highest standards of ethical conduct amongst its elected members. Accordingly, elected members will –

- claim only for legitimate expenses as laid down by any determination of the Remuneration Authority then in force, and any lawful policy of council developed in accordance with that determination;
- not influence, or attempt to influence, any council employee to take actions that may benefit the member, or the member’s family or business interests;
- not use council resources for personal business (including campaigning);
- not solicit, demand, or request any gift, reward or benefit by virtue of their position; and
- where a gift to the value of $100 or more is offered to a member, and accepted, immediately notify the Chief Executive.

19. Disqualification of Members from Office

Elected members are automatically disqualified from office if they are convicted of a criminal offence punishable by two or more years imprisonment, or if they cease to be or lose their status as an elector or of certain breaches of the Local Authorities (Members’ Interests) Act 1968.

Under the Local Government Act 2002, local authorities, when adopting a code of conduct, must consider whether or not they will require members to declare whether they are an undischarged bankrupt. This council believes that bankruptcy does raise questions about the soundness of a person’s financial management skills and their judgment in general. The council therefore requires elected members who are declared bankrupt to notify the Chief Executive as soon as practicable after being declared bankrupt.
COMPLIANCE AND REVIEW

This part deals with ensuring that elected members adhere to the code of conduct and mechanisms for the review of the code of conduct.

Compliance

20. Elected members must note that they are bound to comply with the provisions of this code of conduct (Local Government Act 2002, Schedule 7, section 15(4))

21. Members are also bound by the Local Government Act 2002, the Local Authorities (Members’ Interests) Act 1968, the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, the Secret Commissions Act 1910, the Crimes Act 1961 and the Securities Act 1978. The Chief Executive will ensure that an explanation of these Acts is made at the first meeting after each triennial election and that copies of these Acts are freely available to elected members. Short explanations of the obligations that each of these has with respect to conduct of elected members is attached in the Appendix to this code.

22. Alleged breaches of the Code shall be reported to the Chief Executive Officer or Mayor as appropriate. Where it is a minor matter, the Mayor may require a Member to apologise at a subsequent Council meeting. Where it is considered that the matter is of substance, a report shall be submitted for the consideration of the Code of Conduct Committee in accordance with the Committee’s Terms of Reference.

23. Where the Committee recommends to the Council any action, the exact nature of the action the Council may take depends on the nature of the breach and whether there are statutory provisions dealing with the breach.

24. Where there are statutory provisions:
   - Breaches relating to members’ interests render members liable for prosecution by the Auditor-General under the Local Authority (Member’s Interests) Act 1968.
   - Breaches which result in the Council suffering financial loss or damage may be reported on by the Auditor-General under the Local Government Act 2002, which may result in the member having to make good the loss or damage.
   - Breaches relating to the commission of a criminal offence may leave the elected member liable for criminal prosecution.

   In these cases the Council may refer an issue to the relevant body, any member of the public may make a complaint, or the body itself may take action of its own initiative.

25. Where there are no statutory provisions, the Council may take the following action:
   - Request an apology
   - Censure
   - Removal of the elected member from Council committees and/or other representative type bodies.
   - Dismissal of the elected member from a position as Deputy Mayor or Chair of a committee.

   A decision to apply one or more of these actions requires a Council resolution to that effect.

26. Review
Once adopted, a code of conduct continues in force until amended by the Council. The code can be amended at any time but cannot be revoked unless the Council replaces it with another code. Once adopted, amendments to the code of conduct require a resolution supported by 75 per cent or more of the members of the Council present.

Council will formally review the code as soon as practicable after the beginning of each triennium. The results of that review will be presented to Council for their consideration and vote.
APPENDIX 1:

LEGISLATION BEARING ON THE ROLE AND CONDUCT OF ELECTED MEMBERS

This is a summary of the legislation requirements that has some bearing on the duties and conduct of elected members. Copies of these statutes can be found in the councillor’s lounge or in the office of the Administration Manager.

A. Local Authority (Members’ Interests) Act 1968

This Act regulates situations where a members’ personal interests impinge, or could be seen as impinging on their duties as an elected member.

The Act provides that an elected member is disqualified from office if that member is concerned or interested in contracts under which payments made by or on behalf of the local authority exceed $25,000 in any financial year.

Additionally, elected members are prohibited from participating in any council discussion or voting on any matter in which they have a pecuniary interest, other than an interest in common with the general public. The same rules also apply where the member’s spouse contracts with the authority or has a pecuniary interest.

Members may also contact the Audit Office for guidance as to whether that member has a pecuniary interest, and if so, may seek an exemption to allow that member to participate or vote on a particular issue in which they may have a pecuniary interest. The latter must be done before the discussion or vote. The Chief Executive must also seek approval from the Audit Office for contractual payments to members, their spouses or their companies that exceed the $25,000 annual limit.

Failure to observe these requirements could also leave the elected member open to prosecution under the Local Authority (Members’ Interests) Act 1968. In the event of a conviction elected members can be ousted from office.

The Audit Office publication Financial Conflicts of Interests of Members of Governing Bodies (2001) provides further guidance on this Act.

B. Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

The Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 sets out a list of meetings procedures and requirements. Of particular importance for the roles and conduct of elected members is the fact that the chair has the responsibility to maintain order at meetings, but all elected members should accept a personal responsibility to maintain acceptable standards of address and debate. No elected member should –

- create a disturbance or a distraction while another councillor is speaking;
- be disrespectful when they refer to each other or other people; or
- use offensive language about the council, other councillors, any employee of the council or any member of the public.

A publication by the Department of Internal Affairs entitled “Local Authority Meetings”, provides further guidance.
C. **Secret Commissions Act 1910**

Under this Act it is unlawful for an elected member (or officer) to advise anyone to enter into a contract with a third person and receive a gift or reward from that third person as a result, or to present false receipts to council.

If convicted of any offence under this Act a person can be imprisoned for up to 2 years, or fines up to $1000, or both. A conviction therefore would trigger the ouster provisions of the Local Government Act 2002 and result in the removal of the member from office.

D. **Crimes Act 1961**

Under this Act it is unlawful for an elected member (or officer) to –

- accept or solicit for themselves (or anyone else) any gift or reward for acting or not acting in relation to the business of council;
- use information gained in the course of their duties for their, or another persons, monetary gain or advantage.

These offences are punishable by a term of imprisonment of 7 years or more. Elected members convicted of these offences will also be automatically ousted from office.

E. **Securities Act 1978**

The Securities Act 1978 essentially places elected members in the same position as company directors whenever council offers stock to the public. Elected members may be personally liable if investment documents such as a prospectus contain untrue statements and may be liable for criminal prosecution if the requirements of the Act are not met.
APPENDIX 2:

GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF GOOD GOVERNANCE

The code of conduct that follows is based on the following general principles of good governance –

(a) **Public interest**
   Members should serve only the interests of the district as a whole and should never improperly confer an advantage or disadvantage on any one person.

(b) **Honesty and integrity**
   Members should not place themselves in situations where their honesty and integrity may be questioned, should not behave improperly and should on all occasions avoid the appearance of such behaviour.

(c) **Objectivity**
   Members should make decisions on merit including making appointments, awarding contracts, or recommending individuals for rewards or benefits. Elected members should also note that, once elected, their primary duty is to the interests of the entire district, not the ward that elected them.

(d) **Accountability**
   Members should make decisions on merit. Members should be accountable to the public for their actions and the manner in which they carry out their responsibilities, and should cooperate fully and honestly with the scrutiny appropriate to their particular office.

(e) **Openness**
   Members should be as open as possible about their actions and those of the council, and should be prepared to justify their actions.

(f) **Personal judgment**
   Members can and will take account of the views of others, but should reach their own conclusions on the issues before them, and act in accordance with those conclusions.

(g) **Respect for others**
   Members should promote equality by not discriminating unlawfully against any person and by treating people with respect, regardless of their race, age, religion, gender, sexual orientation, or disability. They should respect the impartiality and integrity of the council staff.

(h) **Duty to uphold the law.**
   Members should uphold the law, and on all occasions, act in accordance with the trust the public places in them.

(i) **Stewardship**
   Members must ensure that the council uses resources prudently and for lawful purposes, and that the council maintains sufficient resources to meet its statutory obligations.

(j) **Leadership**
   Members should promote and support these proposals by example, and should always endeavour to act in the best interests of the community.
APPENDIX 3:

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2002

Chief Executive

The Chief Executive is appointed by the council in accordance with sections 42 of the Local Government Act 2002. The Chief Executive is responsible for implementing and managing the council's policies and objectives within the budgetary constraints established by the council. In terms of section 42 of the Act, the responsibilities of the Chief Executive are –

(a) implementing the decisions of the council;
(b) providing advice to the council and community boards;
(c) ensuring that all responsibilities, duties and powers delegated to the Chief Executive or to any person employed by the Chief Executive, or imposed or conferred by any Act, regulation or bylaw are properly performed or exercised;
(d) managing the activities of the local authority effectively and efficiently;
(e) maintaining systems to enable effective planning and accurate reporting of the financial and service performance of the local authority;
(f) providing leadership for the staff of the local authority;
(g) employing staff on behalf of the local authority (including negotiation of the terms of employment for the staff of the local authority).

Under section 42 of the Local Government Act 2002 the Chief Executive employs all other staff on behalf of the local authority.
Extract of Current WDC Standing Orders (effective 8 January 2018)

Sections 17 and 19


17. Exclusion of public

17.1 Motions and resolutions to exclude the public

Members of a meeting may resolve to exclude the public from a meeting. The grounds for exclusion are those specified in section 48 of LGOIMA (see Appendix 1).

Every motion to exclude the public must be put while the meeting is open to the public, and copies of the motion must be available to any member of the public who is present. If the motion is passed the resolution to exclude the public must be in the form set out in schedule 2A of LGOIMA (see Appendix 2). The resolution must state:

(a) the general subject of each matter to be excluded;
(b) the reason for passing the resolution in relation to that matter; and
(c) the grounds on which the resolution is based.

The resolution will form part of the meeting’s minutes.

s. 48 LGOIMA.

17.1 (A) Code of Conduct Committee

Should a Code of Conduct Committee be called, the Chairperson has the right to exclude elected members that are not directly involved in the Committee, based on LGOIMA reasons related to privacy of natural persons.

ie: The only persons recommended to be present at a Code of Conduct Committee is the committee panel (consisting of four elected members), the elected member whom any complaint has been laid against and the Chief Executive and minute taker. It is the discretion of the Committee Chair as to the presence of the Mayor or any other elected member for specific portions of the meeting that may directly relate to specific aspects of the hearing.

17.2 Specified people may remain

Where a meeting resolves to exclude the public, the resolution may provide for specified persons to remain if, in the opinion of the meeting, they will assist the meeting to achieve its purpose. Any such resolution must state, in relation to the matter to be discussed, how the knowledge held by the specified people is relevant and be of assistance.
No such resolution is needed for people who are entitled to be at the meeting, such as relevant staff and officials contracted to the council for advice on the matter under consideration.

s.48 (6) LGOIMA.

17.3 Public excluded items

The chief executive must place in the public-excluded section of the agenda any items that he or she reasonably expects the meeting to consider with the public excluded. The public excluded section of the agenda must indicate the subject matter of the item and the reason the public are excluded.

s.46A (8) LGOIMA.

17.4 Non-disclosure of information

No member or officer may disclose to any person, other than another member, officer or person authorised by the chief executive, any information that has been, or will be, presented to any meeting from which the public is excluded, or proposed to be excluded.

This restriction does not apply where a meeting has resolved to make the information publicly available or where the chief executive has advised, in writing, that one or both of the following apply:

(a) there are no grounds under LGOIMA for withholding the information;
(b) the information is no longer confidential.

17.5 Release of information from public excluded session

A local authority may provide for the release to the public of information which has been considered during the public excluded part of a meeting.

Each public excluded meeting must consider and agree by resolution, what, if any, information will be released to the public. In addition the chief executive may release information which has been considered at a meeting from which the public has been excluded where it is determined the grounds to withhold the information no longer exist. The chief executive will inform the subsequent meeting of the nature of the information released.

19. Conduct

19.1 Calling to order

When the Chairperson calls members to order, they must be seated and stop speaking. If the members fail to do so, the Chairperson may direct that they should leave the meeting immediately for a specified time.

19.2 Disrespect

No member may speak or act in a manner which is disrespectful of other members or inconsistent with the local authority’s Code of Conduct at any meeting.
19.3 Retractions and apologies

In the event of a member or speaker who has been disrespectful of another member or contravened the council’s Code of Conduct, the Chairperson may call upon that member or speaker to withdraw the offending comments, and may require them to apologise. If the member refuses to do so the Chairperson may direct that they should leave the meeting immediately for a specified time and/or make a complaint under the Code of Conduct.

19.4 Disorderly conduct

Where the conduct of a member is disorderly or is creating a disturbance the Chairperson may require that member to leave the meeting immediately for a specified time.

If the disorder continues the Chairperson may adjourn the meeting for a specified time. At the end of this time the meeting must resume and decide, without debate, whether the meeting should proceed or be adjourned.

The Chairperson may also adjourn the meeting if other people cause disorder or in the event of an emergency.

19.5 Contempt

Where a member is subject to repeated cautions by the Chairperson for disorderly conduct the meeting may, should it so decide, resolve that the member is in contempt. Any such resolution must be recorded in the meeting’s minutes.

19.6 Removal from meeting

A member of the police or authorised security personnel may, at the Chairperson’s request, remove or exclude a member from a meeting.

This standing order will apply where the Chairperson has ruled that the member should leave the meeting and the member has refused or failed to do so; or has left the meeting and attempted to re-enter it without the Chairperson’s permission.

19.7 Financial conflicts of interests

Every member present at a meeting must declare any direct or indirect financial interest that they hold in any matter being discussed at the meeting, other than an interest that they hold in common with the public.

No member may vote on, or take part in, a discussion about any matter in which they have a direct or indirect financial interest unless an exception set out in s.6 LAMIA applies to them, or the Auditor-General has granted them an exemption or declaration under s.6.

Members with a financial interest should physically withdraw themselves from the table unless the meeting is in public excluded in which case they should leave the room.
Neither the Chairperson nor the meeting may rule on whether a member has a financial interest in the matter being discussed. The minutes must record any declarations of financial interests and the member’s abstention from any discussion and voting on the matter.

s. 6 & 7 LAMIA.

19.8 Non-financial conflicts of interests

Non-financial interests always involve questions of judgement and degree about whether the responsibility of a member of a local authority (or local or community board) could be affected by some other separate interest or duty of that member in relation to a particular matter. If a member considers that they have a non-financial conflict of interest in a matter they must not take part in the discussions about that matter or any subsequent vote.

The member must leave the table when the matter is considered, but does not need to leave the room. The minutes must record the declaration and member’s subsequent abstention from discussion and voting.

Neither the Chairperson nor the meeting may rule on whether a member has a non-financial interest in the matter being discussed.

19.9 Qualified privilege for meeting proceedings

Any oral statement made at any meeting of the local authority in accordance with the rules adopted by the local authority for guiding its proceedings is privileged, unless the statement is proved to have been made with ill will or took improper advantage of the occasion of publication.

s. 53, LGOIMA.

19.10 Qualified privilege additional to any other provisions

The privilege referred to above is in addition to any other privilege, whether absolute or qualified, that applies as a result of any other enactment or rule of law applying to any meeting of the local authority.

s. 53, LGOIMA.

19.11 Electronic devices at meetings

Electronic devices and phones should only be used to support the business of the meeting. Where personal use is unforeseen prior to the meeting, members should seek permission from the chair to leave the meeting to deal with such matters. It is not deemed good practice or indeed appropriate to convey any aspect of meeting content or decision via personal electronic devices prior to the conclusion of the meeting.
Code of Conduct Committee

1. **Membership**
   
   Deputy Mayor  
   Three (3) Councillors

2. **Quorum**
   
   Any two members.

3. **Delegation**
   
   3.1 To hear alleged breaches of the Code of Conduct. The Committee will undertake such investigative enquiries as it considers appropriate, including interviews with the alleged transgressor and appropriate members, employees or members of the public.
   
   3.2 To recommend to the Council in respect of alleged breaches, action provided for in the Code of Conduct.

4. **Guidelines for Committee Operation**
   
   4.1 Where an alleged breach of the Code of Conduct is brought to the attention of the Mayor, the Mayor may decide that it is a matter for the Committee’s consideration. The Chair will arrange a suitable meeting time for the matter to be heard.
   
   4.2 At any stage the Committee may consider exercising its powers under section 48 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LOGIMA) to exclude the public.
   
   4.3 The Mayor will be asked to report on the alleged breach, including any evidence the Mayor considers the Committee should take into account.
   
   4.4 The Mayor may request other parties to present information in relation to the matter under consideration.
   
   4.5 In the event that the alleged breach relates to the Mayor, the Committee Chair and Chief Executive Officer may engage independent counsel to present the case.
   
   4.6 Any person against whom an allegation has been made, that person
   
   4.6.1 will be given a reasonable opportunity to respond to the allegation by written submission and appearance before the Committee; and
   
   4.6.2 may ask that further witnesses give evidence to the Committee in his or her interest.
4.7 The Committee shall prepare a report to the Council. The report shall be made available to the person alleged to have breached the Code of Conduct prior to it being circulated to the Council.

4.8 Committee reports to the Council shall be considered at an in-committee meeting, subject to the provisions of LOGIMA.

4.9 Should the Mayor and Councillors be unable to hear the matter due to a conflict of interest, the Chief Executive Officer shall engage independent counsel to investigate and report on the alleged breaches in accordance with the guidelines contained in this terms of reference.
TERMS OF REFERENCE
COUNCIL AND COMMITTEES

Code of Conduct Committee

1. Membership

   Deputy Mayor (Chair)
   Three (3) Councillors

2. Quorum

   Any two-three members.

3. Delegation

   3.1 To receive a report from the Chief Executive and/or Mayor, outlining alleged breaches of the Code of Conduct.

   3.2 To consider if the complaint warrants further investigation.

   3.3 Provide any member against whom the complaint has been made, the opportunity to appear and speak in their own defence.

   3.4 Endorse the Terms of Reference for any specific investigation, as advised by the Chief Executive.

   3.5 The Committee may undertake such investigative enquiries as it considers appropriate, including interviews with the alleged transgressor and appropriate members, employees or members of the public.

   3.6 The Committee Chair and the Mayor (or CE if the Mayor is subject to any breach) may appoint an independent investigator to undertake the investigation of any alleged breach of the Code of Conduct and prepare a report for the Committee.

   3.7 The Code of Conduct Committee to consider the findings of any independent investigator report.

   3.8 To recommend to the Council in respect of alleged breaches, action provided for in the Code of Conduct.

4. Guidelines for Committee Operation

   4.1 Where an alleged breach of the Code of Conduct is brought to the attention of the Mayor, the Mayor may decide, in conjunction with the Chief Executive, that it is a matter for the Committee’s consideration. The Chair-Chief Executive/Governance Manager will arrange a suitable meeting time for the matter to be heard.
Code of Conduct Committee

4.1 the Local Government official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LOGIMA) to exclude the public and/or any elected members that are not directly involved in the investigation (as per Standing Orders 17.1(A)).

4.2 At any stage the Committee may consider exercising its powers under section 48 of the Local Government official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LOGIMA) to exclude the public and/or any elected members that are not directly involved in the investigation (as per Standing Orders 17.1(A)).

4.3 The Mayor and/or Chief Executive will be asked to report on the alleged breach, including any evidence the Mayor/Chief Executive considers the Committee should take into account.

4.4 The Mayor Chair may request other parties to present information in relation to the matter under consideration.

4.5 In the event that the alleged breach relates to the Mayor, the Committee Chair and Chief Executive Officer may engage independent counsel to present the case.

4.6 Any person against whom an allegation has been made, that person;

4.6.1 will be given a reasonable opportunity to respond to the allegation by written submission and appearance before the Committee; and

4.6.2 may ask that further witnesses give evidence to the Committee in his or her interest.

4.7 The Committee shall prepare a report to the Council. The report shall be made available to the person alleged to have breached the Code of Conduct prior to it being circulated to the Council.

4.8 Committee reports to the Council shall be considered at an in-committee (public excluded) meeting, subject to the provisions of LOGIMA.

4.9 Should the Mayor and Councillors be unable to hear the matter due to a conflict of interest, the Chief Executive shall engage independent counsel to investigate and report on the alleged breaches in accordance with the guidelines contained in this terms of reference.

4.9.10 Any decision about the outcomes and, in particular, whether to initiate any disciplinary process against any person, is for the Waimakariri District Council to determine, after careful consideration of the report by the Code of Conduct Committee.

The investigator shall not be involved in the decision making process.
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. The purpose of this report is to update the Council on Health and Safety matters for the month of April.

**Attachments:**

i. Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties

ii. April 2019 Health and Safety Dashboard Report

**RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Council:

(a) **Receives** report No 190416056804

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

2. **BACKGROUND**

2.1. The Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 requires that Officers must exercise due diligence to make sure that the organisation complies with its health and safety duties. Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties for WDC is outlined in Appendix 1.

