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OXFORD-OHOKA COMMUNITY BOARD

AGENDA FOR THE MEETING OF THE OXFORD-OHOKA COMMUNITY BOARD TO BE HELD IN THE A&P MEETING ROOM, OXFORD TOWN HALL, 30 MAIN STREET, OXFORD ON THURSDAY 9 NOVEMBER 2017 AT 7PM.

RECOMMENDATIONS IN REPORTS ARE NOT TO BE CONSTRUED AS COUNCIL POLICY UNTIL ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL

BUSINESS

1 APOLOGIES

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board – 5 October 2017

RECOMMENDATION
(a) THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
Confirms the circulated minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting, held 5 October 2017, as a true and accurate record.

4 MATTERS ARISING

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

6.1 Tram Road Speed Limit Review – Bill Rice (Senior Transport Engineer) and Chris Sexton (Intern Engineer)

MEMO: Trim No. 171027116188
Tram Road Speed Limit Review - Bill Rice, Senior Transport Engineer.
RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives Memo No. 171027116188.

(b) Approves consultation being carried out on the proposal to change the speed limit on Tram Road to 80km/h, as outlined in the plan (TRIM 170914099898) attached to the main report (TRIM 170913099302).

(c) Notes that consultation on this proposal will be carried out between 10 November and 24 November 2017.

(d) Notes that the Board will be updated at the end of the consultation process.

(e) Notes that any submissions on the proposal will be taken into account before the change is presented to the Council on 8 December 2017 for consideration.

6.2 Appointee request from Swannanoa Cricket Club Domain Development Group – Karyn Ward (Community Board Advocate)

NOTE: The Swannanoa Cricket Club Domain Development Group have verbally advised staff that their preference for a Board representative and liaison person is Mark Brown.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 170922102675.

(b) Approves the appointment of Board Member …………………… as a Board representative and liaison person, to the Swannanoa Cricket Club Domain Development Group.
7 REPORTS

7.1 The Oaks Reserve Draft Concept Plan – Grant Stephens (Green Space Community Engagement Officer)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 16106111868

(b) Notes that staff have undertaken initial consultation with the community through a feedback flyer (attachment ii) and at the request of the Oxford Eyre Ward Advisory Board used the results of this feedback to guide the design of the Draft Concept Plan for The Oaks Reserve, included as attachment i.

(c) Supports staff submitting The Oaks Draft Concept Plan to Council for funding consideration from the 2018 2028 Long Term Plan. (Trim No. 71016111793).

(d) Notes that if funding is approved, the plan would be subject to a process of further public consultation before a more detailed concept plan was prepared. This would then be presented back to the Oxford Ohoka Community Board for approval prior to being implemented.

(e) Notes that if the Board wishes to redevelop the area it will be necessary to change its classification under the Reserves Act from a Gravel Pit Reserve.

7.2 Meeting venues and dates until end of 2018 – Sarah Nichols (Governance Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 171026116094

(b) Resolves to hold Board meetings at the following venues, commencing at 7.00pm on the following dates:
   • Thursday 7 December 2017 – West Eyreton Hall
   • Thursday 8 February 2018 – Oxford Town Hall (auditorium)
   • Thursday 8 March – Ohoka
   • Thursday 5 April – West Eyreton Hall
   • Thursday 3 May – Oxford Town Hall (A&P Room)
   • Thursday 7 June – Ohoka
   • Thursday 5 July – West Eyreton Hall
   • Thursday 9 August – Ohoka
   • Thursday 6 September – Oxford Town Hall (A&P Room)
   • Thursday 4 October – West Eyreton Hall
   • Thursday 8 November – Ohoka
   • Thursday 6 December – Oxford Town Hall (A&P Room)
7.3 Retrospective ratification of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board’s Submission to Environment Canterbury regarding RC175184 Canterbury Landscape Supplies Ltd 949 South Eyre Road & 33 Diversion Road Eyreton – Karyn Ward (Community Board Advocate)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 171027116328.
(b) Ratifies the Board’s Submission to Environment Canterbury (Ecan) regarding RC175184 Canterbury Landscape Supplies Ltd 949 South Eyre Road & 33 Diversion Road Eyreton. (Trim 171024114418).