2.2. An officer under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 is a person who occupies a specified position or who occupies a position that allows them to exercise a significant influence over the management of the business or undertaking. Councillors and Chief Executive are considered to be the Officers of WDC.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. There are 5 work-related incidents in this report, 2 of which require further investigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Event description</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18/03/2019</td>
<td>Property or Vehicle Damage</td>
<td>“Die”, “Hi” and a smiley face and a couple of hand wipes, written in blood in a toilet</td>
<td>Police were informed and report raised. Internal investigation completed, however at that time the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2. The Management Team has recently completed a review of the Health and Safety Risk Register. This fulfils the requirement for 6-monthly review, and changes will be updated to the TRIM record of the Risk Register within the month. Of particular note was that the Management Team reviewed each risk score, and amended some of them to reflect both changes in control measures, and adjustment of risk appetite/perception. Full results will be submitted to the Audit and Risk Committee for the 21 May meeting.

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

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. **Groups and Organisations**

4.1.1. The above reporting is shared with Management Team and the Health and Safety Committee in particular, for their review and comment.
4.2. **Wider Community**

4.2.1. The community has not been consulted with regard to this matter, as this is internal compliance reporting, relating to Health and Safety at Work.

5. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. **Financial Implications**

5.1.1. All financial implications for the upcoming year’s health and safety activities have been accounted for within approved project costs (such as Promapp implementation), or via departmental budgets already allocated to health and safety.

5.2. **Community Implications**

5.2.1. Community implications have not been included in this report as this is internal compliance reporting, relating to Health and Safety at Work.

5.3. **Risk Management**

5.3.1. Risk Management is one of the key performance requirements of a functioning Health and Safety system, therefore an updated version of the Health and Safety Register Action Plan is a key aspect of this monthly report (see Attachment 2).

5.4. **Health and Safety**

5.4.1. Continuous improvement, monitoring, and reporting of Health and Safety activities are a key focus of the health and safety management system. Attachment 1 indicates the health and safety monitoring and improvement activities that are in progress at WDC.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Legislation**

6.2.1. The key legislation is the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015.

6.2.2. The Council has a number of Human Resources policies, including those related to Health and Safety at Work.

6.2.3. The Council has an obligation under the Local Government Act to be a good employer.

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

6.3.1. There is a safe environment for all

The Health, Safety and Wellbeing of the organisation, its employees and volunteers ensures that Community Outcomes are delivered in a manner which is legislatively compliant and culturally aligned to our organisational principles: ta mātou mauri.

6.4. **Delegations**

6.4.1. An officer under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 is a person who occupies a specified position or who occupies a position that allows them to exercise a significant influence over the management of the business or undertaking. Councillors and Chief Executive are considered to be the Officers of WDC.
## Discharging Officer Health and Safety Duties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICER DUTIES</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF ACTIVITIES TO SUPPORT DISCHARGE OF DUTIES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KNOW</strong></td>
<td>• Updates on new activities/major contracts</td>
<td>Various Committee reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Council reports to include Health and Safety advice as relevant</td>
<td>Monthly, as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Audit Committee to receive minutes of Health and Safety Committee meetings</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Update on legislation and best practice changes to Audit Committee</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDERSTAND</strong></td>
<td>• Induction of new Council through tour of District and ongoing site visits.</td>
<td>Start of each new term and as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• H&amp;S Risk register to Audit Committee</td>
<td>Six monthly, or where major change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training on H&amp;S legislation and best practices updates</td>
<td>At least annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CCO activities reported to the Audit Committee</td>
<td>At least annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td>• LTP or Annual Plan to have a specific report on H&amp;S resources</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reports to Committees will outline H&amp;S issues and resourcing, as appropriate</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MONITOR</strong></td>
<td>• Report to every Council meeting – standing agenda item to include Dashboard Update and any major developments</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Risk register review by Audit Committee</td>
<td>Six monthly, or where major change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPLY</strong></td>
<td>• Programme of H&amp;S internal work received by Audit Committee</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Internal Audit reports to Audit Committee</td>
<td>As completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Incident Investigations reported Audit Committee</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Worksafe review of incidents/accidents reported to Audit Committee</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VERIFY</strong></td>
<td>• Receive any external audit results and remedial actions (if any) reported to Audit Committee</td>
<td>Two yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Worksafe audits, if undertaken</td>
<td>As completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-assessment against Canterbury Safety Charter and/or SafePlus reported to the Audit Committee</td>
<td>As completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Objective 1: Improve Health and Safety systems, to align with organisational objectives

### Action 1: Re-develop Safety Management System to ensure that all Policies align with SafePlus framework (see TRIM 180315027921), and all critical risk procedures are captured in Promapp.

**Current Progress:** AS PER LAST MONTH

Policy structure has been drafted, and re-writing of policies has commenced. Policy structure has 3 key policies: Leadership & Commitment, Risk Management and Worker Engagement. There will be several sub-policies under the ‘Risk Management’ main policy, to address critical risks (e.g. Asbestos Management, Drug and Alcohol, Driver Safety etc.)

To date, the following number of health and safety procedures have been captured in Promapp:
- Published (finalised) = 33
- Unpublished (in progress) = 7

Additionally, the Water Unit have used Promapp to review and rewrite their Standard Operating Procedures, and have >130 procedures that have been developed. For the most part they have been finalised, with some in final draft phase.

Promapp training has been delivered to the Water Unit team and the Standard Operating Procedures are available on their mobile devices.

### Action 2: Implement Promapp training module to improve the management of all Health and Safety training.

**Current Progress:** AS PER LAST MONTH

The Promapp training module has been purchased, and key staff (including H&S Admin and Manager) are trained in how to use the module. Single sign-on has been confirmed, and all staff are creating their Promapp profiles.

Once all profiles are created, Health, Safety and Quality team will transfer current training data across to the Promapp Training Module. A full project plan for this activity has been created (yet to be approved) and will require resources from both the Health and Safety and the Quality functions.

## Objective 2: Maintain a fit-for-purpose internal health and safety auditing system to ensure that WDC is compliant with health and safety policies, procedures and legal requirements.

### Action 3: Review and re-develop internal health and safety auditing system, aligned with SafePlus. (see TRIM 180315027921).

**Current Progress:** AS PER LAST MONTH

The SafePlus Online Self-Assessment tool from WorkSafe has been issued. From there the team will complete the following actions:
- Assess the suitability of the tool (and determine any changes in approach – if required) COMPLETE
- Confirm audit timing and approach (report to Management Team) COMPLETE
- Arrange audit COMPLETE
- Complete audit and submit findings to Management Team COMPLETE
- Develop action plan and monitoring schedule IN PROGRESS
- Review process and adjust if required
### Objective 3: Ensure that all contractors are managed according to health and safety procedural requirements, and improve staff knowledge of those requirements.

**Action 4: Contractor management process improvement project (carry-over).**

- Deliver training to all staff once Promapp processes are complete (Oct 2018).
- Develop audit function based on PDU audit role.

**COMPLETE**

Contract Management training is complete as of 12th November. Training delivered to 55 contract managers from across the Council, and notes sent out to a total of 90 (including the staff that attended training). Timing of the training was determined by the Promapp rollout project (access to the system).

Additionally:
- Health and Safety Manager provides a H&S Contract Management overview to all new staff at their induction.
- Health and Safety Manager also provided an overview of current procedures to U&R, Water Unit, Greenspace and Regeneration teams at a June workshop.
- A 6-monthly reminder email was sent to staff on 24/08 to inform them of H&S processes and tools to manage contractors.
- A ‘deep-dive’ audit of adherence to H&S aspects of contract management has been completed as part of SafePlus assessment (see above).

### Objective 4: Improve the Health and Wellbeing of staff, and create measures to ensure success.

**Action 5: Wellbeing strategy development and implementation project (carry-over).**

**COMPLETE**

A Wellbeing Committee has been established, the wellbeing strategy is complete, and has been submitted to Management Team for their approval in early August. Additionally, the Management Team approved:

- Wellbeing calendar of events
- Wellbeing presence on intranet
- Wellbeing branding
- Wellbeing communications plan.

The Wellbeing Committee has now issued the strategy and communications to all staff (September 2018), and will coordinate and communicate all wellbeing activities going forward.

### LEGEND

- On track
- Slightly behind schedule (less than one month)
- Behind schedule (greater than one month)

In addition to the above workplan, there will be a particular focus on working with volunteers to manage their health and safety. This will include creating written agreements with high risk volunteers, and proactively engaging with all volunteers to ensure that health and safety expectations are aligned with all parties.
Incidents/Injuries – April 2019 (as at 16 April 2019)

April 2018 to Current: Worker/Volunteer Incident Reporting
Incidents/Injuries - April 2019 (as at 16 April 2019)

April 2018 to Current: Worker/Volunteer Incident Reporting

- Near Miss: 16 (22%)
- Injury: 42 (59%)
- Property or Vehicle Damage: 11 (15%)
- Illness/Medical Incident: 3 (4%)

Incident Type:
- Near Miss
- Injury
- Property or Vehicle Damage
- Illness/Medical Incident

Graph showing the distribution of incidents across different categories.
## Lost Time Injuries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Injuries</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Causes of LTIs are:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Body stressing x2 (manual handling) (63hrs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Falls, trips, slips x2 (231hrs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>187.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Causes of LTIs are:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Falls, trips, slips x1 total 174.7 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Body stressing x1 (manual handling) (13 hrs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LEAD INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety Inspections Completed</td>
<td>Q1 2019</td>
<td>6 out of 15 Workplace Walkarounds completed for Q1 2019 (March). Hazards raised for any non-compliances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Delivered</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>People Trained: 460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Delivered</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>People Trained: 334 (to March 2019)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contractor Database (drawn from SiteWise Database)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk rating</th>
<th>Risk type</th>
<th>Suggested Actions</th>
<th>Action Owner</th>
<th>Due date</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Armed Hold-up/Violent or Abusive Customers (on Council Sites) &amp; Site Security</td>
<td>*Develop and implement action plans based on Site Security Reviews.</td>
<td>Liz Ashton</td>
<td>Review at end 2018/19</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Boat Operations</td>
<td>*Practise rescue plan drills on regular basis</td>
<td>Phil Drozdowski</td>
<td>31/05/2019 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Confined space entry</td>
<td>*Review procedures for any work on Ocean Outfall Pipeline/drop-structure to ensure they are adequate.</td>
<td>Phil Drozdowski/Kalley Simpson</td>
<td>15/03/2019 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Confined space entry</td>
<td>*Review the records kept of permits to work, and contractor inclusion in permits to work.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>31/03/2019 (revised)</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Contractor Health and Safety Management</td>
<td>*Train all contract managers in H&amp;S processes/requirements at time of induction.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Contractor Health and Safety Management</td>
<td>*Identify volunteer groups and leaseholders that engage contractors on behalf of WDC and train in contract H&amp;S management processes.</td>
<td>Chris Brown/Nick Harrison</td>
<td>31/03/2019</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>*Ensure that emergency response procedures (i.e. what do to in the event of incident/interaction with underground or overhead power lines) is available, and that all relevant staff are trained, in procedure.</td>
<td>Phil Drozdowski/Jeff Millward</td>
<td>30/04/2019 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Hazardous Substances</td>
<td>*Review the hazardous substances records and adherence to requirements.</td>
<td>Charlotte Browne</td>
<td>01/03/2019 (revised)</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Mobile plant and machinery</td>
<td>*Check maintenance records and maintenance schedules are in place to ensure safety of equipment.</td>
<td>Unit Managers</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Mobile plant and machinery</td>
<td>*Improve competency records to include a schedule of levels of competency for each staff member/each piece of mobile plant.</td>
<td>Phil Drozdowski/Jeff Millward</td>
<td>31/05/2019 (revised)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk rating</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Suggested Actions</td>
<td>Action Owner</td>
<td>Due date</td>
<td>Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Volunteers conducting hazardous activities</td>
<td>*Undertake a review of operations to ensure that all activity and training is being carried out as per internal H&amp;S processes.</td>
<td>Liz Ashton</td>
<td>31/01/2019</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Water Safety</td>
<td>*Need to review the contractor’s Job Safety Analysis when removing avian botulism bird carcasses.</td>
<td>Kalley Simpson</td>
<td>31/01/2019</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Water Safety (Public)</td>
<td>*Require review of security fencing of all Waste Water Treatment Plant sites (internal review - test against other organisations). Review Stormwater site security (internal review - test against other organisations).</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary</td>
<td>31/03/2019 (revised)</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence</td>
<td>Working at heights</td>
<td>Water Unit: *Review of all structures which require work at heights to determine the adequacy of the fall protection (in particular the harness systems) and any further procedure/training required to ensure safe use of systems.</td>
<td>Phil Drozdowski/Kalley Simpson</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent or Abusive members of public (in the field)</td>
<td>*Consider use of body cameras for enforcement staff *Enforce mandatory StopViolence training for all staff that interact with public face-to-face *Develop 'key client' staff relationships to ensure that only certain staff deal with identified difficult customers</td>
<td>Managers &amp; Team Leaders</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Not started</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Consequence/High Risk</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Review and action of 3-Waters Sites Hazard Review (Dan McNally) and Water Unit Observation Report (Impac)</td>
<td>Gerard Cleary/Jeff Millward</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk rating</td>
<td>Risk type</td>
<td>Suggested Actions</td>
<td>Action Owner</td>
<td>Due date</td>
<td>Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All actions are new since the September 2018 Risk Register review.
1. **SUMMARY**

   1.1. This report is to seek support for the draft terms of reference for the Town Centre Feature Lighting & Decorations Working Group.

   1.2. The steering group will be responsible for overseeing the development of an implementation plan for feature lighting and decorations in both Rangiora and Kaiapoi town centres.

   1.3. Membership of the working group is to include representation from the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board. This report requests that two representatives from the Board be appointed to the working group.

**Attachments:**

   i. Draft Terms of Reference for the Town Centre Feature Lighting and Decorations Working Group (Trim 190328045690)

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

   **THAT** the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

   (a) **Receives** report No. 190403049853;

   (b) **Appoints** two elected members to the Town Centre Feature Lighting and Decorations Working Group. The elected members shall be as follows:

   ______________________________________________________

   ______________________________________________________

   **AND**

   **THAT** the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board recommends:

   **THAT** the Council:

   (c) **Receives** report No. 190403049853;
(d) Approves the Terms of Reference for the working group;
(e) Approves the formation of the Working Group and membership as recommended by the Board.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 A report was taken to Council in January 2019 as part of the Annual Plan process to update Council on town centre decorations and lighting installation carried out in Rangiora and Kaiapoi.

3.2 As part of this process it was agreed a working group would be set up to consider future lighting and decoration requirements in Rangiora and Kaiapoi town centres, oversee the development of an implementation plan and have an overview of the implementation process.

3.3 The working party is to meet on a monthly basis and will have a Project Manager from within the Project delivery Unit to support the group.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

4.1 A draft terms of reference has been prepared for the working group which sets clear objectives for the group.

4.2 The process of deciding the level of feature lighting and decorations in the town centres will require specialist input and consultation particularly in the area of lighting. This is likely to include preparation of a brief, options assessment and undertaking trials before further progressing the design.

4.3 In respect to decorations, consideration will need to be given to the requirement and possible scope of decorations required.

4.4 Budget provision in 2019/20 of $50,000 has been requested as part of the Annual Plan process to allow for specialist lighting designs to be undertaken.

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

5. COMMUNITY VIEWS

5.1 Groups and Organisations

5.2 No specific feedback has been sought to date however consultation will be undertaken with the Promotions Associations and town centre business on these issues as part of the wider project.

5.3 Wider Community

5.4 Community views on town centre lighting and decorations have not been sought, however it is considered that there is a community expectation that the lights and decorations will continue to be installed as they have been in previous years.

6. IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1 Financial Implications

6.2 As detailed in 4.4, budget provision in 2019/20 of $50,000 has been requested as part of the Annual Plan process to allow for specialist lighting designs to be undertaken.
6.3. No other budget is currently allocated for additional lighting or decorations.

6.4. Community Implications

6.5. The working party will provide feedback to Community Boards and Council as work progresses.

6.6. Risk Management

6.7. There is a risk on not meeting Community expectation. This risk can be mitigated by carrying out reviews, consultation and securing specialist services in this knowledge area.

6.8. Health and Safety

6.9. There are no specific Health & Safety considerations to be considered as part of this report.

7. CONTEXT

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

7.2. Legislation
There is no relevant legislation in this matter.

7.3. Community Outcomes
This report consider the following 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 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.

7.4. Delegations
The Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board has the authority to receive information and consider requests for representation.
TERMS OF REFERENCE
COUNCIL AND COMMITTEES

TOWN CENTRES DECORATIONS & LIGHTING WORKING GROUP

Membership

Two Council representatives (one to be the Town Centres Portfolio holder), two Rangiora-Ashley Community Board Representatives, two Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board Representatives, Manager of Utilities and Roading, Manager of Community & Recreation, Town Centres Manager, Roading & Transportation Manager, plus a Project Manager.

1 Terms of Reference

The Working Group will be responsible for overseeing the development of an implementation plan for both Rangiora Town Centre and Kaiapoi Town Centre by XX 2019 as well as delivery of the plan, with reference to the following areas:

1.1 Consideration of future decoration requirements for the town centres,
1.2 Consideration of future lighting requirements (decorative, pedestrian and feature lighting) for the town centres,
1.3 Approve a programme of consultation and investigations necessary to develop the Implementation Plan,
1.4 Oversee the development of implementation plans for both Rangiora and Kaiapoi town centres,
1.5 Recommend adoption of the Implementation Plans for each town centre to both Boards and Council,
1.6 Provide regular update reports to the Council, the Rangiora-Ashley and Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Boards,
1.7 Oversee the implementation of the approved plans.

2 Objectives

2.1 To review the current levels of decorations and lighting in Rangiora and Kaiapoi Town Centres,
2.2 To resolve any outstanding issues with the currently lighting feature installations as required,
2.3 To identify the opportunities for improvement in relation to decorations, feature lighting, pedestrian lighting and street lighting in Rangiora and Kaiapoi Town Centres,
2.4 To consider possible future enhancement of existing public spaces and facilities,

2.5 To develop a comprehensive implementation plan which clearly defines the objectives and sought outcomes with regards to decorations and lighting,

2.6 To identify the roles of the Council and other stakeholders in the implementation plan, including making recommendations of key steps and actions.

3 Meeting Frequency

Monthly

4 Staff Support

Management Team and Council staff as required.

A Project Manager is being provided by the Project Delivery Unit.
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT FOR DECISION

FILE NO and TRIM NO: No. 190313032940

REPORT TO: Rangiora Ashley Community Board

DATE OF MEETING: 10 April 2019

FROM: Vanessa Thompson, Business and Centres Advisor

SUBJECT: Good Street Road Stop (for the pedestrianised portion between High Street and the Service Lane)

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

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report seeks endorsement from the Rangiora Ashley Community Board to progress arrangements to formally stop the road status of Good Street between High Street and the Service Lane.

1.2 Should the Community Board endorse this road closure, staff will seek approval from Council to arrange surveying of the affected area and lodge the survey and proposed road stop with Land Information New Zealand, then undertake the necessary public notification and feedback process.

1.3 Staff will also negotiate a Memorandum of Understanding with the property owners of 5 Good Street and 140 High Street concerning the registration of easements preventing vehicle access to Good street through their existing property boundaries. The exception to this will be vehicles accessing the loading zone via the property boundary for 5 Good Street. This nonbinding agreement will be formalised contractually following the outcome of a successful road closure.

Attachments:

i. Map of the proposed road stop area on the section of Good Street between High Street and the Service Lane.

ii. Map of the property boundaries for 5 Good Street and 140 High Street.

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Rangiora Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190313032940

(b) Notes the information included in the report and the intention to propose, once the road is stopped, the establishment of a local purpose reserve status to the land released.

(c) Recommends that Council initiate a formal road stop process through Land Information New Zealand and the legal requirements around a public consultation period.
Supports the concept of staff negotiating an appropriate car parking solution for 140 High Street and Rangiora Fish Supply.

3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 For a large number of years thoroughfare traffic has been discouraged down the section of Good Street between High Street and the Service Lane through the implementation of traffic bollards, which has encouraged relatively free pedestrian movement within the space. The street has been further "pedestrianised" with the addition of park bench seats, pavement tiles instead of general roading surface, and retail activity encroaching into the street. Over time, the community has come to perceive this portion of Good Street as being pedestrian centric. This section of Good Street, however, is still classified as a legal road.

3.2 A number of complaints have been received over the years relating to concerns for pedestrian safety caused by cars driving down the street, some at speed. These complaints predominantly relate to the provision of a carpark supplied to one tenant located within 140 High Street (Rangiora Fish Supply) and the general public, on occasion, driving into Good Street in error.

3.3 The street restricts thoroughfare vehicle access through the installation of traffic bollards. However, a historical nonbinding arrangement was negotiated between Council and Rangiora Fish Supply giving the tenant keys to the bollards at the North end of the street to enable deliveries to the back door of their shop. There was an expectation that the tenant, when accessing the street for deliveries, would replace the bollard to restrict further vehicle access. However, over time, one bollard at the north end of the street has gone missing enabling vehicle access by other members of the public, and the tenant has regularly parked for the duration of their work shift at the back of their shop.

3.4 When the street was originally "closed in" and treated for pedestrian access, a formal road stop process was not undertaken by Council. Staff would now like to formalise the land status underpinning the street in order to address pedestrian safety concerns and to safeguard future work related to aesthetic enhancements to Street, similar in quality to Conway Lane treatments.

3.5 Staff have undertaken some preliminary legal enquires with Corcoran French to determine the legal road stop and public notification process, as follows:

- Council must arrange for the relevant section of the road to be surveyed, and then lodge the survey plan for the road to be stopped and an explanation for the purpose of the stopped road with Land Information New Zealand.

- When the survey plan is approved by Land Information New Zealand and allocated a plan number, Council must then make this plan available for inspection by the public at the Council offices and undertake a public notice period concerning the road stop proposal. Members of the public must be given the chance to lodge objections within a 40 day period from the date of the first public notice.

- If no objections are received, Council may by further notice declare the road is stopped and lodge the necessary notice paperwork and plans with Land Information New Zealand before the road stopping can take effect.

- If, however, public objections are received and these are not agreed upon by Council, Council must forward the objections to the Environment Court together with a plan and description of the road stop proposal for consideration.

- The Environment Court can confirm, modify or reverse the decision of Council and will make a final decision on the proposal based on the need for the road as opposed to the need for the road stopping. Environment Court will also assess that: there is reasonable cause to justify the proposal; public benefit outweighs private injury; and, the purpose for the stopped road is desirable and in the public's best interest.
• If the road stop proposal is denied by the Environment Court, then the road may not be subject to another road stopping proposal for two years.

3.6 On Wednesday 12 December, staff presented a range of legal and stakeholder considerations concerning the road stop process to the Rangiora Ashley Community Board. Staff intended to return to the board in 2019 to request support toward a formal road stop process, once initial conversations had been undertaken with property owners and tenants down the street gauging their feelings towards the proposal.

3.7 A number of conversations have now taken place, and the majority of property owners and tenants are enthusiastic about the Council’s potential to undertake aesthetic and functional improvements to the street if the road is legally stopped, and, on that basis, have signalled their support for any formal road stop process.

3.8 Staff now recommend progressing the road stop process and securing the underlying land status in order to support future functional and aesthetic improvements to Good Street consistent with Rangiora Town Centre Strategy principles and objectives.

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

Road Stop

4.1. The proposed boundary for the stopped road is the portion of Good Street between High Street and the Service Lane. See the highlighted section in Figure 1 and Attachment 1.

4.2. **Local Purpose Reserve**

Under Section 345 of the Local Government Act 1974, Council must give an explanation as to the purpose for which the stopped road will be utilised. Staff recommend that the land be designated as local purpose reserve (access or public spaces zone) similar to the underlying land status of Conway Lane.

4.3. **Fee Simple:**

Council has the option of designating the land status to fee simple providing opportunities around the future divestment of the land. However, with a private sale there is the possibility of the future landowner imposing restricted or prohibited access to the land by the general public, so this option is not recommended.

4.3. If there is a desire to maintain the status of Good Street as a legal road but limit its use by restricting vehicle access between High Street and the Service Lane, then no specific provision currently exists that permits Council to permanently stop vehicles using a legal road. Section 72 of the Transport Act 1962 and section 22AB of the Land Transport Act 1998 may provide Council with the means to make a bylaw to limit the road use. However, this option would need to undergo further legal scrutiny to determine whether a bylaw is permissible under these circumstances and to ensure any wording therein is legally robust. Staff do not recommend this option unless: the road closure process is unsuccessful but Council still wishes the road to remain pedestrianised; and, Council actively resources the enforcement of said bylaw.
5 Good Street and 140 High Street

4.5. The title boundaries for 5 Good Street and 140 High Street currently extend into the pedestrianised portion of Good Street. See Figure 2 and Attachment 2 for the highlighted orange and blue sections. Should the road stop be successful, both property owners have signalled their willingness to enter into a formal easement arrangement with Council preventing vehicle access to the street through their existing property boundaries. This arrangement may necessitate some level of financial compensation to the property owners, although, no figures have been discussed at this stage. Easement terms for 5 Good Street would not preclude vehicular access to the loading zone that currently encroaches into a portion of that existing property boundary.

4.6. 5 Good Street
The property owner at 5 Good Street is currently investigating strengthening options for his property. Should the quote for work exceed his expectations, he may opt for a complete rebuild or the sale of his building. 5 Good Street has a building line restriction in place historically imposed by Council in the 1970’s preventing a build up to the boundary line in Good Street. The owner has the option of writing to Council requesting that this restriction be reviewed and revoked. Council has sole discretion as to whether the restriction should stay in place or not. On this basis, the owner is reluctant to enter into an ‘in perpetuity’ easement agreement on his title and would expect any easement to include an ‘opt out’ clause should he (where permissible) wish to undertake a complete rebuild to the line.

4.7. 140 High Street
Rangiora Fish Supply (a tenant at 140 High Street) currently park their car behind their store for the duration of their work shift, i.e. up to 7 days per week, typically between the hours of 10am – 10pm. See Fig. 3. This parking arrangement has eventuated as a result of a historical assumed existing use right by the property owner and tenant.

In exchange for an easement over his land, the property owner at 140 High Street requests that Council fix the car parking issue for Rangiora Fish Supply. Staff are mindful of the precedent factor, but the loss of an “existing use” park provides some justification for Council to resolve the issue. Potentially, any solution could be contained to the term of the lease associated with Rangiora Fish Supply and not in perpetuity on the title depending on the outcome of negotiations with the property owner.

Possible resolutions could include: the provision of a carpark from the public supply down the Service Lane; negotiation of a lease arrangement on a private site (i.e. at the rear of 156 High Street); supplying the tenant with a free-parking permit for the town centre; or, a one off financial
compensation for the property owner and Rangiora Fish Supply in lieu of a carpark. There are a range of pros and cons with each situation and a likely financial cost to Council that would require further investigation depending on the preferred option.

In addition to the supply of a carpark, Rangiora Fish Supply have requested that Council supply them with a flat deck industrial loading trolley to facilitate the movement of stock (2000kg of potatoes weekly) from the Good Street loading zone to the rear of their shop. The rest of the Good Street tenants’ deliveries are not adversely impacted by a road closure of the Street.

**Loading Zones**

4.9. Tenants towards the north end of the street (City Mission, Fusion) would like to keep the loading zone in place to facilitate ease of deliveries if the road is stopped. Those with shop frontages bordering High Street (Country Lane, Charmed, Stonebaked Bakehouse) have indicated they would benefit from a loading zone in front of their shops. The provision of loading zones down Good Street and High street can be further considered as part of the Rangiora Town Centre Strategy and Parking Review currently underway in 2019.

**Rubbish Collection**

4.9. The road stop will have no impact on the rubbish collection service. Council rubbish and recycling trucks don’t enter into Good Street to make their collections. Bags and bins are placed either at the High Street or Service Lane kerbsides by the retail tenants.

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

**5. COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. Conversations have taken place with affected property owners and tenants down Good Street.

A summary of stakeholder responses to key issues are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Deliveries Impacted</th>
<th>Supportive of Road Stop</th>
<th>Supportive of Aesthetic Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murray Irvine</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>4 Good Street, 124 &amp; 140 High Street</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Conditions *</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Briden</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>5 Good Street</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Conditions **</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapia Gentle Chiropractor</td>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>5 Good Street</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Boutique Hairdresser</td>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>5 Good Street</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Mission Opportunity Shop</td>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>140 High Street</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fusion Café</td>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>140 High Street</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salon Van Nail Beauty</td>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>140 High Street</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora Fish Supply</td>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>140 High Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Conditions ***</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Lane</td>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>140 High Street</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charmed</td>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>140 High Street</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonebaked Bakehouse</td>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>140 High Street</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Discussed in clause 4.7. **Discussed in clause 4.6. ***Discussed in clause 4.7.
5.2. As indicated by the table, the majority of immediate stakeholders are supportive of the road stop process and its implications which could lead to future aesthetic and functional enhancements to the street. While the road stop generally has little impact on the day-to-day operations for most tenants, some stakeholders, while supportive of the road stop in principle, have linked some expectations to the process.

5.3. The wider community has not been consulted with in relation to this matter, but would be consulted as part of any formal road stop process during the public notification period.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

**Financial Implications**

6.1. The road stop process and its associated easement arrangements for 5 Good Street and 140 High Street may necessitate some form of financial compensation for the property owners. Staff are hopeful of negotiating an outcome where easement rights/financial compensation are relinquished by the property owners in anticipation of future upgrades to their land in Good Street, as well as for the resolution of pre-imposed conditions.

6.2. Provision of parking and a goods delivery solution for Rangiora Fish Supply may result in some financial compensation from Council as discussed in section 4.7.

6.3. Should the road stop process need to be considered by the Environment Court and Council wish to pursue a road closure course of action, further funding for legal costs will need to be obtained. It is anticipated that all expenses related to the road stop process will be covered from the Roading budget, however, an additional budget request will be needed to support this project.

6.4. Should the recommendations in this report be supported, a further report will be presented to Council seeking approval to undertake the road stopping process.

6.5. In the future, staff will likely seek funding for aesthetic and functional improvements to Good Street.

**Community Implications**

6.6. A formal road stop of Good Street between High Street and the Service Lane supports the vision and objectives of the Rangiora Town Centre Strategy 2020 for safe, accessible pedestrian oriented streets and spaces.

6.7. Current community expectation and use of the Good Street laneway is that of a pedestrianised space.

**Risk Management**

6.8. It is likely that the road stop process may be challenged by member/s of the public requiring a decision through the Environment Court. This would delay – possibly by six months or more - a formal road stop decision and slow progress towards any aesthetic and functional improvements to the street. To mitigate this, communication leading up to and during the public consultation period should focus on the benefits of the proposed road stop and the anticipated positive outcomes, i.e. resolving pedestrian safety concerns, future opportunity to upgrade the street, increased connectivity and accessibility for pedestrians etc. Staff will also make every effort to resolve property owner conditions, where reasonably practicable.

6.9. The provision of a carpark for Rangiora Fish Supply may result in negative feedback from members of the public, and set up a precedent and expectation for similar outcomes with other developments/projects in the town centres. There remains a risk that the tenant will object to the
road stop if they are not happy with the parking solution proposed. There will be a need to consider the risks and costs associated with any compensation offer against those associated with an Environment Court process. The fact that the affected portion of Good Street has been “pedestrianised” for a significant number of years may support the Council’s proposal in any Court situation. As such, the implementation of an appropriate solution will be sought in negotiation with the tenant and property owner.

6.10. On the outcome of a successful road stop, and due to changing circumstances for the property owners, there is a possibility they may choose not to enter into formal easement agreements. To reduce this likelihood, staff have explained the implications of not having the easement in place – public saliency around pedestrian safety issues; and the possibility that Council could upgrade the street but may exclude their property boundaries due to concerns that improvements may be compromised by vehicle traffic.

6.11. Council has the option of progressing with aesthetic and functional enhancements of the streets without undertaking a formal road stop process. Staff recommend that any significant investment into the street be supported by an underlying land status that supports the intended future purpose of the laneway as a safe pedestrian centric space.

6.12. Council could progress with upgrades to Good Street without securing easements arrangements for 5 Good Street and 140 High Street. While a portion of Good Street would be legally stopped as a road, vehicles could legally operate within the property boundaries of 5 Good Street and 140 High Street if the property owners were so inclined. Therefore, failing to secure easements arrangements would mean public safety concerns are not resolved and future investment in the street may be compromised without a supportive underlying land status.

Health and Safety

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

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

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

7.2. Legislation

7.2.1. **Section 319 (h) of the Local Government Act 1974**
A local authority has a general power in respect of roads in section 319(h) of the Act to stop roads in accordance with section 342 and Schedule 10 of the Act.

7.2.2. **Section 342 of the Local Government Act 1974**
Does permit the Council to temporarily close a road in limited circumstances but is a measure not intended to be long term.

7.2.3. **Section 72 of the Transport Act 1962 and section 22AB of the Land Transport Act 1998**
May provide Council with the power to make a bylaw to limit the use of a road. However, this would require further legal investigation to ensure a bylaw is permissible under these circumstances.
7.3. **Community Outcomes**

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

- The Council makes information about its plans and activities readily available.
- The Council takes account of the views across the community including mana whenua.

7.3.2. **ENVIRONMENT**: There is a safe environment for all

- Harm to people from natural and manmade hazards is minimised.
- Crime, injury and harm from road crashes, gambling, and alcohol abuse are minimised.

7.3.3. **PLACES & SPACES**: 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 distinctive character of our takiwa – towns, villages and rural areas is maintained*

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

7.4. **Delegations**

7.4.1. A formal road stop request requires the approval of Council.
ATTACHMENT 1 - Map of the proposed road stop area on the section of Good Street between High Street and the Service Lane.

The actual road stop area will be determined by surveying once the formal road stop process is underway.
ATTACHMENT 2 - Map of the Good Street property boundaries for 5 Good Street and 140 High Street.
# MINUTES OF YOUTH COUNCIL (YC) MEETING

Held in the Committee Rooms, Rangiora Service Centre, WDC, High Street, Rangiora at 7pm Tuesday 26 February 2019

| 1. | **Present:**  
| | Sam Redman (WDC), Ellie Tizzard, Benya Ickenroth, Caitlin Tipping, Katie Lange, David Ayers (WDC Mayor), Andrew Besuyen, Alex Jackson, Eris Le Compte (Minute Secretary). |
| 2. | **Apologies:** Jacob Harford, Kirstyn Barnett (WDC Councillor), Dan Gordon (WDC Councillor), Arabella Jarman. |

| 3. | **Report from David Ayers**  
| | Consultations for the Annual Plan will open next month.  
| | New steps are being installed at the river in Kaiapoi.  
| | The Colour Festival takes place 9 March and the official opening of the new track at Ashley Gorge is on 11 March.  
| | New citizens to the area were sworn in last week. Over his time as Mayor, David has overseen the swearing in of citizens from 55 different countries.  
| | An invitation was extended to members of the Youth Council to attend the WDC Community Board meetings. Next meeting to be held 6 March, 5pm at the Council Chambers. Caitlin and Katie expressed an interest in attending. |

| ACTIONS: | Caitlin & Katie |

| 4. | **Youth Strategy Implementation**  
| | Sam Redman  
| | Various subjects for discussion by Youth Council.  
| | - Youth centre  
| | - Employment  
| | - Mental health in the region  
| | - Youth Council ambassadors for WDC  
| | - Rangiora Action Community Board with a view to funding  
| | - Having a youth voice  
| | Invite Liz Ashton to a Youth Council meeting.  
| | The Rangiora-Ashley Community Board next meeting is 13 March at Loburn Pavilion, 7pm. |

| ACTIONS: | Sam |

| 5. | **Youth Centre Working Group**  
| | Sam has attended a meeting with Youth Centre Services re the youth centre. It is important to have a representation with this group. Also important that employment in the area be discussed. |
| 6. | **Application for MYD Funding**  
An application has been lodged with the Ministry of Youth Development for $27,000 funding with outcome to be advised in April. If successful, possible uses for funding are:  
- Skate Jam  
- All Night Party  
- Centre Stage Talent Show  
- Cultural Food Festival  
- Team Building and Development  
To be discussed at a later date. | Sam |
| 7. | **Youth Development Strategy Aotearoa (YDSA) Review**  
The current strategy was adopted in 2002. Sam has attended a meeting around updating this and using input and consultations from Youth Council | Sam |
| 8. | **Recruitment**  
Sam has distributed and sent out notice of a recruitment drive – schools etc. So far he has received two/three persons of interest and is hopeful for more. Replies to be received before 22 March. Maybe put together an article for local newspapers. | Sam |
| 9. | **Youth Connect**  
It is planned to send a group to #Active Youth Connect being held at Wainui 6-7 April. Registrations close on 10 March. Please contact Sam if interested.  
ECAn have offered an invitation for a youth representative from the Waimakariri District to take part in their new Youth Ropu group. Anyone interested, again, please contact Sam. | Contact Sam |
| 10. | **Terms of Reference & Expectations Brainstorm**  
Sam asked for ideas and input from those present which will be discussed and formatted at future meetings.  
The group did a brainstorm around expectations for both staff and youth councillors | |
| 11. | **General Business**  
The Hoodies are ready for collection for those who have not already done so.  
Sam handed out certificates to members  
A presentation gift for Olivia | |
**Age Friendly Meeting**

An Age-Friendly meeting takes place at the Rangiora Town Hall on 3 March at 10am. Residents are asked to complete the survey which has been circulated to the public.

**WDC Health Advisory Group**

Benya reported on her attendance at the WDC Health Advisory Group February meeting.

Subjects discussed included family violence, mental health, drug and drunk driving, health and education and introducing Mana Ake to schools and a youth development centre. Some time was spent discussion on whether the district needed yet another off licence liquor facility. The law as it stands at the moment does not place on a limit of how many off-licences are allowed in the region.

To consider inviting various persons/committees from WDC Council to talk at Youth Council meetings.

An invitation for Youth Council to sit in on WDC Council meetings which are held on the first Tuesday of each month at Council Chambers. Sam is happy to email agenda out to members.

Volunteers are still required to help at the Colourfest. Please contact Sam if you are available.

---

**Meeting closed at 8.28 pm**

**Next meeting** on Tuesday 26 March 2019 at 7pm in the Rakahuri Room, at the Rangiora Service Centre.

____________________  ______________________
Chair                  Date
PRESENT:
Sam Redman (WDC), Caitlin Tipping, Arabella Jarman. David Ayers (WDC Mayor), Dan Gordon (WDC Councillor), Jacob Harford, Kirstyn Barnett (WDC Councillor), Katie Lange (late arrival), Eris Le Compte (Minute Secretary), Carol Horgan and Emily Chapman (OSHSDG), Clair Fletcher (ECAN)

APOLOGIES:
Benya Ickenroth, Ellie Tizzard

1. WELCOME:
Arabella welcomed everyone present as well as guest speakers

2. OXFORD AND SURROUNDING AREAS HEALTH SERVICE DEVELOPMENT GROUP (OSHSDG):
Carol and Emily outlined a set of 10 proposals around health and transport services that their group would like to see improved in the Oxford and surrounding areas. This group has been set up due to the population increase in the region in recent years. Main areas of concern are:
- Transport to and from Christchurch Hospital
- After Hours service
- Rural based mental health service
- Locally based health advisory group
- Sharing patient information
- Better use of technology
- Restorative care
- In the near future the group would be keen to appoint a representative from the WDC Youth Council.

3. ECAN BUS ROUTE PROPOSAL CONSULTATION:
ECAN was pleased with submissions received from young people after
consultations in 2018. Main concerns were around fares and rates fare. A fare review will take place before the end of this year. The next steps are to provide more certainty for contracts, including the Waimakariri area and with more flexibility around routes. The Waimakariri consultations will be open between 29 April and 24 May 2019. However, any changes made in future will have to be within the current budget, but it is hoped to expand the Rangiora bus service further east and west. Also being trialled at the moment is an ‘on call’ service in Timaru which will be assessed when the trial ends as to whether it could be extended to other areas in New Zealand. Any comments to be directed to Sam.

4. REPORTS FOR DISCUSSION:
David has attended many local events recently.

Money has been allocated for bio diversity treatment and waste water etc.

It is hoped to procure funding for new tennis courts at the new Rangiora stadium.

Council are looking at sustainability for electric charging points at various places in the region.

Rangiora along with many other rural areas have been advised by Police to not go ahead with a national remembrance service for the mosque attacks on 15 March due to police security numbers already being stretched on that day.

5. YOUTH STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION UPDATES
Currently the Youth Centre Working Group meets during the daytime. Sam is to suggest meetings are moved to late afternoon/evening? Sam is also keen to contact the Rangiora Youth Police Officer to see if there is any interest.

6. COMMUNITY BOARD PRESENTATION AND ANNUAL PLAN
Caitlin and Katie attended the Rangiora Ashley Community Board meeting at Loburn and answered questions from the floor.

Dan Gordon was also present and praised both Caitlin and Katie for the way in which they spoke on the many questions put to them. It is recommended that the Youth Council put in a submission.

7. RECRUITMENT
To date Sam has received four applications and would still like more. It was agreed to extend the application period for another week.
Ellie will be doing a survey at the Oxford show on 30 March which would be a good opportunity to put the word out.

Arabella, Jacob and Caitlin offered to help with the interviewing. Sam will contact by email.

8. #ACTIVATE - SOUTH ISLAND YOUTH CONNECT
This event takes place at Wainui on 6th and 7th April. Sam has reserved spaces and will email out details to members.

9. TERMS OF REFERENCE
This to be carried over to a future meeting.

10. GENERAL BUSINESS
Age-Friendly Meeting:
Caitlin attended the meeting and organisers were pleased with the results from the surveys.

Pizza in the Park:
Around 40 people turned up for this WaiYouth event.

Annual Plan:
Sam has prepared a draft for the Annual Plan and will circulate to members. Sam asked for a group to represent at the hearing.

Road Safety Committee:
Sam to ask about this.

Resignation of Aurora Melville:
A resignation has been received from Aurora. It was agreed to recognise her contribution by sending a card.

11. ACTIONS:
- **ACTION - Clair** to be invited back to the next Youth Council meeting.
- **ACTION - Sam** to contact Arabella, Jacob and Caitlin to organise interviews with Youth Council applicants.
- **ACTION - Sam** to send out draft annual plan submission and Youth Council Terms of Reference.
- **ACTION - Sam** to send out #Activate details to members.
- ACTION - Sam to ask about the Road Safety Committee meetings.
- ACTION - Sam to send card to Aurora.

12. GENERAL BUSINESS:
No general business.

Meeting closed at 8:55pm.
Next meeting is on Tuesday 30th April 2019 at 7pm, at the Rangiora Service Centre.