7.4 Ratification of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board’s Submission regarding the District Plan Review ‘Comments and Issues’ Phase – Edwina Cordwell (Governance Adviser)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 171009109016.
(b) Ratifies the Board’s Submission regarding the Waimakariri District Council’s District Plan Review ‘Comments and Issues’ Phase (Trim 171009108984).

8 CORRESPONDENCE

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
(a) Receives the letter regarding Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan and Kerbside Options (Trim 171030116729).
(b) Receives both the letter from the Mandeville Residents’ Association regarding Speed Limits at Commercial Development at the Mandeville Village (Trim 171102118664) and the letter of acknowledgement (Trim 171101118551).
(c) Receives the request from the Waimakariri Access Group to appoint a representative to the group from the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board. (Trim 171031117662).
9 CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT

9.1 Chairperson’s Report for October 2017

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 171031117684.

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

10.1 Woodend Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 11 September 2017 (Trim No. 171003106542)

10.2 Rangiora-Ashley Community Board meeting minutes – 13 September 2017 (Trim No. 170919101095)

10.3 Kaiapoi-Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 18 September 2017 (Trim No. 170918100755)

10.4 Draft Submission to the Productivity Commission’s issues paper on a Low-emissions Economy – Report to Council 3 October 2017 (Trim No. 170920101559)

10.5 Battle of Passchendaele Commemoration 2017 – Report to Council 3 October 2017 (Trim No. 170922102546)

10.6 Road Safety Action Plan – Report to Council 24 October 2017 (Trim No. 171004107285)

10.7 Stormwater Drainage Bylaw Review 2017/18 – Report to Council 24 October 2017 (Trim No. 170907097266)

10.8 CAREX Report on Glyphosate – Report to Council 24 October 2017 (Trim No. 171012110892)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.8

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.

12 CONSULTATION PROJECTS

12.1 Dudley Park Shelter Belt Removal

Consultation closes 5pm, 16 November 2017.


12.2 Stormwater Drainage Bylaw

http://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/have-a-say/letstalk/consultations/stormwater-drainage-bylaw
12.3 **Williams Street Beach Road Intersection**
Consultation closes 5pm, 13 November 2017.


13 **REGENERATION PROJECTS**

13.1 **Town Centre, Oxford**
Updates on the Oxford Town Centre projects are emailed regularly to Board members. These updates can be located using the link below:


13.2 **New Arterial Road, Kaiapoi**
Regular updates on the progress of the new Arterial Road will be posted on the Council’s website. There are also links to intersection layout plans for each of the new intersections. The updates can be located using the link below:


14 **BOARD FUNDING UPDATE**

14.1 **Board Discretionary Grant**
Balance as at 9 November 2017: $3660.95

15 **MEDIA ITEMS**

16 **QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

17 **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS**

**NEXT MEETING**
The next meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board is scheduled for Thursday 7 December 2017 commencing at 7.00pm, at West Eyreton.

**Workshop**

1. **Update on Oxford Town Centre Strategy**
   Simon Markham (Manager Strategy and Engagement)

2. **Members’ Forum.**
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE OXFORD-OHOKA COMMUNITY BOARD
HELD IN THE WEST EYRETON HALL, 3 EARLYS ROAD, WEST EYRETON ON 
THURSDAY 5 OCTOBER 2017 AT 7.03PM.

PRESENT
D Nicholl (Chair), W Doody, J Ensor, S Farrell, J Lynn and T Robson.

IN ATTENDANCE
S Markham (Manager, Strategy and Engagement), C Brown (Community Green Space Manager), B Rice (Senior Transport Engineer), G Stevenson (Utilities Projects Team Leader), M Ball (Property Officer), K Graham (Journey Planner/Road Safety Co-ordinator), V Caseley (District Plan Manager), G Stephens (Green Space Community Engagement Officer), K Ward (Community Board Advocate) and E Stubbs (Minutes Secretary).

The Chair welcomed 48 members of the public who were in attendance.