NOTES:
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY AND RECREATION COMMITTEE
MEETING HELD IN THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH
STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 26 MARCH 2019 AT 1 PM.

PRESENT
Councillor K Barnett (Chair), Mayor D Ayers, Councillors A Blackie, R Brine, W Doody and D Gordon.

ATTENDING
Deputy Mayor Felstead, Councillors N Atkinson, J Meyer and P Williams.
C Brown (Manager Community and Recreation), J Palmer (Chief Executive), M Greenwood (Aquatic Facilities Manager), P Eskett (District Libraries Manager), G MacLeod (Greenspace Manager), K Walker (Kaiapoi Aquatic Centre and Facilities Asset Manager), T Sturley (Community Team Manager), M Burdon (Community Development Advisor) and E Stubbs (Governance Support Officer).

M Sparrow (Wellbeing North Canterbury Board), J King (Combined Churches of Rangiora) and D Ryan (Waimakariri Community Housing Steering Group).

1 APOLOGIES
There were no apologies.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
No conflicts of interest were reported.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee held on Tuesday 12 February 2019

Moved D Gordon seconded A Blackie

THAT the Community and Recreation committee:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Community and Recreation Committee, held on Tuesday 12 February 2019, as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
Councillor Gordon referred to the previous workshop on the North Canterbury Minibus Trust and asked if raised matters had been followed up with the Trust.
C Brown advised that there had been discussion with the Roading unit regarding location of the Southern Bypass and effect on potential land. Indications were that there was still space available and a report would come back to the Committee in the future.

Councillor Gordon asked whether the Health Hub land had been raised with the Canterbury District Health Board and C Brown advised he would follow up.
5 DEPUTATIONS

5.1 Deidre Ryan (Waimakariri Community Housing Steering Group (WCHSG), Chair), Mary Sparrow (Wellbeing North Canterbury Board) and Jason King (Combined Churches of Rangiora) provided an update to the Committee on the Community House development. D Ryan noted that the process had started in 2016 when Social Services Waimakariri facilitated a community forum where support for a shared community space was established. The WCHSG was set up with the task of developing a feasibility study and funding was received from a Lotteries grant for the study. The study was completed in November 2018 and the John Knox Presbyterian Church site was determined to be the most suitable from nine potential sites, being on the corner of High and King Streets, Rangiora.

D Ryan outlined the benefits of a Community House, commenting that it was an opportunity to provide better resources for the community by collating agencies together. It was a cost effective method of providing facility provision within an economy of scale. There was value in collaborative space and ‘hallway’ conversations to explore and respond to events and provided a resource base for Christchurch agencies to use. It was an accessible place for people to come in when they needed help most with no ‘wrong door’ and it tied in with other adjoining facilities.

J King noted that he wore two hats in the project, as he was on the church building committee and part of the working group. The church was looking to redevelop the site and had a desire to build relationships with, and serve the wider community. The church particularly liked the idea of partnering with Wellbeing North Canterbury. They already had good relationships with the Red Cross, Blood Service and Presbyterian Support Services. J King advised that advanced designs were in process and should be completed within two to three months. The church proposed having conversations with the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand in the near future.

Questions

Councillor Brine asked if car parking had been considered as there would be a need for car parks for clients, staff and worshippers. J King advised car parking had been considered as part of the overall plan. They had had an indication that car parking would be sufficient and noted the nearby location of council car parking.

Councillor Doody asked if rooms were available for those community groups interested. D Ryan advised that they were still in a development process and it would be inappropriate to say the door was closed to other interested partners. There would be a variety of utilisation with some agencies based there more permanently, while other groups would be ‘in and out’.

Councillor Gordon commended the steering group on the work undertaken to date and the thorough investigation of opportunities. He asked about the commercial skills of the wider building team and commented he would be interested in viewing the plans when they were ready to be released. J King provided details of the building team noting they were a good range of people including some outside of the parish providing expertise.

Mayor Ayers asked about the potential increase in demand caused by providing space. D Ryan commented a key part of the hub was it was there to provide resource and support. It was not an attempt to draw community satellites in under one roof, rather to connect and serve. M Sparrow commented that the Hub could provide a space that groups, for example, from Christchurch on a ‘come as you need basis’.

Councillor Barnett referred to the wider community use of the space and asked about the ownership model of the building. J King advised that the Presbyterian Church Aotearoa New Zealand would own all property assets. There would be a lease to Wellbeing North Canterbury and they would run the building how they liked. It would
be a similar relationship to Presbyterian Support Services which worked well, being built on trust and relationships.

Councillor Barnett asked about consultation with the general public on what they would like to see. D Ryan explained the project had grown from a core of people within the sector, however, they believed there was a place for general consultation.

Councillor Barnett asked what role the Council had in that area. D Ryan commented they had a valued contributor through T Sturley and the Community Team and hoped that would be retained.

Councillor Gordon asked if there were other models on collation and collaboration of services and how successful were those. D Ryan explained that the steering group had spent time researching. The EPIC Centre in Christchurch was an innovative, simple and effective model example which housed several small IT companies with collaborative areas including one kitchen and bathroom. J King highlighted the Village Church in Bryndwr and the Oxford Terrace Baptist Church. M Sparrow noted the shared facility in Silverstream.

Councillor Barnett thanked the presenters.

6 REPORTS

6.1 Croquet Club Loan Deferral and Council Funding Contribution for Croquet Lawn Extension – C Brown (Manager Community and Recreation)

C Brown spoke to the report, noting that the purpose was to seek a deferral of a $42,000 loan granted to the Rangiora Croquet Club and to consider the matter as an Annual Plan submission for an application of $25,000 to the Club for the development of two new greens. The club currently had 47 members and significant development spending had attracted new members.

C Brown referred to para 3.13 which outlined reasons why the development should be financially supported by the Council. The reasons included the Council having had historically supported active recreation by provision of playing surfaces; the club was developing into a sustainable and viable club; croquet provided a recreation and social function for an aging demographic; and, the club had been active in seeking external funding.

Moved Councillor Brine seconded Councillor Gordon

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee recommend:

THAT the Council:
(a) Receives report No. 190221020363.
(b) Approves the loan repayments for the Community Loan of $42,000 provided to the Rangiora Croquet Club being deferred for a further three years from April 2018 until April 2021.
(c) Notes that deferring the loan for a three year period allows sufficient time for the Rangiora Croquet Club to complete the development of two additional full size greens which are required to allow for current and future club membership.
(d) Considers as an annual plan submission a grant of $25,000 for the Rangiora Croquet Club for the development of two new croquet greens for the 2019 / 20 financial year.

CARRIED
Councillor Brine commented that the croquet club had tried for many years for funding and had eventually received support. They had 14 members when they originally came to the Council seeking support. It was a matter of building facilities and people would come; it was an example of a success story.

Councillor Gordon endorsed the comments of Councillor Brine. He had met with the croquet club on occasion and had been impressed with the development, noting $75,000 had been raised by the Club for developments. Councillor Gordon also noted the other funding sources for the new greens and it was the growth in membership that resulted in the need for new greens. The Club were aware of the need to repay the loan and that was easier with increased membership. He noted the granting of $25,000 was for the whole of Council to consider.

Councillor Barnett supported the recommendation and reiterated that the $25,000 was for the Council to consider in light of all funding submissions. The club served people of all demographics and when she had visited she had been impressed with the hard work of members. It was an open and inviting club of benefit to the community.

6.2 **Community Facilities Fees and Charges Working Party – C Brown (Manager Community and Recreation)**

C Brown spoke to the report which was seeking to establish a working party to revise the current Community Facilities Fees and Charges Policy. It was essentially the result of discussions with the Committee on the requests for fee waivers or reductions from groups.

C Brown provided some background to the Policy which was approved in 2012 and revised in 2018. Rules for user exemptions from standard fees were changed to require approval from the Committee. The current method had created debate and there was concern that there was no clear policy direction on whether exemptions were appropriate or justified. It was agreed that a working party was required to review the situation.

C Brown outlined the key objectives of the working party which were to, review all current fee agreements, review applicability of fees, recommend fee waiver processes and recommend any amendments to the policy.

C Brown noted that the recommendation had identified Councillors Doody and Barnett for the working party and was looking to potentially appoint another two councillors.

Indications of interest were requested.

Moved Councillor Barnett  seconded Councillor Doody

**THAT** the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190319035957

(b) **Approves** the Community Facilities Fees and Charges Policy Review Working Party Terms of Reference (Trim 190319035802).

(c) **Appoints** Councillor Wendy Doody, Community Facilities Portfolio Holder as a member of the Community Facilities Fees and Charges Policy Review Working Party.

(d) **Appoints** Councillor Kirstyn Barnett, Community Development Portfolio Holder as a member of the Community Facilities Fees and Charges Policy Review Working Party.

(e) **Appoints** Councillors Dan Gordon and John Meyer as members of the Community Facilities Fees and Charges Policy Review Working Party.
CARRIED

Councillor Barnett commented the issues had been discussed at length and she hoped the working party could move forward as one.

Councillor Doody explained she had worked with the Community and Recreation Manager on this previously and it was timely to review the policy.

Councillor Brine commented on previous attempts to improve the policy and it being found ‘too hard’. He wished the working party well in their deliberations.

Mayor Ayers commented it was a matter worth considering and he wished the working party all the best.

Councillor Barnett remarked on understanding Councillor Brine’s position. She commented there had been a lot of feedback from the public since fees had been increased and she believed community facilities were for the community. She suggested it was a policy that could require a regular review.

6.3 Mandeville Sports Ground Capital Budget Update – C Brown (Manager Community and Recreation)

C Brown spoke to the report, commenting that there had not been an update for some time. Mandeville Sports Club (MSC) had worked closely with the community and staff on the development of the Reserve. C Brown referred to para 3.1 in the report which listed completed upgrades.

C Brown advised that MSC would like to use the remaining $9,500 to develop the north-west sports field where the Eyreton Pony Club used to be located. The development was always anticipated. In the past there had been good quality stone buried and the $9,500 funding would be adequate. The work would leave $17,500 in the budget which had already been allocated to a walking track. In addition there was $200,000 for the development of a toilet to service the equestrian side of reserve.

Moved Councillor Doody seconded Councillor Blackie

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:
(a) Receives report No. 190315034750.
(b) Notes that the last remaining capital development funding of $9,500 is to be used by the Mandeville Sports Club for the purpose of developing the North West sports fields within Mandeville Sports Grounds.
(c) Notes that there is currently $17,500 that will remain in the budget. This has already been allocated towards the development of the walkway around the reserve.
(d) Notes that a separate budget of $200,000 remains in the current financial year for the development of a toilet to service the equestrian side of the domain.

CARRIED

Councillor Doody was pleased to see the work the Club had done commenting on the enormous number of volunteer hours. MSC were working toward the walking track and planting reserve. Due to health and safety regulations it was difficult to use volunteers which had an impact on the budget.

6.4 Community House Feasibility Study Update – T Sturley (Community Team Manager)
T Sturley spoke further to the deputation to provide more detail around the rationale behind the proposal. She highlighted the report did not propose a financial model for capital building costs as that was a discussion still to be had. However, the Council already allocated significant operational funding to Wellbeing North Canterbury which could be used towards operational costs at the new facility. The steering group was made up of key anchor tenants and the workshop had had representatives of community groups, health services and social services.

T Sturley noted the preferred site option was the John Knox site, the site was clear and immediately available. She addressed the issue of parking raised in the deputation and noted the preferred site had greater potential for parking to any other site considered. A further consideration was it could potentially increase the Council parking usage.

T Sturley noted the existing adjoining kitchen and meeting room which would reduce costs. In addition it was a prominent site, centrally located and close to complementary services including Presbyterian Support. Since the earthquakes there had been a lack of facilities to meet or operate out of and the cost and competition for space was an ongoing issue. A community house facility could provide five spaces used for 40 hours rather than 20 spaces used for 10 hours.

T Sturley outlined the benefits of community housing including affordable accommodation, sustainable service provision, ease of access and good cross referral. She noted that those seeking social services often had complex needs and the model provided a broad range of services under one roof.

Councillor Williams asked about security in the facility and referred to the security at WINZ and the library as he held some concern regarding volunteers being at risk. T Sturley thanked Councillor Williams for highlighting the concern commenting there were good models to follow.

Moved Councillor Gordon seconded Councillor Doody

**THAT** the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190314037068

(b) **Notes** that the preferred option detailed in the report is to locate such a facility at the John Knox Presbyterian Church site on the corner of King and High Streets in Rangiora.

(c) **Notes** that, as key stakeholders are still in discussion, financial implications, in terms of funding capital costs are yet to be determined.

(d) **Notes** that, in terms of operational costs, it is anticipated that Council will continue to allocate operational funding to Wellbeing North Canterbury. Such funding would cover their rental costs, which as a key anchor tenant, will contribute significantly toward offsetting the estimated $145,000 operational costs for the facility.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Gordon believed it was a great proposal, years in the making, noting he had been Chair of the Wellbeing North Canterbury Trust in the past. He referred to the rigour in the commercial arrangement and commented on the vision of former Councillor, Peter Allen. The partnership with the Church and good location meant aspects were aligning well.

Councillor Doody agreed with the comments of Councillor Gordon and believed it was a great way to move forward in partnership. The location was a good central area.
Councillor Brine held concerns around car parking, commenting people did not want to walk 200m. While he hoped he was wrong, Councillor Brine believed car parking could cause issues.

Councillor Barnett noted that car parking was on the Council’s radar with budget in the Long Term Plan. Her questions around car parking had been answered and it may require leadership from the Council. The value of a community house was huge and she was particularly pleased to see the conjoined model. Councillor Barnett would be interested to see the governance of the facility and openness to all members of the community. Councillor Barnett commented, that in her opinion, the Council would be foolish not to pursue the matter in a supporting role. She congratulated staff on their work.

Councillor Williams commented it was a good proposal for the community.

Mayor Ayers commented on some of the background, including the potential of Rangiora Hospital. It was good to see the feasibility coming through and he was looking forward to receiving further reports. Mayor Ayers accepted there was a growing parking issue, but noted the facility was not all day use. Mayor Ayers commented security was an interesting point to consider. In the library security was for misbehaviour, not danger. He accepted some clients were challenging and that had to be considered, however it was not a new issue. From a town centre point of view, the impact of a non-commercial use in a business area should be considered. However, it had been the site of the Presbyterian Church for over 100 years, and would be for the foreseeable future. He did not think a community house facility in that location was bad.

6.5 **Age Friendly Community Project Update – T Sturley (Community Team Manager)**

T Sturley introduced the report noting the survey results were currently being collated.

M Burdon spoke to a PowerPoint presentation to update the Committee on the Consultation Workshop, particularly regarding emerging themes and priorities. The workshops had been held in five centres around the district. M Burdon explained the format of the workshops, importantly tables were kept to a maximum of six to eight people to ensure in-depth conversations.

M Burdon explained the recurrent themes from brainstorming which included participation, access, being valued and connections. When asked what could be done better and what were the gaps and opportunities the themes aligned to existing strategies, however some gaps and opportunities were identified. These gaps were around transport, accessibility, housing options, ‘after hours’ heath service and specialist services. M Burdon explained that an evaluation survey filled out by 81 of 100 workshop participants, mostly rated the District positively in terms of age-friendliness.

M Burdon provided an overview of general feedback from a number of presentations including the Marae, rest homes and the Migrants and Newcomers Group. It was noted that there was much positivity in the District already, including communication and friendliness. M Burdon highlighted some feedback received including font and use of internet versus printed media, lack of toilet signage, bus stops near rest homes, need for businesses to be more age friendly and a desire to be valued.
M Burdon noted there had been 373 responses to the district wide survey, the majority in hard copy. There were some emerging issues as previously noted. M Burdon advised that the District Age-friendly Plan would be presented to the Committee in May and submitted to MSD following that.

T Sturley highlighted that the Ministry of Social Development Office for Seniors (MSD) had praised the application and had asked whether the Waimakariri application could be used as a template for other communities. She commented there was good alignment with strategies including the Age Friendly Community Model.

Moved Councillor Doody  seconded Councillor Gordon

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 190314033928.

(b) Notes the extensive engagement process undertaken to inform the development of an age friendly plan.

(c) Notes that the Ministry of Social Development ‘Office for Seniors’ has commended staff on their application for funding for this project and have asked that the Waimakariri application be presented on their website as an exemplar to guide applications from other communities.

(d) Notes that $11,800 in external funding was secured to resource the Age Friendly Community Plan project.

CARRIED

Councillor Doody praised staff for excellent work. It was a good platform to move forward she remarked.

Councillor Gordon supported the remarks of Councillor Doody. He was particularly pleased to hear of the commendation from MSD. He concurred that the consultation was well run with an excellent facilitator. He noted the good engagement model run by Greenspace and hoped to see more of that going forward.

Mayor Ayers commented that he had attended some of the steering group meetings and noted that an age friendly community was friendly to all ages, for example transport issues of the elderly were also relevant to teenagers. He commented on the potential isolation of elderly in retirement villages as many of those were not from the district. By going to those communities staff were helping to connect. Isolation and connectedness was a ‘two-way’ process. Mayor Ayers commended the report. On the point that a lot of people did not know what the Council was doing, he suggested that after the Annual Plan was finalised that the full report be available to the community to see if promises were kept.

Councillor Barnett endorsed previous comments and the value of going out and talking to the community. She asked how the 50% travelling to Christchurch were captured. She commented on the roles of libraries and pools in that engagement. It was good to see low-hanging fruit such as toilet signage identified.
6.6 **District Libraries Update – P Eskett (District Libraries Manager)**

P Eskett delivered her mihi as a way of introduction to the Committee and noted she was currently President of the Library and Information Association of New Zealand Aotearoa.

P Eskett highlighted para 4.3 regarding the seed saving workshops in collaboration with Eco Educate. The initiative had a focus on exchange of seeds and a number of schools were involved with collecting seeds, labelling and providing instructions on growing. It would be extended into the libraries as part of KidsFest. The network of library seed banks supported a number of the United Nations Agenda for Sustainable Development Goals and the initiative would form part of the NZ voluntary reporting to the UN.

P Eskett highlighted the idea of Library Community Commons as part of the last free space where everybody was welcome to share ideas.

P Eskett highlighted para 4.6, the Next Chapter Group which met monthly in the Kaiapoi Library in partnership with Dementia Canterbury to support members of the community and carers living with dementia. It was a morning themed programme to engage conversation and stimulate memories and assist carers with social isolation. She noted the predicted rise of dementia and the cost benefit of community care.

P Eskett highlighted the Summer Reading Challenge and the research that showed the importance of students continuing to read over summer to prevent a reading slump. There had been a 149% increase in registrations and 213% increase in completion rates compared with the previous year and P Eskett congratulated Hillary Mercer and the team on the result.

P Eskett advised of the upcoming Peter Carson exhibition.

Moved Councillor Doody seconded Councillor Brine

**THAT** the Community and Recreation Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190315034754.

(b) **Notes** the customer service improvements that have been implemented in the library during the 2019 calendar year.

(c) **Circulates** this report to the Boards.

CARRIED

Councillor Doody noted the joint effort in the report presented well. She was interested in the information on Dementia and hoped to see the programme extended to the three libraries. There was an upcoming collaborative event with Selwyn, Christchurch and the Hurunui.

Councillor Barnett commented on libraries as a community space.

6.7 **Aquatic Facilities Update – M Greenwood (Aquatic Facilities Manager) and K Walker (Kaiapoi Aquatic Centre & Facilities Asset Manager)**

M Greenwood spoke to the report, highlighting para 4.3. There had been a shallow water black-out during a standard breath holding exercise, resulting in a freeze on the practice until a more robust process was in place.
M Greenwood noted there had been two formal complaints in the last two months. Firstly regarding staff not handling a behaviour complaint professionally resulting in the staff member receiving professional development; and secondly, around the number of school children using the facility and the encroachment onto public space.

M Greenwood advised there had been verbal commitment from Water Safety NZ that they had successfully been allocated $15,000 toward the Schools programme.

K Walker referred to para 4.5 Facilities PoolSafe assessment in Ohoka, Kaiapoi and Rangiora. This had involved looking at Normal Operating Procedures and Risk Management Procedures and all three pools had achieved the required standard.

K Walker advised that the Oxford doggy pool party had over 50 dogs attending in poor weather with positive feedback.

Moved Councillor Blackie seconded Councillor Brine

THAT the Community and Recreation Committee:
(a) Receives report No. 190227023702.

(b) Notes Aquatic Facilities progress against its key performance indicators for Water Quality and Facility Attendance.

(c) Circulates the report to the Boards for their information.

CARRIED

7 MEMO

7.1 Neighbourhood Support Funding – Variation to Purpose – T Sturley (Community Team Manager) (Trim No. 190208014239)

For information only

8 PORTFOLIO UPDATES

Greenspace (Parks Reserves and Sports Grounds) – Councillor R Brine

Councillor Brine advised that there was feedback from the Loburn Domain regarding concern around lack of irrigation. Following a dry summer there had been injuries whilst training on the hard surface. Councillor Brine commented there was not a quick fix and there was a need to mitigate risk. $40,000 was required for investigation work and he was expecting the club to progress the issue.

G MacLeod, the new Greenspace Manager introduced himself to the Committee and provided some background on his experience.
8.1 Community Facilities (including Aquatic Centres, Halls, Libraries and Museums) – Councillor W Doody

Councillor Doody urged the Committee to visit the Ashley Gorge Reynolds Heritage Pavilion as it was a splendid building in an iconic area for the district. She thanked the Council for their assistance.

Councillor Doody noted the departure of librarian M O’Connell to the Hurunui District Council and commented the group were learning to fill the void in Creative Communities.

Councillor Doody commented on Pensioner Housing, she liked to view properties when vacated and had been concerned around the state some of the homes were left. She believed something should be put in place to assist staff.

The Access Group had taken staff and Councillors down High Street in wheelchairs and with other ‘ailments’ to highlight the concerns around accessibility.

There had been questions around why the Oxford Pool could not be open for a further two weeks however she understood it was a staff resourcing matter.

8.2 Community Development and Wellbeing – Councillor K Barnett and Councillor W Doody

Councillor Barnett advised of the Big Brothers Big Sisters breakfast fundraiser on 3 May.

Councillor Barnett advised of a meeting with the Hope Community Trust. They had obtained the old area of the community garden and had development plans. Some fruit trees remained. The number of activities they were engaged in was amazing. The biggest issue was funding, however they were in a reinvigorated state.

Councillor Barnett was pleased to see the memo on COG’s funding and Councillor Doody was pleased to see backpedalling on rural provisions.

9 QUESTIONS

There were no questions under Standing Orders.

10 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

There was no urgent general business.

As there was no further business, the meeting closed at 2.55pm.

CONFIRMED

_______________________
Chairperson

________________________
Date
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE AUDIT AND RISK COMMITTEE HELD IN THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY 26 MARCH 2019 COMMENCING AT 3.30PM.

PRESENT

Councillor N Atkinson (Chairperson), Mayor D Ayers, Deputy Mayor K Felstead, Councillors K Barnett, A Blackie and P Williams.

IN ATTENDANCE

Councillors R Brine (absent 5.30pm to 5.44pm), W Doody, D Gordon, J Meyer, S Stewart, H Warwick (ENC), G Byrnes (TKTT) and J Hullen (TKTT).

J Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support), J Palmer (Chief Executive), S Markham (Manager, Strategy and Engagement), A Ismail (IT Systems Administrator), and S Nichols (Governance Manager).

The meeting adjourned at 5.10pm for a workshop and reconvened at 5.30pm.

1 APOLOGIES

Nil.

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Nil.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee held on Tuesday 12 February 2019

Moved Councillor Felstead seconded Councillor Barnett

THAT the Audit Committee

(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of a meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee, held on the 12 February 2019, as a true and accurate record, subject to a minor grammatical change to item 6.5.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING

Nil.

5 PRESENTATIONS

5.1 Miles O’Connor, Bancorp Treasury

Miles O’Connor from Bancorp Treasury spoke to the Council in relation to future economic forecasts, the Councils’ Treasury Policy and Standard and Poors. Presentation Trim 190330046952 was later circulated to the Councillors.
M O'Conner explained the services Bancorp Treasury provided to the Council and how the debt is managed. An overview of overseas market influences was discussed, impact of interest rates and international bonds, and where Waimakariri District Council is benchmarked in relation to other New Zealand Council's. General discussion also occurred in relation to current rating with Standard and Poors. Debt flexibility and life of assets was also discussed in conjunction with J Millward. A general discussion related to the consequences of a changing financial environment was also explored.

6 REPORTS

6.1 Enterprise North Canterbury Half Year Report to December 2018, Promotion of the Waimakariri District Business Plan Report to December 2018 and Draft Statement of Intent beginning 1 July 2019 – S Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement)

S Markham presented the report and H Warwick (CE of Enterprise North Canterbury) and spoke to a PowerPoint presentation (Trim 190330046953) that supported the report.

H Warwick highlighted the business support work and funding for the past six months, including training and networking programmes, on-line resources for business, surveys incorporating town studies and data analysis. An overview of District promotion input and influences was highlighted. H Warwick provided an outline to expectations and major events occurring over the next six months, including an independent trade stand at TRENZ which is New Zealand’s biggest annual international tourism showcase run by Tourism New Zealand and links to international markets. This year the TRENZ event is being held in mid-May in Rotorua. It would be the first time ENC have attended in their own right, whereas previously North Canterbury was promoted under the umbrella of Christchurch.

Councillor Stewart referred to pg 18 of the agenda and sought further information in relation to training opportunities. H Warwick advised an average class size was eight to ten people per workshop. Originally many workshops were half day in duration but now the majority of workshops would occur over a full day.

Councillor Stewart sought further clarification in regards to the income for the Information Centre, querying the increased expenses and whether a surplus is possible at year end. H Warwick advised that on average $100,000 of sales would generate $12,000 to the I-site above Council funding, and that income is anticipated to double this year, however computer software and on-line services will also contribute to an increase of expenditure. The initial increase from income is primarily based on train bookings (Coastal Pacific) and is unlikely to continue into the future.

In a supplementary question Councillor Stewart asked why costs had increased to the level they have. H Warwick clarified it was related to cost of sales. The overall running costs are covered in in the operational budget.

Councillor Gordon stated he was concerned that ENC appear at most Audit and Risk Committee meetings, enquiring if the Committee were putting undue reporting requirements on ENC, in comparison to other CCO groups that report to the Committee. S Markham advised the reason for the presentation today was as part of the requirement of six monthly reporting in relation to the half year report. The solution would be not to require six monthly reporting, which was not recommended. S Markham explained H Warwick had attended more frequently in recent months because of past review requirements and today was the last portion of the review process that started in early 2018.
J Palmer advised the six month reporting process is not onerous. If any further high level reviews were required that would be a different situation, however by ENC presenting every six months it is helpful to the Committee. J Millward advised of requirements under the Local Government Act (sec 66) or when there were changes to the Statement of Intent.

Councillor Barnett enquired if there was a basic itinerary of recommended activities for a half and full day visitor. H Warwick advised such information was available at the I-site and on the Visit Waimakariri website.

Councillor Barnett enquired if ENC were promoting into Christchurch to attract Christchurch residents as visitors. H Warwick advised newspaper advertising was not utilised but the district was promoted through social media, and currently had 4,000 followers.

In a supplementary question Councillor Barnett enquired about promotion for the Christchurch market and the Visit Waimakariri site. S Markham advised that further research has yet to occur since the last survey, however ENC were achieving good results through paid adverts on social media in Christchurch.

Councillor Atkinson commented on the River Queen vessel, and whether bookings could be taken through the I-site. H Warwick advised that ENC have offered to help with bookings and are recommending on-line bookings. It is understood there is interest already for group bookings for birthdays and Christmas functions.

Following a question from Mayor Ayers related to visitor spend, S Markham reflected on MIBE information, indicating that visitors to the Waimakariri District spent approximately $150m per year. This spend was comparable to visitor spend in the Hurunui District, acknowledging that the attraction for visiting was different in each district. S Markham advised he would circulate the MIBE information to the Councillors.

Moved Councillor Atkinson seconded Mayor Ayers

**THAT** the Audit and Risk Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No 190225021990.

(b) **Receives** the ENC Half Year Report to December 2018;

(c) **Receives** the Promotion of the Waimakariri District Business Plan Report to December 2018;

(d) **Receives** the Draft Statement of Intent beginning 1 July 2019;

(e) **Provides** any comment it may wish to make on the Draft Statement of Intent beginning 1 July 2019.

(f) **Acknowledges** the work carried out by Enterprise North Canterbury and thanks the Trustees and staff for their efforts;

(g) **Circulates** the report to the Community Boards.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Atkinson stated that the visibility of ENC and Visit Waimakariri is needed to continue. He considered the report as conveying good news and was pleased to see that new trustees had recently been appointed enhancing the vibrancy at the Board level. Councillor Atkinson believed that Waimakariri was in a new growth phase, having passed the recovery phase. This involved increased interest from visitors for attractions such as cycle trails and beaches, which flowed onto business benefits.
Mayor Ayers stated it is clear that central business retailers are finding it hard at the present time, however $150m spend from visitors is significant and the Council may tend to undervalue the input of ENC, as the district does not have a single significant aspect like Hanmer. However, he acknowledged the beaches and other aspects like the cycle trails do draw people to the district. Mayor Ayers reflected that the district has a good variety of retail outlets, that enables choice and helps makes the district a good place to live.

Councillor Stewart stated that she welcomed the report. Councillor Stewart suggested a recommendation to the incoming Council to recognise the change of ENC and encouraged a meeting with the new Council to grow the relationship. Councillor Stewart stated she would be interested in reviews related to river pollution solutions from Mr B Penter, (newly appointed Board member), as he brings experience from the Waikato River Authority. Councillor Stewart also offered the suggestion of a local summit on water and impacts on the rural industry being held in the district in 2020. Councillor Stewart reflected on challenges ahead for the farming community, and it was not solely the retail sector undergoing a changing economic environment.

Councillor Gordon stated he always looked forward to the positive work of ENC and he was satisfied that the six monthly reporting process was appropriate. Councillor Gordon remarked, as holder of the Business Promotion and Town Centres portfolio, he held concern for the retail sector and the current economic climate. Councillor Gordon reflected on a recent meeting, steps taken by retailers through the earthquakes and an upcoming discussion on the merits of progressing projects as the feedback is there is an economic slow down. Councillor Gordon queried the Council role and the importance of listening.

Councillor Barnett endorsed Councillor Gordon’s comments, and the importance of getting smarter. She reflected on promotions such as ‘branding’ for day visitors particularly, noting that there had not been a shopping promotion for some time, whilst acknowledging any promotion had to be driven by the retailers themselves. Councillor Barnett commented on the recent opening of the Waikuku Old School Collective shopping cluster on State Highway One.

Councillor Atkinson, in his right of reply, reflected on a branding exercise that occurred many years ago and the continuation to market and promote towns and the district. Councillor Atkinson stated he was supportive of ENC coming to the new Council for a discussion, and believed the six monthly reporting frequency is the right balance. He stated that by ENC attending TRENZ in their own right it is a huge step forward as it provides an opportunity to link big events with major operators.

The meeting adjourned at 5.10pm for a workshop related to event underwriting, presented by S Markham. The meeting reconvened at 5.30pm.

_Councillor R Brine vacated the room at 5.30pm._
6.2 **Te Kohaka o Tuhaitara Trust - Six month Financial Statements for the period ended 31 December 2018 – J Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)**

Greg Byrnes (TKTT General Manager) and Joseph Hullen (TKTT Deputy Chair) were present for the report.

G Byrnes introduced the report and took it as read. It was advised that the past six months had been productive and it was appreciated that two full time rangers had been recruited and were busy on various aspects of Trust work.

Councillor Stewart queried the surplus and operational budget. Matters were explained by J Millward.

Councillor Stewart clarified the Next Steps funding from the Water Zone to which G Byrnes advised that the Trust would be presenting at the Waimakariri Water Zone meeting in April.

Moved Councillor Barnett seconded Councillor Williams

**THAT** the Audit and Risk Committee

- **Receives** report No.190314034122.
- **Receives** the Six Month Report for the Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust for the period ended 31 December 2018;
- **Notes** the operations for the six months to 31 December progressing as planned and within budget.

**CARRIED**

Councillor Barnett stated she was pleased with the work undertaken and appreciated the good projects currently underway.

Councillor Williams congratulated the Trust on the work undertaken to date.

6.3 **Te Kohaka o Tuhaitara Trust – Statement of Intent for the Year ending 30 June 2020 – J Millward (Manager Finance and Business Support)**

Greg Byrnes (TKTT General Manager) and Joseph Hullen (TKTT Deputy Chair) were present for the report.

J Hullen outlined changes and enhancements to trails and the work involved on the Western Ridge through Pegasus. It was reported that the pest control programme was working successfully with buy-in from the Pegasus Residents Group and supported by the newly appointed education ranger. The Trust were currently investigating options for land parcels at The Pines and Kairaki in the regeneration land, including how to generate income. The Trust was also reviewing aspects of the Pegasus Town WCMA and CMA into the Management Plan, with work proposed to be completed by the end of the financial year. G Byrnes advised that some work had already commenced this year but the outputs would be more visible next year.

Councillor Stewart requested more detail on the agreements of gazetted notification of land and land use. J Palmer commented on the process that needs to be followed by the Trust to enable the land to be entrusted into the Reserve Management Plans to enable the overall objectives to be met. There was brief discussion on the relationship between reserve management plans, regeneration land and the overall management with further discussions with the Council to occur over time as the process progressed.
Councillor R Brine returned to the meeting at 5.44pm.

Mayor Ayers commented on the ownership of regeneration land and reminded members of the central government commitment. Councillor Atkinson, as Chair, stopped the discussions as they were not focused on the report and recommend a discussion at another time.

Mayor Ayers enquired about the Trust taking over the management of the Kaiapoi Pa. J Hullen advised information and a proposal had been presented to both the Runanga and the Pa Trustees. The Trust was awaiting to hear back regarding the offer of land maintenance. Discussions would be ongoing.

Moved Councillor Williams seconded Councillor Blackie

THAT the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) Receives report No 190311031096.

(b) Receives the Statement of Intent for Te Kōhaka ō Tuhaitara Trust for the year ending 30 June 2020.

(c) Notes that under the Local Government Act 2002, the Audit and Risk Committee may request Te Kōhaka ō Tuhaitara Trust to make changes to the Statement of Intent. Te Kōhaka ō Tuhaitara Trust would consider these changes requested and re-present the Statement of Intent prior to the 30 June.

CARRIED

6.4 Cyber Security Quarterly Status Report – J Simon (CIO) and D Sewell (ICT Team Leader)

A Ismail presented the report which was taken as read. A Ismail explained several aspects of the report including average batch management compliance, involving many laptops being used for Civil Defence. Testing of signatures had occurred before rolling out and in late December a specialty security firm undertook a penetration test on the network. The outcome of testing was positive, reflecting on the work that had been undertaken over the last 12 months. The BMS and Scada systems are currently being upgraded to reduce risks and Cloud risk assessments are occurring to ensure maximum security is maintained. A Ismail outlined ongoing processes to ensure security is maintained at a high level.

Councillor Gordon queried the new phone system. Staff acknowledged issues had been identified and were working through matters, which includes ongoing staff education.

Councillor Barnett enquired about the phishing campaign. A Ismail spoke of two different campaigns running and the different purposes they served. Overall results were positive.

Councillor Stewart queried the new phone system with the 0800 number. Staff acknowledged Councillor Stewart’s comments, with matters raised from the recent feedback survey. Issues had been identified and discussions were occurring with suppliers as some matters related to software, whilst other aspects related to ongoing staff education.
THAT the Audit and Risk Committee

(a) Receives report no. 190226022048.

(b) Notes progress of the work programme is on target and within budget.

(c) Notes Council is sourcing appropriate Cyber Security insurance with cyber insurance to be tendered and in place before 25 June 2019.

CARRIED

Staff advised that the Digital Mobility Project had been entered for a Solgm Excellence Award and a short promotional video was played for elected member interest.

7 PORTFOLIO UPDATES

7.1 Audit, Risk, Long Term Plan and Excellence Programme – Deputy Mayor K Felstead

Councillor Felstead reflected that the Draft Annual Plan had been released for public consultation and feedback was starting to be received.

7.2 Communications – Councillor N Atkinson

Councillor Atkinson commented on the Community Survey being released, and awaited the feedback with interest.

8 QUESTIONS

Nil.

9 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

Nil.

10 MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Moved Councillor Barnett seconded Councillor Blackie

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

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution, are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Minutes of the Public Excluded portion of the Audit and Risk Committee meeting of 12 February 2019</td>
<td>Confirmation of Minutes</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons To carry out commercial activities without prejudice</td>
<td>A2(a) A2(b)ii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

**CLOSED MEETING**

*The public excluded portion of the meeting occurred from 6.13pm to 6.14pm.*

**OPEN MEETING**

*There being no further business, the meeting closed at 6.14pm.*

CONFIRMED

______________________________  
Chairperson

______________________________  
Date
MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE REGENERATION STEERING GROUP HELD IN THE RUATANIWHA KAIAPOI CIVIC CENTRE ON MONDAY 1 APRIL 2019 AT 4.00PM

PRESENT:

Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri representative A Reuben, D Ayers (Mayor), J Palmer (Chief Executive), C Brown (Manager Community and Recreation), D Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager - District Regeneration).

IN ATTENDANCE:
M Flanagan, WDC, G MacLeod, WDC.

1. APOLOGIES
An apology was received and sustained from C McKay, C McMillan J Watson and J Palmer for absence.

Moved: P Redmond Seconded: J Meyer
CARRIED

2. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Moved: J Meyer Seconded: P Redmond

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group:

Confirms as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting held on Monday 4 February 2019.

CARRIED

3. MATTERS ARISING
There were no matters arising.

4. DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
There were no deputations or presentations.

5. TE KŌHAKA O TŪHAITARA TRUST UPDATE
There was no update from the Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust.

6. REPORTS

6.1 District Regeneration Communications Report – February/March 2019 – Sarah Lodge - (Communications Advisor – District Regeneration), Duncan Roxborough (Implementation Project Manager – District Regeneration)

D Roxborough advised the purpose of the report is to give an update on the monthly communication activities.

D Roxborough referred to Clause 4.7 and noted the time lapse camera has now been installed and is capturing footage of the projects as they develop. The camera is currently capturing activity to the south of Cass Street. This will capture the stormwater management area, the planting, and the BMX track construction.
D Roxborough referred to Clause 4.9 and advised the latest Regeneration Update video has now been released. The videos are now a bit shorter in viewing length time to try to keep the viewership up.

D Roxborough referred to Clause 4.12 to advise that a sign will be installed by the boat ramp pontoon to clarify that the ramp is there for short term launching and retrieval only.

D Roxborough referred to Clause 4.14 and 4.15 advising that an email has been sent out in regard to the works that will be starting for the Jones Street repair works and also some of Rooney’s completion works of the stormwater. There is some disruption taking place in Jones Street at present and will continue for the next couple of months while the Jones Street earthquake repair works are completed.

D Roxborough referred to Clause 4.18 and noted the Honda Forest first stage planting will be taking place in May. It is planned to have a community planting day on the 18th May. There will be further information coming out on this.

P Redmond asked if the time lapse camera would also act as a crime camera.

D Roxborough advised the camera only takes still shots. It may be able to be used if you needed to see a vehicle was there at a certain time as the photos are time stamped.

Moved: A Blackie
Seconded: C Greengrass

THAT the Regeneration Steering Group:

(a) Receives report No. 190321038229.

CARRIED

7. CORRESPONDENCE

7.1 Reply email from Piet Oudolf

D Roxborough commented on the reply from Piet Oudolf from the initial inquiry that he has declined and has referred another colleague who also designs gardens.

S Stewart suggested that in order to advance this that we could set up a small working group to look at how this could be advanced. S Stewart noted she is keen to facilitate this and invite others who may be interested to see what could be achieved. S Stewart noted there are other people in the community who are very keen on having some sort of garden in Kaiapoi as a tourist attraction for both the locals and visitors. S Stewart noted for the types of projects that are proposed for the Regeneration area we are probably looking at Kaiapoi South around the Courtenay lakes, and with this being a horticultural use it falls within the rural uses under the Regeneration plan. S Stewart noted that it may be that it comes to nothing but would like to think that with the few enthusiast that are around the table we can get together and invited some other interested people from the community to see if we can work through something.

S Stewart will advance and have a discussion with C Brown.

C Brown noted there has been some discussion around what could potentially be the next steps forward. The Regeneration team could try and identify if this is a possibility and where it could be located, and also do some further investigation on where else these types of gardens are and the pros and cons around having a garden like this in terms of maintenance, and bring this information back to the Regeneration Steering Group.

C Brown noted staff would be happy to work with members of this group to progress. We do not know a lot about these types of gardens and would be happy to advise and receive input from members of the group to help pull this together.
C Brown advised staff will come back to the group with a report with some further information, and noted if anyone is interested in having a meeting staff can send an email invitation.

8. MATTERS REFERRED

There were no matters arising.

9. GENERAL

9.1. Mahinga Kai

A Reuben asked what the concept is, and what are the boundaries for the Mahinga kai area. A Reuben suggested it would be good to have an initial scoping and engagement discussion. A Reuben noted if the Mahinga kai is based around a water perspective he could look at making an application for a cultural allocation to flood the land and get some waterways established through the area.

D Ayers commented that in terms of getting this started there needs to be a meeting held from a governance level, and then look to maybe forming an working party or advisory group to progress.

N Atkinson noted that TKTT would like to be involved from what they have already designed.

A Reuben noted it would be good to know what the end use would be for the Mahinga kai area.

M Pinkham noted it would be helpful if we could see some examples on where this has been done before as we need to have vision of what we can achieve and we don't want to go down a path where we are experimenting. It would be really good to see what other people have achieved with some really good results.

A Blackie to have a discussion with C Brown, A Reuben and D Ayers to try and get some preliminary scoping at a very superficial level to find out if a working party would be required, or the like, and come back to the next meeting with some direction.

9.2 Update on Land Divestment

D Roxborough gave an update on the land divestment process and advised that as of Friday 22 March the land divestment has been settled. The Council now own the regeneration land. This has initiated other processes that we are now undertaking. There is also the ongoing custodianship of the land. The Council are already taking care of the maintenance and rates on the land. In relation to the divestment terms, there are a number of encumbrance clauses in there, such as; the Crown does have some ongoing interest if there is any on-divestment to third parties. D Roxborough noted there will be tracking on any development costs or money that council put into the land in terms of improvements of those parts that may have potential for on-divestment or leasing. It was signalled in the Recovery Plan to do a land swap by the Feldwick Drain. This is something that is still being worked on.