1 APOLOGIES
Moved J Lynn Seconded J Ensor
Apologies were received and sustained from K Felstead and M Brown for absence.

CARRIED

2 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Item 5.1 W Doody as a member of the Solid Waste Working Party.
Item 12.2 W Doody as a Councillor.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
3.1 Minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board – 7 September 2017

Moved J Ensor seconded S Farrell
THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
(a) Amends the minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting held on 7 September 2017, Page 3, G Tisnall should be G Chisnall and Page 3, paragraphs two and three should refer to Number 10 Road not Diversion Road.
(b) Confirms the circulated minutes of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meeting, held 7 September 2017, as a true and accurate record.

4 MATTERS ARISING
Nil.

5 DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS
5.1 Kirstyn Barnett, Chair of the Cust Community Network (CCN), spoke to the Board regarding their group and their Rural Recycling Project survey. She apologised for the absence of the secretary, Yolande Lawrence. She noted
that the CCN arose out of a Vision Café held during the last electoral term, and that their membership now crossed the common boundary between the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board (OOCB), and the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board (RACB). A comparable deputation to the RACB had been made in September 2017. The main aim of the group was to develop amenity services in the Cust area, for example they organised the Winter Gala. Their Facebook page had 500 likes. K Barnett acknowledged the work of the past Chair, Maria Cassia.

The Rural Recycling project is an initiative to make recycling more easily accessible to those in the area who wished to use such a service. A Facebook survey has indicated 98% of local residents supported rural recycling. K Waghorn, Solid Waste Asset Manager, has advised CCN that around 100 people regularly recycle at the Southbrook and Oxford centres and that there are funds for a trial of the project to be undertaken in 2018. The CCN would oversee the recycling centre and provide advice to the community to minimise contamination.

The CCN believes that the Cust Domain is ideal as a potential location for the proposed recycling centre. There is an area next to the toilet block that is screened, imperceptible to residents and sheltered which will moderate the issue of wind-blown rubbish. Freedom campers are allowed to camp in the domain.

K Barnett advised they would be presenting to the Council's Solid Waste Working Party in November 2017 to seek funding approval and requested support from the Board for the trial to be undertaken.

D Nicholl queried how freedom campers would be prevented from putting rubbish in with the recycling. K Barnett noted that contamination could and does occur and that the aim would be to keep contamination below 15% with pro-active community education and signage. CCN would monitor the site however, there would inevitably be some contamination.

S Farrell asked whether the site would be manned, and who would maintain its orderliness. K Barnett replied it would be an unmanned drop-off. However, CCN was committed to doing a regular visual check and to ensure that it was tidy. The trial would ascertain if that was sufficient monitoring.

J Lynn sought clarification to confirm there was no recycling currently in Cust and asked for further details about the recycling drop-off. K Barnett replied there was no recycling outside the urban area. The recycling would go into the 'mixed recycling' stream. Vandalism remained a possibility.

5.2 Emma Gillard, Oxford business owner, spoke to the Board regarding Agenda Item 7.1. Approval to remove three All Day Parking Spaces. Ms Gillard noted that there had been a recent review by WDC staff of the safety and visibility issues around the parking spaces in Oxford. E Gillard commented that she had been troubled to learn that there was the potential to lose three more carparks in the town centre particularly as the previous installation of the pedestrian crossing had already resulted in one to two carparks being lost. E Gillard believed that removing additional parking spaces would be detrimental to businesses in the vicinity.

Since learning of the results of the review she has taken notes of the use of car parking in Oxford.

Ms Gillard provided the Board with her observations:

- The two carparks directly opposite her shop often had three cars parked there.
- In addition the carparks were often taken up by business owners and employees.
E Gillard did not believe it was her place to suggest that employers request staff park further away but had noted the 60min parking restrictions in Meyer Place. She suggested parking restrictions could be considered and enforced along Main Street from around Bay Road to the Oxford Town Hall.

She noted that the review was for safety purposes and affirmed her support of such an approach. However, she challenged the safety of many intersections in Oxford; due to ongoing hazards road users needed to exercise caution and common-sense.

E Gillard expressed her concerns regarding the effect of losing such proximate carparks would have on her business. She had observed potential customers unable to find a park outside her shop, were likely to drive past, and away. Businesses are struggling in Oxford and so making them as accessible as possible was important. She noted that while there was ample parking by the ‘big tree’ and Jaycee building, the location of those was not always perceived as convenient.

S Farrell inquired if any other businesses had raised concerns about the loss of car parks. E Gillard was unable to comment.