D Roxborough advised they are working on vesting of the reserves. There has been some work done on the Reserves names, and we are waiting on some final feedback from the Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri to be able to lock these names in. We are waiting on confirmation to ensure these have been interpreted correctly. Once confirmed the reserves can be vested.

10. MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Moved: A Blackie    Seconded: N Atkinson

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

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution, are as follows:
This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons</td>
<td>A2(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons</td>
<td>A2(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CARRIED**

CLOSED MEETING

The public were excluded from the meeting from 4.20pm until 5.08pm.

11. NEXT MEETING

The next scheduled meeting of the Regeneration Steering Group commences at 4.00pm on Monday 6 May 2019 at the Ruataniwha Centre, Kaiapoi.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS THE MEETING CLOSED AT 5.10PM.
OXFORD-OHOKA COMMUNITY BOARD

MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE OXFORD-OHOKA COMMUNITY BOARD HELD IN THE MANDEVILLE SPORTS CLUB, 431 MANDEVILLE ROAD, SWANNANOA ON WEDNESDAY 3 APRIL 2019 AT 7PM.

The Chairperson called for two minutes’ silence in respect for a local resident, Abdelfattah Qasem, who died in the 15 March terror attack in Christchurch.

1 APOLOGIES
There were no apologies

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
There were no conflicts of interest.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board – 7 March 2019
Moved S Farrell seconded T Robson
(a) THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
   Confirms the circulated minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting, held 7 March 2019, as a true and accurate record.
   CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
There were no matters arising.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
5.1 Mandeville Residents’ Association re Car Parking at Mandeville Shopping Precinct
Mr G Chisnal a representative of the Mandeville Residents’ Association (MRA), was in attendance to speak to the Board regarding the Association’s proposal to address the issues they believe have been created by a shortage of carparking at the Mandeville Village Development.

The Association proposed that the Council purchase land from a neighbouring landowner to provide further carparking for Mandeville Village. The MRA presented a plan, for this area of private land, which indicated that an extra 50 carparks, toilet and a pedestrian path could be constructed.

The MRA also presented a PowerPoint slide showing a ‘reserve car parking map’ which they believed had been approved by the Council. The Board Chair enquired from whom the map had been obtained, believing it to be subject to a staff briefing protocol. The MRA representative was unwilling to disclose this information.

The Association understood that the Council had made a decision to install a car park and to remove several trees and were opposed to any changes to the current reserve area. Staff advised that no report or decision had been made on any arrangements to address parking at Mandeville. The MRA and
Board had previously been advised that a report was expected to the May meeting. The Association also stated that it was opposed to any formalisation of the current informal parking on the neighbouring reserve.

The Association also requested that the Council consider closing the reserve off so as to stop any casual/overflow parking and to install picnic tables for the use of local residents. The Board were told that recently a vintage car rally had used the site for a meeting which was the type of event that residents would like to promote so as to utilise the reserve more.

J Lynn asked how often the reserve had been used for such events and was told there was no current data but that now the reserve was accessible and tidy, could be used more often in the future.

J Ensor asked a number of questions of the MRA relating to previous deputations on this same matter in 2017. He also noted that the MRA’s October 2018 proposal for a car park, on the private land adjacent to the retail area, was for angle parking whereas the one presented to the meeting was for straight parks. The MRA replied that it no longer supported the angle parking option. J Ensor then asked whether the MRA had any views regarding possible safety issues during times when petrol tankers were loading the petrol bowsers at the nearby garage. The MRA believed that this caused the access to be blocked and increased traffic congestion to the area.

The Chairperson thanked the MRA for its deputation and that staff would ensure that the MRA was advised of any report in advance of it being considered by the Board.

5.2 Mandeville Residents’ Association – Drainage Issues

Mr T McBrearty, a representative for the MRA was in attendance to request Board support for its recommendations on drainage issues which had been explored in an extensive site visit with WDC specialist staff earlier in the year. A tabular document had been created by Waimakariri District Council (WDC) staff, recording the site visit issues and WDC staff comment, to which the MRA had added its recommended potential remedial action. T McBrearty wished to advise the Board that the MRA had now made these further recommendations on the WDC comments and sought Board support for them. It was suggested that the MRA present the document as part of a submission to the Draft Annual Plan.

The Board received the tabled document (Trim Ref: 190404049881).

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

There was no adjourned business.

7 REPORTS

7.1 ANZAC Day Services 2019 – Kay Rabe (Governance Advisor)

Moved M Brown seconded T Robson

THAT the Oxford - Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190311030760.

(b) Appoints the Board Chair, D Nicholl and Board member J Lynn to attend the Ohoka ANZAC Day service on Wednesday 24 April 2019 at 11am at Ohoka Hall, Mill Road and to lay a wreath.
(c) **Appoints** Board members S Farrell and T Robson to lay a wreath on behalf of the Board at the Oxford ANZAC Day service to be held in the Oxford Town Hall at 9:30am on Thursday 25 April 2019.

(d) **Appoints** Board member M Brown to attend the Cust and West Eyreton ANZAC Day service on Thursday 25 April 2019 at 10am and lay a wreath at West Eyreton.

**CARRIED**

Note:
1. That Crs Felstead and Doody will be attending the Ohoka ANZAC Day service as Council representatives.
2. That Cr Felstead will be attending the Oxford ANZAC Day service as the Council representative.
3. That Cr Doody will attend the Cust ANZAC Day service as the Council and Board representative and M Brown will attend the West Eyreton service as the Board representative.

8 **CORRESPONDENCE**

Moved W Doody seconded J Lynn

Correspondence was tabled from Oxford Squash Club regarding its proposed extension. T Robson informed the Board that the Pearson Park Advisory Group had also received a letter requesting its support which was duly given. The Board received the correspondence.

**CARRIED**

J Lynn produced invoices and documentation relating to the allocation of funding for the Ohoka Domain upgrade made from the Board’s Landscape Fund. He requested that staff arrange payment and asked for clarification on the balance of the Landscape Fund as shown in the agenda (item 13 refers).

9 **CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT**

9.1 **Chairperson’s Report for March 2019**

Moved M Brown seconded K Felstead

**THAT** the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No 190326042112.

**CARRIED**

10 **MATTERS FOR INFORMATION**

10.1 **10.1 Report on Notice of Motions of 4 December 2018 and 5 February 2019 re Fireworks and Nuisance – Geoff Meadows (Policy Manager)** (Trim No 190226022485)

10.2 **10.2 Elected Members Remuneration and Expenses Policy Review – Sarah Nichols (Governance Manager)** (Trim No 190224021130)

10.3 **10.3 Enterprise North Canterbury half year report to December 2018, promotion of the Waimakariri District Business Plan report to December 2018 (Trim number 190225021990)**

10.4 **10.4 District Libraries Update March 2019 (Trim number 190315034754)**
10.5 Aquatic facilities Update March 2019 (Trim number 190227023702)

10.6 Report to Utilities and Roading Committee regarding The Vehicle Crossing Bylaw Review 2019 (Trim number 190225021686)

10.7 Report to Utilities and Roading Committee regarding stock water race bylaw review March 2019 (Trim number 190219018655)

10.8 Report - Water Conservation Programme Implementation Report to Utilities and Roading Committee March 2019 (Trim number 190130010451)

10.9 Activity on the Kaiapoi River – Simon Hart (Business and Centres Manager) (Trim number 190306027166)

Moved J Ensor seconded S Farrell

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.9

CARRIED

11 MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE

The purpose of this exchange is to provide a short update to other members in relation to activities/meetings that have been attended or to provide general Board related information.

J Ensor
- Paid his respects at the floral tribute outside the Botanic Gardens in Christchurch and was deeply moved by the flowers and messages.
- Community Board Conference may be adding an item to its programme in relation to arms control.

J Lynn
- Update on the progress of work in the Ohoka Domain upgrade
- Update on the renovation of the Gatekeepers lodge
- Attended the Oxford A & P Show – disappointing turnout.

S Farrell
- Attended the Visually Impaired Group meeting
- Attended the Oxford Promotions Group meeting
- Attended the Oxford Historical Society meeting
- Attended the Rural Residential Planning Strategy drop in session at the Oxford town hall
- Attended the Oxford A & P Show – disappointed at attendance
- Attended the site visit to Canterbury Landscapes Limited

T Robson
- Attended the Rural Residential Planning Strategy drop in session at the Oxford town hall
- Attended the Oxford A & P Show – Hamper promotion and draw could be done better
- Met with roading staff regarding issues at the Tui/Weka/Rata Street intersection and with Police regarding safety issues at the pedestrian refuge outside the Police Station.

M Brown
- Attended the Rural Residential Planning Strategy drop in session at the Oxford town hall
• Attended the Oxford A & P Show – perhaps rethink approach to increase attendance next year
• Attended Board Submissions’ workshop
• Attended the Swannanoa Cricket Club opening
• Attended Mandeville Sports Club Board meeting
• Requested information on ford closures be followed up

K Felstead
• Update on reports that were considered at the Council meeting which included subdivision contributions, Canterbury Museum Trust contributions, ANZAC Day representation, Local Government New Zealand Conference attendance, Rangiora Croquet Club expansion and Waste Bylaw.

W Doody
• Draft Annual Plan and Draft Rural Residential Plan Strategy consultation – thanked members for their support
• Attended Rural and Provincial meeting – COGs to readdress rural communities. Creative Communities also presented.
• Attended Waimakariri Access Group meeting and were all allocated different disabilities and then experienced the difficulties in accessing various businesses and negotiating different obstacles on everyday street environments. Very informative session.
• Attended Mandeville Sports Club Board meeting
• Resource Consent Hearing for a proposed wedding venue in Threlkelds Road in Ohoka on Friday 5 April 2019
• Two Oxford area school students working on community projects – both to do with waste, one on rubbish disposal and one on pollution in rivers. Complimented S Allen for her excellent work with the student in relation to river pollution.

D Nicholl asked if these students should be put in contact with the local school student army but was told that this was a limited school project at present but may develop into something more long term in the future.

J Ensor asked W Doody if the Mandeville Sports Club Board was aware of, and dealing with the possibility of contractors tar sealing from the boundary further up the driveway. W Doody replied that the Club had all the information regarding this matter and was dealing with it appropriately.

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

13 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

13.1 Board Discretionary Grant
Balance as at 27 March 2019: $727 (note $500 commitment to Waimakariri Arts Trust).

13.2 General Landscaping Fund
Balance as at 27 March 2019: $1,060.

14 MEDIA ITEMS
15 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

16 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board is scheduled for Thursday 9 May 2019 commencing at 7.00pm, at the Oxford Town Hall.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING CLOSED AT 8.23pm.
CONFIRMED

________________________
Chairperson

________________________
Date

Workshop
- Members Forum – discussion on correct process to follow when dealing with a request to staff on a matter being dealt with by the Board
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WOODEND-SEFTON COMMUNITY BOARD HELD IN WAIKUKU BEACH HALL 1 BRIDGE STREET, WAIKUKU BEACH ON MONDAY 8 APRIL 2019 AT 7.00PM.

PRESENT
A Thompson (Chairperson), A Allen, J Archer, A Blackie, R Mather and J Meyer.

IN ATTENDANCE
D Ayers (Mayor), C Brown (Community and Recreation Manager), G Stephens (Greenspace Community Engagement Officer), S Morrow (Rates Officer Land Information), K Rabe (Governance Advisor) and E Stubbs (Governance Support Officer).

1 APOLOGIES
Moved A Thompson seconded R Mather
An apology was received and sustained from S Powell for absence. CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Item 7.3 A Thompson as a Trustee of Presbyterian Support.
A Thompson, as Deputy Chair, was in the Chair due to S Powell’s absence. A Thompson called for nomination of a further Chair during the discussion of the Discretionary Fund applications.
Moved A Blackie seconded A Allen
That J Meyer take the Chair for Item 7.3. CARRIED

3 CONFIRMATION MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board – 11 March 2019
Moved J Meyer seconded R Mather
THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting, held 11 March 2019, as a true and accurate record. CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
There were no matters arising.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS FROM THE COMMUNITY
There were no deputations.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS
There was no adjourned business.
7 REPORTS

7.1 Woodend War Memorial – Grant Stephens (Greenspace Community Engagement Officer)

G Stephens advised the purpose of the report was to update the Board on progress on the Woodend War Memorial. He reminded the Board that in June 2017 it had approved the design and granted $5,000 towards the project from its General Landscaping Budget. The Lions Club, the originators of the project, had successfully fundraised and the building of the Memorial was about to commence. The Board was requested to approve the two minor changes to the design.

Initially the design had a flat roof for a ‘pill box’ shape but staff had suggested that the roof be pitched to improve water run-off and to discourage vandals from climbing onto the roof. Following engineering work, it had been highlighted that a shallower pitched roof would be structurally stronger, cost less as the bracing would not need to be as involved, and the roof not as heavy. In addition it was suggested the roof should have a bevelled edge to deter vandals from climbing onto the roof. G Stephens commented that if people climbing on the Memorial became a problem then further options could be explored.

The Lions had also suggested a relief artwork to go around the base of the Memorial consisting of barbed wire and poppies. The barbed wire signified the futility of war and oppression and the poppies recognised the fallen and were symbolic of rising above hostility. As art in a public space it required Board approval.

A Allen asked if the poppies would be red and was told that the artwork would be a subtle relief design formed in the concrete.

A Blackie asked if the relief would be vandal proof and G Stephens advised that the concrete was 40kpa and the relief was only 3-4mm in height.

J Archer asked if the location could be moved further from the road to allow more room for the public to congregate for ANZAC services. G Stephens advised that, to do this the tree behind the Memorial would need to be relocated. C Brown advised the tree was approximately six years old. The suggestion was made that the road could be closed, as in other areas, during services to allow for public congregation. There was a concern that if the Memorial was located further back from the road it would lose impact and visibility.

A Blackie queried the bevelled edge and was advised that it was a smooth rounded edge that would make a difficult handhold if vandals attempted to climb on the Memorial.

Moved A Allen seconded A Blackie

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 19032946462.

(b) Approves the change to the roof pitch of the Memorial design and addition of bevelled edge to deter climbing.

(c) Approves the art design specified in Attachment ii of the agenda, for the panels of the Memorial.

CARRIED
7.2 **Woodend Sefton Pre-approved Road Naming List – Scott Morrow (Rates Officer Land Information)**

S Morrow spoke briefly to the report noting that the agreed list of road names would be used for naming of new roads in the Board’s community area and would be made available to developers.

Moved A Archer seconded J Meyer

**THAT** the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190321037885.

(b) **Approves** the list of proposed road names as a Pre-approved Road Name List to be used for the naming of new roads in the Community Board area. (Trim 190321037831).

**CARRIED**

J Archer noted the requirement for the full name ‘Nathaniel Archer’ as there was already an Archer Place in Rangiora.

Prior to item 7.3 J Meyer assumed the Chair. A Thompson, sat back from the table and took no part in the discussion or decisions made.

7.3 **Application to the Woodend-Sefton Community Board’s Discretionary Grant fund 2018/2019 – Kay Rabe (Governance Advisor)**

K Rabe advised that Presbyterian Support had applied to all the Boards for funding apart from Oxford-Ohoka Community Board.

A Blackie commented that Presbyterian Support were a huge operation with income in the millions. He believed the discretionary grant funds were for groups such as sports club or community groups who had little funding. In addition the Council was working in partnership with Presbyterian Support for this Expo and he felt that there could be a perception of ‘double dipping’.

Moved A Blackie seconded A Allen

**THAT** the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190313032779.

(b) **Declines** the application from Presbyterian Support.

**CARRIED**

K Rabe noted that the Northside Boardriders Club had not received funding previously.

Moved A Allen seconded A Blackie

**THAT** the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) **Approves** a grant of $500 to Northside Boardriders Club Inc. towards the cost of two rescue boards for the Winter Freeze event and ongoing club use.

**CARRIED**

A Thompson resumed the Chair.
7.4 **ANZAC Day Services 2019 – Kay Rabe (Governance Advisor)**
K Rabe spoke briefly to the report noting that S Powell would not be available to attend ANZAC Day services.

Moved A Allen seconded A Blackie

**THAT** the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190315034850.
(b) Appoints Board members A Allen and R Mather to lay a wreath on behalf of the Board, at the Sefton Cenotaph at the ANZAC Day service on **Wednesday** 24 April 2019 at 6pm in the Sefton Domain.
(c) Appoints Board members J Archer and A Blackie to attend the ANZAC Day service on **Wednesday** 24 April 2019 at 6pm at the Woodend Community Centre and to lay a wreath on behalf of the Board.

CARRIED

8 **CORRESPONDENCE**

There was no correspondence.

9 **CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT**

9.1 **Chairperson’s Report for March 2019**
Moved R Mather seconded A Allen

**THAT** the Woodend-Sefton Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190401047078.

CARRIED

10 **MATTERS FOR INFORMATION**

10.1 **Report on Notice of Motions of 4 December 2018 and 5 February 2019 re Fireworks and Nuisance – Geoff Meadows (Policy Manager)** (Trim No 190226022485).

10.2 **Elected members Remuneration and Expenses Policy Review – Sarah Nichols (Governance Manager)** (Trim No 190224021130).

10.3 **Enterprise North Canterbury half year report to December 2018, promotion of the Waimakariri District Business Plan report to December 2018** (Trim No 190225021990)

10.4 **District Libraries Update March 2019** (Trim No 190315034754).

10.5 **Aquatic Facilities Update March 2019** (Trim No 190227023702)

10.6 **Report to Utilities and Roading Committee regarding the vehicle crossing bylaw review March 2019** (Trim No 190225021686).

10.7 **Report to Utilities and Roading Committee regarding stock water race bylaw review March 2019** (Trim No 190219018655)

10.8 **Report to Utilities and Roading Committee regarding water conservation programme implementation March 2019** (Trim No 190130010451)

10.9 **Youth Council Minutes January 29 Meeting** (Trim No 1902120155950)

10.10 **Activity on the Kaiapoi River – Simon Hart (Business and Centres Manager)** (Trim No 190306027166)
10.11 **Oxford-Ohoka Community Board Meeting Minutes – 7 March 2019** (Trim No 190226022558)

10.12 **Rangiora-Ashley Community Board Meeting Minutes – 13 March 2019** (Trim No 190306026941).

10.13 **Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board Meeting Minutes – 18 March 2019** (Trim No 190313032757)

Moved J Meyer seconded R Mather

THAT the Woodend-Sefton Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.13.

CARRIED

11 **MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

11.1 **J Archer**

- 4 March attended Woodend Community Association meeting.
- 6 March attended All Boards briefing.
- 7 March attended Neighbourhood BBQ at Owen Stalker Park, those who attended appreciated event.
- 11 March Road Naming workshop.
- 17 March Kaiapoi Community Garden new building opening. The building was the old dental clinic and well refurbished by Menz Shed.
- 26 March attended Annual Plan and Rural Residential Submissions workshop and Drop In session at Woodend Community Centre.
- 28 March attended Drop In session at Waikuku Beach Hall. Drainage and entry signs were discussed.

11.2 **A Allen**

- Waimakariri Health Advisory Group meeting –
  - Measles outbreak workload and shortage of vaccine.
  - Waimakariri was an Accredited Safe Community and A Allen was part of the advisory group looking at how to meet that again.
  - Since the 15/3 attack, there had been an increase in mental health referrals. Post 30 June there would be no government support or funding.
  - Surge in social media discussion around after hours service, looking at how it could be managed.

11.3 **R Mather**

- Compiled ‘Pegasus Page’ for April Woodpecker.
- 12 March attended Networking Forum at Kaiapoi.
- 12 March attended Pegasus Residents Group (PRGI) committee meeting.
- 13 March attended Ronel’s community cuppa.
- 13 March Attended Older Persons Health Services Forum meeting at John Knox Centre. Speakers from The Gut Foundation: Margaret Fitzgerald and Health & Disability Advocacy gave an update on their services and the code of rights.
- 25 March attended Social Services Waimakariri forum at Woodend Community Centre.
- 26 March attended Board Submissions workshop on Annual Plan and Rural Residential Development Strategy.
- 26 March attended Annual Plan Drop-In session at Woodend Community Centre.
- Pegasus Residents Group
  - Assisted with Annual Plan submission
  - Attended Easter Fun Day at Pegasus Bay School.
  - Met with various council staff to discuss Pegasus Community Centre Plans.
  - Noted upcoming PRGI AGM on 21 May, Mike Kwant and Greg Byrnes guest speakers.
- Welcome Bags – looking at initiative for PRGI, Woodend Community Association, SAYGo and Pegasus Woodend Women’s Institute to fund these.

11.4 J Meyer
- Congratulated Welcome Bags initiative as taking ownership.
- Access Group – commented on staff members including from roading, building and planning attending a workshop where they were tasked to use wheelchairs, walker frames and site impaired glassed around Rangiora. It helped create awareness of difficulties faced by some members of the community.
- Councillors were busy with District Plan, Long Term Plan and Annual Plan.
- Roading was busy with footpaths, sealing etc.