J Lynn asked how the parking limits could be enforced. E Gillard suggested that observations of repeat offenders could be phoned through to the Council.

J Ensor commented on 5-10minute parking restrictions in Nelson, and asked how well E Gillard believed that would work for her shop. E Gillard commented that it would be better to have the carparks still useable than totally removed.

S Farrell suggested another option from the review findings could be to remove fewer carparks. E Gillard responded positively stating anything was better than losing all three parking spaces.

*Item 7.1 was taken at this time.*

### 6 ADJOURNED BUSINESS

#### 6.1 Oxford Public Toilet Mural – C Brown (Community Green Space Manager)

C Brown spoke to the report noting that it lay on the table from the 3 August 2017 meeting pending the establishment of the Arts in Public Places Policy. The report had sought a decision on the installation of a mural on the Oxford Town Centre Toilets. The Board had requested an update on the matter and staff continued to recommend that the Board should continue to defer the matter until the Arts in Public Places Policy was operational. The formation of the Trust was part of the Long Term Plan (LTP) process.

C Brown noted that following completion of the Oxford Service Centre (OSC) the landscape design for this area had been approached holistically. An oversight had resulted in the inclusion of climbing plants on the section of wall previously proposed for a mural but this could be rectified in due course and plants transferred to another area. Alternatively, a mural could still be painted on another section of the toilet block.

S Farrell expressed concern regarding the proposed mural design advanced by Keep Oxford Beautiful (KOB). She would prefer something more compatible with the natural environment now the new OSC and surrounding area has been completed. She asked if this could be communicated to KOB.

W Doody suggested waiting until the Art In Public Places Policy was established. T Robson advocated that KOB should not be placed in an ambiguous position that could continue indefinitely. C Brown advised that if the decision was deferred until the Art in Public Places Policy was approved,
then the associated new Trust may be given authority to approve any such mural installation.

Moved W Doody  seconded S Farrell

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No 170713072891.
(b) **Notes** that during the May 2016 Oxford Eyre Ward Advisory Board meeting a resolution was passed deferring making a decision on a proposed mural being installed on the Oxford Town Centre Toilets until the Art in Public Places Policy was operational.
(c) **Notes** that the Art in Public Places Policy if approved would require the establishment of a Trust to manage requests for public art and this will be considered by Council during the Long Term Plan process.
(d) **Continues** to defer making a decision on the proposed mural for the Oxford Public Toilets until the Arts in Public Places Policy is operational.

CARRIED

Moved S Farrell  seconded J Ensor

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(e) **Write** to the Keep Oxford Beautiful Committee advising their logo is not deemed appropriate for the main street toilets as a mural. Once the Art In Public Places Policy is in place, public consultation with the Oxford Community will take place for an appropriate mural which visitors to Oxford and locals will enjoy.

CARRIED

W Doody against

7 **REPORTS**

7.1 Approval to remove 3 x all day parking spaces – Oxford Town Centre – K Stevenson (Roading Manager) and K Graham (Journey Planner/Road Safety Co-ordinator)

K Graham highlighted that the report recommended the removal of three carparks outside Fresh Choice, and otherwise would take it as read.

D Nicholl commented that it did not appear to be a popular decision. K Graham advised that the report and recommendation came about due to feedback from the community regarding safety concerns, including visibility on exiting the supermarket and also from a specific briefing with the Board. She noted that whilst there was only space allocated for two carparks, often three cars were parked there. Speed surveys down Main Street had shown speed was not a major concern.

J Lynn asked if stopping people exiting from the supermarket’s carpark and turning right would facilitate visibility. K Graham commented that the pedestrian crossing was to the left and to prevent a right turn required physical infrastructure; she would not recommend that as a solution.

J Ensor asked if restricted parking (for example, 5 minute) was a workable solution, and if so could it be trialled? It would still enable older people and less mobile people to be dropped off and picked up. There had been no serious accident on the crossing. K Graham replied whilst the idea was a workable one, the challenge was the enforcement of a 5 minute rule. Currently there was insufficient resources to police restrictions in Oxford regularly. However, the idea also did not negate the safety concerns of the community.
A parking restriction change could not be trialled as parking restrictions changes needed to go through a bylaw review process, otherwise they would not be legally enforceable.