11.5 A Blackie
- Roading – attended workshop on new third lane on Waimakariri River bridge. The WDC part was to address the linkages to cycle and walkways through Kaiapoi and Woodend.
- Attended Food Forest ceremony where an exchange student was honoured for her work.
- Noted that Waimakariri Water Zone Committee and ECan were in discussion regarding an Ashley Estuary Protection Zone. Commented on the lack of communication with Waimakariri District Council particularly in regard to the Pegasus Bay Bylaw. It was noted that the estuary had complicated ownership with ECan / private / WDC / Crown /DoC.

11.6 A Thompson
- Attended Drop-In session at Waikuku Hall which was very positive with good interaction and addressing of issues by staff. It meant some dissatisfaction had been resolved.
- Commented it was positive that ECan was showing interest in the estuary.

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS
K Rabe brought to the Board’s attention the booklet ‘What’s the Plan’ in connection with the revision of the District Plan, which was a pre consultation prior to the Draft District Plan. Consultation closed on 6 May 2019. K Rabe would advise on arrangements to discuss a possible Board submission.

About Draft Annual Plan 2019-2020
Consultation closes Thursday 11 April 2019.

K Rabe advised that the Board members should send their comments regarding the Pegasus Community Centre to her to collate, after which S Powell would review and approve the Board’s submission.
About Vehicle Crossings
Consultation closes Friday 1 May 2019
https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/have-a-say/lets-talk/consultations/about-vehicle-crossings

13 FOSTERING COMMUNITIES

14 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE
14.1 Board Discretionary Grant
   Balance as at 5 March 2019: $1,532.
14.2 General Landscaping Fund
   Balance as at 5 March 2019: $5,260.

15 MEDIA ITEMS
Successful application to discretionary grant from Northside Boardriders.

16 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

17 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the Woodend-Sefton Community Board is scheduled for 7pm,
Monday 13 May 2019 at the Woodend Community Centre.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 7.51pm.
CONFIRMED

__________________________
Chairperson

__________________________
Date

Workshop
(note held prior to meeting)

• Members Forum
  o Discussion regarding Community Facilities provision in
    the Ward.
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE RANGIORA-ASHLEY COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL CHAMBERS, RANGIORA SERVICE CENTRE, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON WEDNESDAY 10 APRIL 2019 AT 7PM.

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

IN ATTENDANCE
D Ayers (Mayor), S Hart (Business & Centres Manager), V Thompson (Business & Centres Advisor), C Wood (Senior Policy Planner), G Barnard (Parks Community Assets Officer), E Cordwell (Governance Adviser) and E Stubbs (Governance Support Officer).

1 APOLOGIES
Moved D Gordon seconded P Williams
An apology for lateness was received and sustained from R Brine.

CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Item 7.3 and Item 15 K Barnett.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board – 13 March 2019
Moved G Miller seconded D Lundy
THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:
(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting, held on 13 March 2019, as a true and accurate record.
(b) Receives the circulated minutes of the Rangiora-Ashley Road and Reserve Naming Community Board meeting, held on 25 February 2019.

CARRIED

4 MATTERS ARISING
There were no matters arising.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
5.1 Mayor Ayers spoke to a PowerPoint on undergrounding of electricity and telecom cables. As a Rangiora resident he cared about the town’s streetscapes and had been a foundation member of Keep Rangiora Beautiful. He commented that streetscapes were not only about trees.

Mayor Ayers referred to a photograph of Oxford Road in the vicinity of Westpark subdivision and noted that in the future as the area became urbanised there was an opportunity to underground power cables during possible kerb and channel work. He commented that undergrounding was Council’s job to do and it came from Council budget. Mayor Ayers requested that the Board advocate for undergrounding when the opportunity arose.
Mayor Ayers showed a number of photographs of Rangiora streets with power poles and cables including West Belt, High Street, Ashley Street, White Street and Wales Street. He compared two sections of Church Street – with and without poles. Mayor Ayers gave the example of Stephens Street where Council had agreed to pay for undergrounding of power lines but declined for underground telecoms, which resulted in two sets of poles.

Mayor Ayers presented photographs of Kaiapoi and noted that there was only one location of overhead lines in Kaiapoi in a small industrial corner. It was related to the timing of local government amalgamation.

Mayor Ayers reiterated that he would like the Board, in the interest of residents, to put pressure on the Council to underground cabling whenever the opportunity arose. He advised it was Council’s role to prioritise such requests. Developers were expected to underground and in terms of consistency he believed that the Council should also do what was expected of developers.

Councillor Williams concurred that the reason the majority of Kaiapoi cabling was underground was related to the timing of amalgamation.

G Miller commented that in his view, the biggest eyesore in terms of above ground power lines was Kippenberger Avenue and asked Mayor Ayers if there was a precedent and where the Board should start in terms of undergrounding in that location. Mayor Ayers replied that Kippenberger Avenue had been an issue for 30 years. Mainpower had consistently refused to underground as it was a rural location. The precedent was Mill Road, Ohoa. Council had declined to pay for undergrounding and new trees had also been planted at Mainpower’s request. Mayor Ayers commented he believed that Kippenberger Avenue would resolve at some point as it was likely that there would be more development and that undergrounding would be a pre-requisite of that were to occur.

C Prickett commented he was struggling to see a way forward as there had been little success for attempts to underground recently. Mayor Ayers disagreed and said there had been occasions of undergrounding recently and there was steady progress. He gave the examples of King Street and Stephens Street for power cables. C Prickett asked how the success came about and Mayor Ayers commented for Stephens Street it was from the residents lobbying. He also gave the example of the footpath on Blackett Street, which local residents had recently lobbied for.

K Barnett asked if there was a timeframe in mind and Mayor Ayers commented that improvements should be opportunistic as older style dish channels were replaced.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

There was no adjourned business.

R Brine arrived at 7.25pm during item 7.1.

7 REPORTS

7.1 Good Street Road Stop (for the pedestrianised portion between High Street and the Service Lane) – Vanessa Thompson (Business and Centres Advisor)

V Thompson introduced the report noting that it sought endorsement to formally stop the road status of Good Street in the vicinity of High Street and change the underlying land status. There was potential to undertake aesthetic improvements to the street if the road was legally stopped.
V Thompson outlined the legal road stop and public notification process which involved surveying, lodging with Land Information NZ and public notification. If there was an objection to the road stop and these were not resolved the objections would need to be forwarded to the Environment Court for consideration. If denied by the Court the matter could not be considered for another two years.

V Thompson highlighted three key issues.

Firstly there were concerns for pedestrian safety with a number of complaints regarding cars driving down the street, some at speed. By resolving the underlying land status the safety issue could be addressed.

Secondly there was a historic building line restriction in place preventing a build up to the boundary line in Good Street. The current owner was looking at doing strengthening work and could opt for a complete rebuild up to the boundary line. It was the sole discretion of the Council to revoke the restriction.

Finally, Rangiora Fish Supply at 140 High Street had utilised a park at the back of its shop and if road access was stopped the historical arrangement required a resolution for the assumed existing use right.

G Miller asked if the tenant of 140 High Street had a tenancy arrangement that provided a car park. V Thompson advised that a copy of the lease had been requested, however they had not had a definitive answer. It was uncertain when the tenancy ended. S Hart commented that while there were legal implications there was also an existing use right and a moral obligation to consider.

K Galloway expressed concern at the discussion of loading zones on High Street. He asked if staff were aware that the passage of trucks and service vehicles on High Street was not supported. V Thompson noted that loading zones were an option that had been outlined but not a definitive solution.

K Galloway asked if businesses would be willing to give up carparks. V Thompson advised that business owners would not be upset if there was not a loading zone on High Street, most deliveries were early in the morning, in addition there was the loading zone on Good Street.

K Galloway commented that the Fish Shop was a unique situation and asked if staff had seen the size of the freezer. V Thompson advised that in conversation the provision of an industrial loading trolley had been discussed.

K Galloway asked if staff were aware that in the past the two shops to the west had right of parking. V Thompson replied that the current tenants had not indicated that. It was something that could be explored with the property owner. Previous conversations had indicated the prime concern was for the Fish Shop. K Galloway asked if there had been consultation with the other businesses and V Thompson replied yes, it was outlined in the report and currently there was only room for one car, the other owners had not expressed concern. S Hart commented that the Rangiora Town Centre Strategy Review would be considering items such as transport, accessibility and parking and that would be considered and reviewed in light of recent development (last 8 or so years).

Moved J Gerard D Gordon seconded

**THAT** the Rangiora Ashley Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190313032940

(b) **Notes** the information included in the report and the intention to propose, once the road is stopped, the establishment of a local purpose reserve status to the land released.
(c) **Recommends** that Council initiate a formal road stop process through Land Information New Zealand and the legal requirements around a public consultation period.

(d) **Supports** the concept of staff negotiating an appropriate car parking solution for 140 High Street and Rangiora Fish Supply.

(e) **Supports** staff further investigating the removal of the building line as set out in 4.6 which would allow the building to be built out.

**CARRIED**

K Galloway against

J Gerard commented that the addition of Recommendation (e) supported staff pursuing the building line issue. He did not believe there needed to be inclusion of detail related to loading zones as that would be addressed in the strategic review.

D Gordon supported the recommendations and congratulated V Thompson on an excellent report on a complex ownership situation. He agreed there was a moral dimension to be considered in terms of the fish shop. He agreed with the inclusion of Recommendation (e). He commented that the town was looking forward to seeing progress.

S Hart affirmed that parking would be considered through the Rangiora Town Centre Strategy Review. Transport and accessibility consultants had been appointed. They were mindful of the existing plan and what it covered, they were not looking for a loading zone as a first option however that could be fleshed out in the plan.

### 7.2 Rangiora and Kaiapoi Structure Plans and Rangiora Town Centre Strategy Review – Heike Downie (Principal Planning Analyst) and Cameron Wood (Senior Policy Planner)

C Wood noted a minor correction to the report, Recommendation (b) should refer to paragraph 4.6.

C Wood highlighted a number of points. The review was a strategic piece of work for Council looking at growth areas. It came about following key drivers outlined in item 3.3 including growth pressures. Another driver was the requirement from central government for Council to provide enough capacity for zoned land for the next 30 years. Council had already completed work in the District Development Strategy 2018 and were working with Greater Christchurch Partners. In addition Rangiora was 9 years into the RTC2020: Rangiora Town Centre Strategy.

C Wood referred to paragraph 4.6 which ran through the project including when updates would come back to the Board. C Wood noted that Town Centre parking had been highlighted in the previous report.

C Wood highlighted that the project came out of the work of the Greater Christchurch Partnership. Council had strong leadership in the Structure Plans but would engage with the Board.

S Hart outlined stakeholders who would be involved in the IBD events they included local business people and developers, ENC and Youth Council, it was a good cross-section. It was in the portfolios of both Councillors Gordon and Atkinson.
D Gordon asked in the situation that the Board wanted to nominate more than two participants was there precedent from other boards. S Hart replied yes, Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board had appointed 5-6 members for the Kaiapoi Town Centre Review. All of the Board was welcome to attend and participate, the two nominated members ensured that there would be some representation from the Board.

K Barnett referred to the proposed August 2019 workshop and asked if that was the point at which Board members could be informed and discuss what had been put forward. C Wood replied yes.

K Barnett noted that Rangiora and Kaiapoi were Key Activity Centres for eastern parts of the district and asked if the Woodend Sefton Community Board would have an opportunity to engage prior to the 2020 All Boards' presentation. S Hart commented it was up to the Board if they wanted to engage more specifically. He noted that there was the opportunity for public engagement.

K Barnett commented that the main people requiring parking did not live in Rangiora and asked if there would be discussion with those people. S Hart commented there were no specific plans to talk to those boards directly however that could be considered. With issues like parking, supply and demand and parking time frames would be considered, regardless of where people came from.

G Miller asked if Keep Rangiora Beautiful was part of the stakeholder group. S Hart replied no, however he was happy to discuss with the project control group. The stakeholder group had the tendency to get quite large which could be difficult to manage in a workshop.

S Lewis asked about expected availability of representatives. C Wood noted the three workshops which were half or full day. There would be good amount of notice after dates were set. The workshops were practical in nature.

J Hoult commented she had devoted two thirds of her life to Rangiora and asked as a resident how her voice would be considered. S Hart noted the presentation back to the Community Board and public consultation process. She would be welcome to attend the workshop, it was not exclusive however it needed to be representative while still manageable in size.

K Barnett referred to the process for the RTC2020 Strategy where there were two consultation groups, firstly a group looking in detail and a second larger group of interested residents that fed into the stakeholder group. She noted the obviously high interest and asked if there could be a similar approach. S Hart was happy to go back and find out the scope of that approach.

D Gordon asked if 3-4 participants were too many and S Hart replied no.

Moved D Gordon seconded R Brine

THAT the Rangiora Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190326041725

(b) Notes the key project timeline and milestones set out in paragraph 4.6 of this report.

(c) Nominates Board member J Gerard, M Clarke, S Lewis, K Galloway and G Miller to be representatives on the Stakeholder Group, which will help inform the development of the Rangiora Structure Plan and reviewed Rangiora Town Centre Strategy, by way of contribution at three Inquiry by Design (IBD) sessions.

CARRIED

D Gordon was comfortable with five names it was a broad representation of the Board. It was a very important strategy review and should be
representative of residents. He was pleased Heike and Cameron were taking
the lead and commented it was a time to refresh.

R Brine did not have an issue with five representatives. It was a process to
come up with the best consultation document possible. Those who may not
be on the group would still get the opportunity to feed into the process and this
was a starting point.

G Miller asked if changes in board members following the October elections
would affect representation and was advised it would.

K Barnett noted for the RTC2020 Strategy there had been three different
consultation groups. There may not be as much work for this strategy as a lot
of work had been completed already following the earthquakes. She was
happy for a cross-section of the Board to represent and asked members to
remember the Ashley part of the Ward, so that they did not need to take their
money to Christchurch. She noted the importance of input from the Woodend
Ashley Advisory Board in the past to open up Rangiora from the east.

D Lundy reinforced the comments of K Barnett and noted the consultation
process for the Red Lion corner changes. Rangiora was still a service town
for a lot of people.

7.3 Application to the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board’s Discretionary
Grant Fund 2018/2019 – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Team Leader)

E Cordwell advised she would take the report as read.

R Brine asked how often the Board had supported uniforms and E Cordwell
advised they had supported uniform purchase in the past including McAlpines
Pipe Band and North Canterbury Athletics.

Moved G Miller seconded K Galloway

THAT the Rangiora Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190326043197.
(b) Approves a grant of $500 to Cust Netball Club towards the cost of
uniforms for the Year 7/8 netball teams.

CARRIED

7.4 ANZAC Day Services 2019 – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Team
Leader)

E Cordwell advised that there was to be no ceremony at the Ashley War
Memorial. The Board could chose to lay its own wreath or accompany
Councillors.

Moved J Gerard seconded P Williams

THAT the Rangiora Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190315034856.
(b) Appoints Board member K Galloway attend the ANZAC Day service at
Rangiora High School at 9.30am (assemble 9.20am) on Thursday 25
April 2019 and to lay a wreath on behalf of the Board.
(c) Appoints Board Members J Gerard and D Lundy to lay a wreath on
behalf of the Board at the Rangiora Cenotaph Service at 11.30am
(assemble at RSA 11.15am) on Thursday 25 April 2019.
(d) Appoints Board Member J Hoult to attend the Cust and West Eyreton
Anzac Day Parade at 10.00am on Thursday 25 April 2019 and to lay a
wreath at Cust.
Appoints Board Member S Lewis to attend the Fernside Anzac Day Parade at 10am on Thursday 25 April 2019 and to lay a wreath on behalf of the Board.

CARRIED

8 CORRESPONDENCE

E Cordwell noted the correspondence from 7a Wiltshire Court regarding a tree on street frontage. There had been similar correspondence in the past. G Barnard and J Gerard would meet with the concerned residents.

Moved C Prickett seconded J Gerard

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives the letter regarding tree on frontage of 7a, Wiltshire Court, Rangiora (Trim 190401047568).

CARRIED

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chair’s Diary for March 2019

Moved J Gerard seconded D Lundy

THAT the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190326042993.

CARRIED

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 7 March 2019 (Trim No. 190226022558).

10.2 Woodend Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 11 March 2019 (Trim No 190306026937).

10.3 Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 18 March 2019 (Trim No 190313032757)

10.4 Youth Council meeting minutes – January 2019

10.5 Report on Notice of Motions of 4 December 2018 and 5 February 2019 re Fireworks and Nuisance – report to Council 5 March 2019 (Trim No 190226022485).


10.7 Enterprise North Canterbury half year report to December 2018, promotion of the Waimakariri District Business Plan report to December 2018 – report to Audit and Risk Committee (Trim No 190225021990)

10.8 Library Update March 2019 – report to Community and Recreation Committee 26 March 2019 (Trim No 190315034754).

10.9 Aquatic Facilities Update – Community and Recreation Committee 26 March 2019 (Trim No 190227023702).


10.13 **Activity on the Kaiapoi River – report to Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board 18 March 2019** (Trim No 190306027166).

Moved C Prickett seconded S Lewis

**THAT** the Rangiiora-Ashley Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.13.

CARRIED

*Item 15 was taken at this time. Note that the minutes have been recorded in accordance with the order of the agenda as circulated.*

11 **MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

11.1 **R Brine**

- Canterbury Joint Landfill Committee meeting
  - Milestone of $1million paid to the Community Trust set up for the Waipara–Omih area as part of Resource Consent conditions.
  - Discussed SOI.
  - The Burwood Resource Recovery Park (earthquake waste) would close in December.
  - There were two generators running, currently there were issues with respect to sulphate and gas could not be stored. It was believed this was related to Gib Board waste following the earthquake. Affected areas were being isolated. There were another 3 generators to go in at the site. It was a good news story – Kate Valley was working and producing saleable gas.

K Galloway referred to the problems with flooding of the Franz Josef rubbish dump and asked how at risk was the old Rangiora tip. R Brine noted he had been asked this question previously and staff had confirmed with the current stopbank there was no risk. However he would request a more detailed answer in writing.

G Miller asked why the Gib board was not being recycled or reused and R Brine explained any waste with suspicion of contamination went straight to Kate Valley.

11.2 **K Galloway**

- Friends of the Dog Park – would be submitting to Annual Plan for an extension to the park.
- Rangiora Museum – would be submitting to the Annual Plan for a building extension.
- Noted concern expressed by Rangiora resident regarding lack of pruning of plane trees on Church Street.

11.3 **D Lundy**

- 18 March – Loburn School meeting to discuss 150 year celebration.
- 28 March attended drop in session Draft Development Strategy, a number of developers were present.
- 4 April Garrymere water meeting.
- 8 April Civil Defence meeting.

11.4 **D Gordon**
- Attended Annual Plan engagements including Kaiapoi Library and Oxford A&P show.
- Attended rural residential drop in sessions in Loburn, Ohoka and Oxford. Were well attended and positive including Ohoka who were sensitive to future development.
- BNZ redevelopment – expressions of interest to be out by end of April. There had been a lag in the project and was good to see progressing.
- Town Centre Chairs’ meeting – good discussion around closing of some retail. Infometrics showed there was growth in district but there was a lag. ENC were going door to door to discuss with businesses. It was limited what could be done, however it was important to listen to business and look for trends.
- Attended meeting with Rangiora Museum over storage. It was clear the container was not a useable solution as the door was difficult to use and the significant archives required a controlled atmosphere. The submission to the Annual Plan would request Council to investigate a better solution.
- Attended meeting with affected neighbours of Multiuse Stadium as Council goes through Resource Consent process. An independent planner had been appointed.
- Garrymere Water – presentation regarding Glentui water solution, not dissimilar although scales were different. It was narrowing to one option – UV treatment at source. That matter would be left until Council decision regarding ‘socialising’ of upgrade costs.
- Attended Eats and Beats, was an excellent evening with a good turnout.

11.5 K Barnett
- Attended number of meetings mentioned earlier.
- Commented some Rangiora students had been in town at the Climate Change Rally on 15 March, it had been managed well in town.
- Attended Mosque attack memorial on Friday.
- Attended Waste Free Workshop Rangiora Town Hall and suggested members join the rubbish.co.nz challenge to remove one item from lifestyle.
- The Youth Council were now recruiting.
- COGs – the latest was removal of COGs funding was on hold pending further discussion on effect on rural communities.
- Working Party for Fees and Charges on Community Facilities had been set up. There had been a number of applications for exemptions to fees, the issue was complicated.

C Prickett asked if there was an update on soft plastic recycling. K Barnett replied there was not as yet, it was a national problem.

11.6 P Williams
- Attended a number of meetings and noted these.
- ECan meeting to discuss aspects of bus services.
- Airport meeting.
- Meetings with C Sargison regarding MultiUse Stadium believed neighbour issues could be sorted amicably.
- Garrymere – some resolution on type of system required. That information needed to be fed back to the rest of the Garrymere population.

11.7 C Prickett
- Garrymere – had been impressed with further refinement of costings by staff who had doing a good job resolving the issues.

11.8 G Miller
- Keep Rangiora Beautiful – had been in operation for 30 years. To celebrate a historical document on what had been achieved was being produced. He noted 14-15 000 trees and shrubs had been planted.
• Attended recycling seminar in Rangiora Town Hall it had been easy to understand for household recycling.
• Attended climate change demonstration in Christchurch.
• Meeting with ECan regarding remediating the Cam River from source to where it crossed Kippenberger Avenue.