Moved J Ensor seconded D Nicholl

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 170719074874.

AND

Recommends to the Council that it:
(b) Trials a 5-10 minute parking restriction on the three parking spaces for six months.

W Doody expressed concern and advised that the Board required further information before making such a recommendation to the Council.

The meeting adjourned at 7.40pm for a workshop, resuming at 7.47pm.

AMENDMENT

Moved W Doody seconded J Lynn

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 170719074874.
(b) Lies the report on the table pending further information.

CARRIED

7.2 Tram Road Speed Limit Review – B Rice (Senior Transport Engineer) and C Sexton (Intern Engineer)

B Rice commented that the Board would recall the recent community feedback regarding speed limit reductions across the Mandeville area. Included in that feedback was some community support for a reduction in speed limit on Tram Road. It was noted at the time that the speed limit on Tram Road would be considered at a later date once the design for the commercial area was confirmed and a safety audit carried out. The final design had not been confirmed, however the recommendation from the safety audit was that there should be a reduction in speed limit along that section of Tram Road.

B Rice noted that due to the nature of the road purely installing 80km/hr signs on that section of Tram Road may not have significant impact and that threshold treatments would need to be included at either end; for example, narrowing lanes.

The report sought the Board’s approval to consult on an 80km/hr speed limit.

S Farrell reminded the Board that at its July 2017 meeting K Stevenson, Roading Manager, had said a review of Tram Road speed limits would be considered further once the detailed design for the Mandeville commercial area was completed; she noted that Board members had not seen that plan. She queried whether the proposed 80km/hr speed limit would need reconsideration, as well as alteration to where the reduced speed came into force, if the Board authorised the consultation without the design for the commercial area being appended into the plan as presented.
B Rice stated it was unlikely as the initial point for speed reduction would be unchanged, regardless of the final intersection design. S Farrell asked whether the consultation should be deferred until the design was complete. B Rice responded that the probable outcome was that the design could be accommodated within the proposed 80km/hr speed limit corridor.

J Ensor commented that the Mandeville Residents’ Association (MRA) remained concerned about the entrance/exit to the business park and road and vehicle safety. They were concerned the proposed 80km/hr may be still too fast. He proposed the decision be deferred until the design was complete.

J Lynn asked why there was a 500m lead in from one direction and a 300m lead in from the other and whether this was sufficient to reduce speed. B Rice commented that staff had spent a long time reviewing and analysing the options. If the limit was extended too far then people forget they are in an 80km/hr zone and start to speed up. The proposed speed reduction area was concentrated where there were more driveways and a more urban environment.

T Robson queried the process going forward and whether the matter would return to the Board. B Rice advised that the Board would be kept informed.

J Ensor was concerned about slip lanes, accidents and wanted to see the full design. B Rice said that reducing the accident potential was the impetus for the speed reduction.

Moved J Ensor seconded S Farrell
THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 170913099302.
(b) Lies the report on the table.

CARRIED

Item 12.2 was taken at this time.

7.3 **Eyreton Domain Draft Master Plan – G Stephens (Green Space Community Engagement Officer)**

G Stephens spoke to the report seeking the Board’s support to submit the Eyreton Domain Draft Master Plan to Council for approval. If approved by Council, there would be a further public consultation and report back to the Board.

G Stephens advised the Eyreton Domain was approximately three hectares and was currently used by equestrians. There has been ongoing discussion with the community regarding other recreational and neighbourhood use of the space. A ‘Let’s Talk’ campaign was initiated in order to get feedback and the Eyreton Domain Draft Master Plan developed.

G Stephens outlined the proposed key elements of the Plan including:

- A new entrance way and signage for the equestrian area off Harrs Road.
- A fence with gates at regular intervals to more easily segregate the equestrian area from a ‘kick-a-ball’ and playground picnic area.
- Signage in general to assist with the shared use and activities taking place in the reserve/domain area.
The cost of implementing the plan is estimated to be approximately $145,000 and this would need to be considered by the Council as part of the Long Term Plan (LTP).

There would not be any further consultation with the community until after LTP deliberations, so as not to raise expectations.

S Farrell asked if there would be more seating in the Neighbourhood Reserve section. G Stephens responded that such features would be incorporated in the more detailed plan phase.

A letter had been sent to residents, including Les Cherry, a long-term resident of the area whose family had donated the land to the community, advising of the process.

J Lynn queried the lease arrangements. C Brown advised there was no current lease. The Reserve Management Plan (if approved) would allow for a lease to be created given that the Plan itself was subject to significant formal scrutiny and due process.

C Brown advised that there was to be an additional formal workshop with the Board regarding the overall Parks and Reserves Management Plan and proposed new Levels of Service in preparation for the LTP. The Board’s formal comments and feedback were being sought, including gaps in provisions for level of service. Although the Eyreton Domain would be included the Board would also get a contextual understanding of all the other projects identified for inclusion and their potential priorities.

J Ensor commented on the facilities of the Eyreton Pony Club at Mandeville and asked if it was a duplication of service. C Brown advised that the Council had not put money into the arenas that were established at the Eyreton Domain and that the equestrian group had a large following that were not members of the Pony Club. Feedback to recent Annual Plans had included comments regarding bridleways and areas for the public to ride horses.

There was an adjournment from 8.55 to 8.57pm.

Moved T Robson seconded S Farrell

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 170919101092.

(b) Notes that staff have undertaken initial consultation with the community through a feedback flyer (attachment ii), and following approval from the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board, used the results of this feedback to guide the design of the Draft Master Plan for Eyreton Domain (included as attachment i).

(c) Notes that staff have sent a letter (attachment iii) to those who provided feedback advising them that a master plan would be created with two separate spaces, one for equestrian and one for neighbourhood park type activities, and informing them of the process going forward.

(d) Notes that the current estimated cost to implement the proposed master plan is $145,000.

(e) Supports staff submitting the Eyreton Domain Draft Master Plan to Council for funding consideration as part of the 2018 - 2028 Long Term Plan (Trim No. 170919101074).

(f) Notes that if funding is approved, the plan would be subject to a process of further public consultation before a more detailed concept plan was prepared. This would then be presented back to the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board for approval prior to being implemented.

CARRIED
7.4 **Ohoka Domain Draft Master Plan – G Stephens (Green Space Community Engagement Officer)**

G Stephens spoke to the report seeking the Board’s support to take the Ohoka Domain Draft Master Plan to the public for consultation. Following that, the results of consultation and any changes would be brought back to the Board to seek its support to submit the Plan to Council for funding consideration as part of the LTP.

G Stephens advised that the main Domain would be linked to the Ohoka Bush and that there is space included for the Ohoka Gatekeeper’s Lodge and car parking.

Consultation in June 2017 with the Ohoka community and users of the Ohoka Domain highlighted two main areas of interest:

- the future of the Ohoka Farmers Market in the domain
- associated car parking issues.

In terms of the Farmers Market consultation feedback highlighted dual community perspectives. Some wanted the market to move to a different site as it had grown too big, others wanted the market to stay and the issues to be addressed. Staff believed that the market should remain in its current location which was a notable factor of its success. In addition, staff believed there were positive social outcomes from the market and issues arising from it could be addressed.

The main issue identified was parking. Solutions to address this were discussed in detail within the report. At this stage staff have proceeded with the installation of stabilisation matting as the preferred option within the concept plan, as it is aesthetically pleasing and addresses the damage issues. A trial of the matting is currently underway.

G Stephens outlined the elements in the Master Plan including:

- the horse paddock returning to the domain
- a line of poplars to be removed
- Ohoka Bush to be extended and organically flow into the main Domain
- space set aside for the Gatekeepers Lodge
- a playground extension
- ground stabilisation matting
- a new vehicle entrance off Whites Road to remove the need to drive past the playground and to assist with relocation of the Lodge.
- the existing BMX track would remain
- the tennis court would remain.

G Stephens commented that the draft plan had been presented to the Ohoka Domain Advisory Group and they were supportive of the current proposal with minor changes. Staff were now ready to take it to the community for further consultation. The cost was in the region of $270,000 for which there was no allocated funding, and would need to be considered by Council through the LTP.

W Doody queried if the Ohoka Lodge museum was included in the $270,000 and G Stephens replied it was not.
J Lynn asked if there was any way the Whites Road entranceway could be fast-tracked and would the Board’s General Landscaping Budget cover it. C Brown advised that the General Landscaping Budget would be insufficient and that it would also need to be considered for a future funding allocation.