11.9 **S Lewis**
• Completed first course for learner drivers licence programme with 9 students, the majority passed. There would be a one month break. It was excellent to have the facilities in the Rangiora Town Hall to use for courses.
• Had become member of RSA and was impressed with facilities
• Attended Board Annual Plan workshop.
• Supported local retail by attending Country Lane celebration.
• Attended Oxford A&P show, it was an excellent day.
• Attended Council briefing regarding improvements to bus services and ‘dos and don'ts’ for upcoming elections.

11.10 **J Houl**
• Timebank
  o Application to Rata had been sent.
  o Noted volunteering could be used for time credits.
• Commented on the importance of controlled atmosphere for archives and believed the Board should be supporting the museum in their endeavours.
• Attended Board Annual Plan workshop.
• Attended Council briefing on buses.
• Learner Licence mentoring – had signed up to observe.

11.11 **M Clarke**
• Attended Eats and Beats.
• Attended Bus routes briefing.
• Attending a number of street side meetings regarding retirement home.
• Attended Oxford A&P show.
• Residents had expressed concern regarding West Belt Road condition, once new road opened it would be heavily used.

12 **CONSULTATION PROJECTS**

E Cordwell referred to the consultation document ‘What’s the Plan? – Shaping the Content of the Reviewed District Plan’ noting it was an important document providing an opportunity for the community to provide feedback on whether they believed Council was heading in the right direction. It was substantial with 13 topics asking 49 questions. To provide greater understanding of these topics there would be a dedicated workshop with relevant staff and each of the boards. E Cordwell requested that board members provide some feedback on which topics they believed required more focus than others.

**About Draft Annual Plan 2019 - 2020**

Consultation closes Thursday 11 April 2019.


**About Vehicle Crossings**

Consultation closes Friday 1 May 2019.

13 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

13.1 **Board Discretionary Grant**
Balance as at 2 April 2019: $4,036.

13.2 **General Landscaping Fund**
Balance as at 2 April 2019: $26,160 (including carry forward).

14 MEDIA ITEMS

15 **MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC EXCLUDED**

*Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987*

Moved J Gerard seconded D Lundy

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

**CARRIED**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Minutes/Report of:</th>
<th>General subject of each matter to be considered</th>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>Greg Barnard (Parks Community Asset Officer)</td>
<td>Further update to the Cust Community Centre Advisory Group Terms of Reference and appointment of community members to the Group.</td>
<td>Good reason to withhold exists under Section 7</td>
<td>Section 48(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Reason for protection of interests</th>
<th>Ref NZS 9202:2003 Appendix A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>Protection of privacy of natural persons</td>
<td>A2(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLOSE MEETING**

The public excluded portion of the meeting occurred from 8.03pm to 8.06pm

**Resolution to resume in Open Meeting**

Moved J Gerard seconded D Lundy

(a) THAT open meeting resumes and that the resolutions made with the public excluded be made public.

CARRIED

**OPEN MEETING**

15.1 **Further update to the Cust Community Centre Advisory Group Terms of Reference and appointment of community members to the Group – Greg Barnard (Parks Community Asset Officer)**

Moved P Williams seconded K Galloway

THAT the Rangiora Ashley Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190321037990.

(b) Notes that the Cust Community Centre Advisory Group terms of reference approved on 13th November 2018 allows for the appointment of up to 9 members, 7 of which are members of the Cust community.

(c) Approves an amendment to the Cust Community Centre Advisory Group Terms Of Reference Section 6.1 to allow the appointment of a maximum of 10 members to the Group.

(d) Approves an amendment to the Cust Community Centre Advisory Group Terms of Reference Section 6.2 to allow the appointment of up to 8 members from the wider community.

(e) Approves the appointment of Kirstyn Barnett, Peter Boerlage, Craig Steele, Margaret Austin, Chris Neason, Jennifer Howard, Natasha Donoghue and Bernard Kingsbury to the Cust Community Centre Advisory Group as community representatives.

(f) Notes that Board members Dan Gordon and Duncan Lundy have already been appointed as the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board representatives to the Advisory Group at the 13th November 2018 board meeting which brings the total number of Group members to 10. The Board should further note that the staff member is appointed as an advisor to the Group and is not included in the total number of appointees

CARRIED
16 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

17 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board is scheduled for 7pm, Wednesday 15 May 2019 in the Council Chambers at the Rangiora Service Centre.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 8.42pm

CONFIRMED

________________
Chairperson

________________
Date

Workshop

• Members Forum
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE KAIAPOI-TUAHIWI COMMUNITY BOARD TO BE HELD IN MEETING ROOM 1 (UPSTAIRS), RUATANIWHA KAIAPOI CIVIC CENTRE, 176 WILLIAMS STREET, KAIAPOI ON MONDAY 15 APRIL 2019 AT 4PM.

PRESENT
J Watson (Chairperson), N Atkinson, R Blair, C Greengrass, M Pinkham, P Redmond and S Stewart.

IN ATTENDANCE
D Ayers (The Mayor), J Palmer (Chief Executive), J McBride (Roading and Transport Manager), M Flanagan (Landscape Planner – District Regeneration), Cameron Wood (Senior Policy Planner), K Rabe (Governance Adviser) and C Fowler-Jenkins (Governance Support Officer).

1 APOLOGIES
Moved J Watson seconded C Greengrass
An apology for lateness was received and accepted from Neville Atkinson. CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
There were no conflicts of interest.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board – 18 March 2019
Moved J Watson seconded P Redmond

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting, held 18 March 2019, as a true and accurate record subject to the following changes:

- Item 7.2 that the following be added “P Redmond stated that he had reservations and concerns regarding permanent structures as indicated in the third option and that the river should be a public reserve and should not be in private ownership.”

- Item 11 under P Redmond the following be added - Attended community BBQ at Moorcroft Reserve – disappointing turn out and requested “staff to investigate the possibility of formalising the ‘informal’ path to link with the existing path already there”.

- “Attended the Food Forest Wellbeing Day
- Attended the ENC function at Rangiora RSA
- Attended Port photo exhibition at Ruataniwha and commented on how blue the water of the Kaiapoi River was in the 1990’s.”

- Item 11 under C Greengrass the following be added – “Attended the opening of the Port and Eagle.”

CARRIED
4 MATTERS ARISING

- Deputation by the Local Police – this matter had been postponed due to the terror attack of 15 March 2019. K Rabe gave an update regarding the postponement. Members would have an opportunity to meet Police at the June All Boards Briefing.

- S Stewart mentioned that concerns had been again raised by residents of The Pines Beach and Kairaki areas regarding burglary, vandalism and other anti-social behaviors. C Greengrass agreed to discuss this matter at the next Pines Beach and Kairaki Residents Group meeting. J Palmer noted that security cameras were installed in town centers but not in rural settlements.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

There were no deputations or presentations.

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

There was no adjourned business.

7 REPORTS

7.1 Report for Town Centre Feature Lighting and Decorations Terms of Reference and Working Group Membership Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager) and Gerard Cleary (Manager, Utilities and Roading)

P Redmond asked if this working group would deal with Christmas decorations and was assured that it was all decorations/adornments.

J Watson suggested that P Redmond and C Greengrass would be good representatives as they had a particular interest in this matter. Both P Redmond and C Greengrass agreed that they would accept nomination to the working group.

Moved J Watson seconded C Greengrass

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190403049853.

(b) Appoints two elected members to the Town Centre Feature Lighting and Decorations Working Group. The elected members shall be as follows:

P Redmond and C Greengrass.

CARRIED

Moved J Watson seconded P Redmond

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board recommends:

THAT the Council:

(c) Receives report No. 190403049853;

(d) Approves the Terms of Reference for the working group;

(e) Approves the formation of the Working Group and membership as recommended by the Board.

CARRIED
7.2 **Kaiapoi Interpretive Signage – Michelle Flanagan (Landscape Planner – District regeneration)**

M Flanagan spoke to her report giving a precise for the Board’s information. The Board had agreed to use $20,000 of its General Landscape Budget to purchase four or five signs to start the project depending on the final costings of the signs.

P Redmond asked about how the sites would be prioritised and was told that the working group had identified the first five sites as McAllister Square and the Old Library and Fire Station, Williams Street Bridge (including Baxters Hut and Kaikai-a-waru), Hansens Mall, Old Post Office, BNZ Building, Rialto Theatre, Old Courthouse and Jail, Trousselot Park (including Mandeville Bridge, War Memorial Hall and Clock, Kaiapoi Kindergarten, Band Rotunda, Trousselot Monument).

S Stewart raised concerns regarding the practice of using weathering steel frame. She felt that as the steel aged it became very hard to read and wanted assurance this would not be the case with these signs.

R Blair agreed that S Stewart’s comments were relevant and had merit and that this matter should be discussed in more detail at the next meeting of the working group.

M Pinkham also suggested that the vertical lettering was difficult for some to read and had health and safety concerns regarding the design of the marker post. The working group assured the Board all these matters would be taken into account at its next meeting and thanked the members for their input.

J Watson congratulated M Flanagan for her excellent work she had done with the regeneration group as well as the signage group. C Greengrass and R Blair added their congratulations and thanks for her leadership on this project.

Moves J Watson seconded C Greengrass

**THAT** the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190404049990.

(b) **Approves** the concept design for the interpretive signage (included as Attachment ii)

(c) **Notes** staff will be engaging Larsen’s Art ‘n’ sign Studio Ltd for the design, construction and installation of the interpretive signage up to a value of $5,000 per interpretive panel.

(d) **Notes** that should the estimated cost for the design, construction and installation of each interpretive panel exceed $5,000 a report to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board will be required.

(e) **Notes** that a list of potential important sites for interpretive signage has been developed as a working document (included as Attachment i).

(f) **Notes** that there is $20,000 allocated from the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board General Landscaping Budget for the interpretive signage.

**CARRIED**
7.3 Kaiapoi Structure Plan – Heike Downie (Principal Planning Analyst) and Cameron Wood (Senior Policy Planner)

C Wood spoke to his report.

M Pinkham reminded staff that a similar process was done in the 1990s and good work was done at that time and he hoped that this would be referred to when implementing this plan.

There was general discussion regarding current constraints including natural hazards, Christchurch International Airport’s review of current plan contours and controlled airspace.

J Watson asked if there was any indication if the contour would increase or decrease and was told that there was speculation about it being broader and shorter but no decision had yet been made known. R Blair commented that on a recent flight the plane came down the centre of the South Island and can nowhere near Kaiapoi.

Moved J Watson seconded M Pinkham

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 190328045496

(b) Notes the key project timeline and milestones set out in paragraph 4.4 of this report.

N Atkinson arrived at 4.34pm.

7.4 Application to the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board’s Discretionary Grant 2018/2019 – Kay Rabe (Governance Advisor)

K Rabe spoke to this report.

P Redmond queried, in regard to the Clarkville Playcentre report, the discrepancies of the dates for when the application arrived and the date the report came to the Board. K Rabe explained that the Playcentre had applied to Oxford-Ohoka Community Board earlier in the year. As was policy no new application could be processed until the accountability for the first grant had been received resulting in a delay before this application was processed.

R Blair requested clarification regarding the Board’s informal policy in regards to funding schools/projects that were funded by the Ministry of Education. Members agreed that Playcentres did not fall into this category.

C Greengrass requested clarification that the application to Oxford-Ohoka Community Board was for different equipment and was informed that the funding from Oxford-Ohoka Community Board was for puzzles.
Moved P Redmond seconded M Pinkham

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190308029066.

(b) **Approves** a grant of $420 to Clarkville Play Centre towards the replacement of a double seated tricycle and the purchase of three balance bikes.

CARRIED

K Rabe spoke to the funding application for Presbyterian Support noting that the grant, if successful, would be retrospective as the event was scheduled for 11 April 2019. This was due to the timing of the Board’s meeting schedule and that because the application had been received in March it missed the deadline for the March meeting. She also clarified that the Rangiora-Ashley Board had funded this event, Woodend-Sefton Board had declined the application and no application had been received for the Oxford-Ohoka Board.

A Blackie commented that Presbyterian Support were a huge operation with income in the millions. He believed the discretionary grant funds were for groups such as sports club or community groups who had little funding.

P Redmond commented that seeing as the event had already happened he was against funding it retrospectively.

Moved P Redmond seconded C Greengrass

(c) **Declines** the application from Presbyterian Support.

CARRIED

7.5 **ANZAC Day Services 2019 – Kay Rabe (Governance Advisor)**

Moved J Watson seconded P Redmond

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 190315034862.

(b) **Appoints** Board member M Pinkham to attend the Kaiapoi Cenotaph Dawn Service at 6.30am on Thursday 25 April 2019.

(c) **Appoints** Board members R Blair, J Watson and P Redmond to lay a wreath on behalf of the Board at the Kaiapoi Cenotaph (Trousselot Park) Service at 10.00am on Thursday 25 April 2019.

(d) **Appoints** Board members C Greengrass and P Redmond to lay a wreath on behalf of the Board at Tuahiwi (Urupa) ANZAC Day Service at 2.00pm on Thursday 25 April 2019.

CARRIED
7.6 Ratification of the Board’s Submission to the Waimakariri District Council’s Draft Rural Residential Development Strategy – Kay Rabe (Governance Advisor)

Moved J Watson seconded M Pinkham

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 190402048283.
(b) Retrospectively ratifies the Board’s submission to the Waimakariri District Council’s Draft Rural Residential Development Strategy (Trim No. 190402047670).

CARRIED

Note: N Atkinson and S Stewart abstained from voting

7.7 Ratification of the Board’s Submission to the Waimakariri District Council’s Draft Annual Plan 2019-2020 – Kay Rabe (Governance Advisor)

Moved C Greengrass seconded R Blair

THAT the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 190402048085.
(b) Retrospectively ratifies the Board’s submission to the Waimakariri District Council’s Draft Annual Plan 2019-2020 (Trim No. 190402047675).

CARRIED

Note: N Atkinson and S Stewart abstained from voting.

8 CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

There was no Chairperson’s report.

10 MATTERS REFERRED FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting minutes – 7 March 2019 (Trim No. 190226022558).
10.2 Woodend Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 11 March 2019 (Trim No 190306026937).
10.3 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 13 March 2019 (Trim No 190306026941).
10.4 Youth Council meeting minutes – January 2019 (Trim No 1902120155950).
10.5 Report on Notice of Motions of 4 December 2018 and 5 February 2019 re Fireworks and Nuisance – report to Council 5 March 2019 (Trim No 190226022485).

10.7 **Enterprise North Canterbury half year report to December 2018, promotion of the Waimakariri District Business Plan report to December 2018 – report to Audit and Risk Committee** (Trim No 190225021990).

10.8 **Library Update March 2019 – report to Community and Recreation Committee 26 March 2019** (Trim No 190315034754).

10.9 **Aquatic Facilities Update – Community and Recreation Committee 26 March 2019** (Trim No 190227023702).


10.11 **Stock water Race Bylaw Review 2019 – report to Utilities and Roading Committee 19 March 2019** (Trim No 190219018655).


10.13 **Report to Council ANZAC Day services and attendance April 2019** (Trim No 190218018037)

M Pinkham raised the matter of a report that should have been circulated to the Board that was omitted in error to the above list. Board members requested that reports being circulated from Council, Committees or other Boards be circulated at the time of the meeting rather than being kept and sent with the agenda.

Moved J Watson seconded N Atkinson

**THAT** the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.13.

CARRIED

11 **MEMBERS’ INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

The purpose of this exchange is to provide a short update to other members in relation to activities/meetings that have been attended or to provide general Board related information.

**S Stewart**

- First Schedule consultation on the Waimakariri plan change to the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan which opened on 15 April and runs to 15 May.
- Environment Canterbury's response to the intrusion of salt in the Kaiapoi River – report to the Utilities and Roading Committee.
- Traces of arsenic found in water from private bores. Public to be encouraged to test their water more regularly.
- Work with Drainage groups in the area to unify charges and services.
- Working with staff to redesign the rhododendron garden in Fairweather Crescent.
- Attended Silverstream public meeting on floor levels and other issues.

**P Redmond**

- 23 March attended the Annual Plan Drop-in session outside the library – not many people.
- 25 March attended Social Services Youth Forum.
- 27 March attended Silverstream public meeting.
- 28 March attended Rural Residential Development Strategy Drop in Session in Rangiora – well supported.
1 April attended Annual Plan and Rural Residential Development workshop
2 April attended Waimakariri Youth meeting – petition for after hours medical service in the district
9 April attended Council Briefing at Rangiora – Environment Canterbury’s changes to the bus service, do’s and don’ts when electioneering and update on remuneration

M Pinkham
19 March attended Rural Residential Development Strategy at Ohoka – good attendance
1 April attended Annual Plan and Rural Residential Development workshop
9 April attended Council Briefing at Rangiora – Environment Canterbury’s changes to the bus service, do’s and don’ts when electioneering and update on remuneration.

J Meyer
Commented that the Board should do all in their power to protect the Kaiapoi River from becoming a saltwater estuary
Footpath replacement south side of Williams Street
Working on Review of District Plan and Hearings for Annual Plan.

A Blackie
Update on request for houseboats on the Kaiapoi River – planners now under pressure to push through processes.
Update on Tenders
Silverstream Reserve – volunteers safety concerns

C Greengrass
Attended Annual Plan Drop-in session outside library
Pines Residents & Kairaki meeting next week
Attended Silverstream public meeting on floor levels
Missed Access meeting
Attended Museum meeting – issue with bulbs blowing continually
6 May Red Cross will be celebrating its 80th Anniversary in Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board

R Blair
Gave an overview of the recent Community Board Conference and thanked the Board for supporting his attendance
Super Seniors grant information
Remuneration observation

N Atkinson
Six weeks of Greater Christchurch Hearings – interesting process
District Plan review

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

About District Plan Review
Consultation closes Monday 6 May

About Vehicle crossings

Consultation closes Friday 1 May
https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/have-a-say/lets-talk/consultations/about-vehicle-crossings

13 REGENERATION PROJECTS

13.1 Town Centre, Kaiapoi
Updates on the Kaiapoi Town Centre projects are emailed regularly to Board members. These updates can be accessed using the link below:

13.2 Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group
The next meeting of the Kaiapoi Regeneration Steering Group will be held in Meeting Room 1, Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre, 4pm on Monday 6 May 2019. This meeting is open to the public.

14 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

14.1 Board Discretionary Grant
Balance as at 9 April 2019: $3,298.

14.2 General Landscaping Budget
Balance as at 9 April 2019: $46,420 – note that this money is targeted for the interpretive signage.

15 MEDIA ITEMS
No media items.

16 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
No questions under standing orders

17 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS
No urgent business

NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board is scheduled for 4pm, Monday 20 May 2019 at the Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre.
THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 5.24pm

CONFIRMED

__________________________
Chairperson

__________________________
Date
### SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 26 March</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waimakariri Youth Council meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 27 March</td>
<td>Productivity Commission Presentation on Local Government Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENC Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silverstream Public Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 28 March</td>
<td>Multi-Use Sports Facility Project Steering Group meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farewelled Bev Brain from her Rangiora High Street business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citizenship Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inspected Canterbury Landscapes site, Eyrewell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 29 March</td>
<td>Attended National Memorial Service – 15 March 2019 Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with David Hill - North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended Canterbury Sports Awards, Wigram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 30 March</td>
<td>Attended Oxford A&amp;P Show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 1 April</td>
<td>Age–friendly Waimakariri, Community Steering Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regeneration Steering Group meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 2 April</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 3 April</td>
<td>Food Forest presentation to Lucrezia Angelucci (Italian exchange student), Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 4 April</td>
<td>CREDS - Education and Training Governance Group – meeting at Ara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 5 April</td>
<td>Cr Wendy Doody attended the North Canterbury Federated Farmers AGM on my behalf, Waimakariri Golf Club – I was able to attend later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Te Matauru Primary School Sod-Turning, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opened Hagley Kitchens Show Room, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended Disabilities and Carers Dance, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 6 April</td>
<td>Attended Soroptimist International North Canterbury 50th Anniversary luncheon, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended St Johns Area Awards, Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 8 April</td>
<td>Canterbury Museum Trust Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodend-Sefton Community Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 9 April</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Council discussion with Ecan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 10 April</td>
<td>Improving trust and confidence in the public sector – Audit NZ presentation, Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waimakariri Passchendaele Advisory Group meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 11 April</td>
<td>Live &amp; Give - Older Persons Expo, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visited family of 15 March shooting victim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 12 April</td>
<td>Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with David Hill - North Canterbury News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion regarding potential alternative sites – Kaiapoi Croquet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 14 April</td>
<td>Canterbury Country Cricket Association Function, Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dinner with Wuhan Visit Travel party, Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 15 April</td>
<td>Waimakariri Sailing Club Closing Day, Kairaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 16 April</td>
<td>Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 18 April</td>
<td>Compass FM Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 23 April</td>
<td>WIL and WDC Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Ball Clock - met Ball Family History Tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 24 April</td>
<td>Dawn ANZAC Service - Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 25 April</td>
<td>Ohoka ANZAC Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sefton ANZAC Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiapoi ANZAC Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangiora ANZAC Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuahiwi ANZAC Ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 26 April</td>
<td>Dawn ANZAC Service - Kaiapoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 29 April</td>
<td>Rural Residential Development Strategy - Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 30 April</td>
<td>Rural Residential Development Strategy - Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Council Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THAT** the Council:

a) **Receives** report No.: 190424059282.
David Ayers
MAYOR