J Lynn requested a breakdown of the $270,000 and C Brown agreed to provide this.

D Nicholl asked if the grass area behind the pavilion needed resurfacing. C Brown advised that was not budgeted for. This could be addressed if the area was considered as a sports ground in the future.

J Lynn queried if there was a Resource Consent in place to operate the market and if the market should be charged for damage repairs. C Brown advised this issue has been raised previously.

S Farrell asked about the conditions of the lease, and whether the market was required to make a booking. C Brown replied they did need to make a booking, it was not a licence to occupy. In practice a regular booking was not made, however Health and Safety plans were provided. There was both a commercial element and a community event element to the Ohoka Farmer’s Market.

S Markham advised that in terms of use for the market, any issues would be identified through the consultation. These would be incorporated into any plan going forward. C Brown agreed that any issues would need to be resolved. The Resource Consent would be a starting point and also for the Market’s use of the building which needs to be addressed in a more formal agreement.

J Ensor asked if the $275,000 cost would reflect in the rates. C Brown advised that this would form part of the Council’s consideration of the overall LTP process.

J Ensor commented that he had concerns around traffic management and if that would be addressed. C Brown commented that was of concern for the roading unit, however the scale of activity on market days slowed traffic, therefore reducing risk.

J Ensor asked if the seat donated by the Women’s Institute would be installed and G Stephens advised there was room to add a seat.

J Ensor queried the possibility of moving the market’s location. C Brown advised that a change of location may deter people from attending and may cause the market to cease operating. The market’s activity did need to be managed, however as it had reached its maximum number of stalls it could not get any bigger.

J Lynn queried when the planned Pavilion remediation and earthquake strengthening work would be finished. C Brown advised that G Barnard would provide an update. J Lynn commented it would be detrimental for the market if repairs occurred over the summer. C Brown advised that there could be some flexibility; for example request that work not be carried out on a Friday.

J Ensor requested clarity on the type of work planned for the Pavilion. C Brown advised they were not major changes, mainly roof replacement and cosmetic enhancement.

Moved J Lynn seconded T Robson

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No: 170921102179.

(b) Notes that staff have undertaken initial consultation with the community through a feedback flyer (attachment ii) and two ‘drop in’ stations and used the results of this feedback to guide the design of the Draft Master
Plan for Ohoka Domain, included as attachment i.

(c) **Notes** that the current estimated cost to implement the proposed master plan is $275,000.

(d) **Approves** staff undertaking public consultation on the Ohoka Domain Draft Master Plan and presenting the results of this consultation and any changes made to the next Board Meeting, to seek support in submitting the Ohoka Domain Draft Master Plan to Council for funding consideration as part of the 2018 - 2028 Long Term Plan.

**CARRIED**

### 7.5 **Classification of Reserve 2953 – M Ball (Property Officer)**

M Ball and G Stevenson spoke to the report, noting that this would be presented to the Council for a decision. The reports sought approval to classify the whole of the reserve as ‘local purpose’. Currently it was part gravel reserve and had been used for forestry until the windstorm of 2013 destroyed much of the trees. In 2009 a corner of the reserve had been re-designated ‘local purpose’.

Moved J Lynn seconded S Farrell

**THAT** the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report 17091910431; with plan 170926103871;

(b) **Supports** the reclassification of Reserve 2953 to a Utility Reserve;

(c) **Approves** a report being submitted to Council to obtain approval under Delegated Authority and subsequent to the advertising and subject to there being no objections to the proposal, the Minister be asked to gazette the classification.

**CARRIED**

### 7.6 **Draft Public Domain Policy Review Reference Group – G Meadows (Policy Manager)**

C Brown spoke to the report advising that the group’s purpose would be to establish a Public Domain Policy and activities undertaken in those areas; for example hawkers and buskers. A representative was being sought from each Community Board to participate in the Reference Group.

J Lynn and T Robson indicated their interest in the requested appointment.

Moved W Doody seconded T Robson

**THAT** the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 170920101797.

(b) **Approves** Board member J Lynn to represent the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board on the Draft Public Domain Policy Review Reference Group.

**CARRIED**
7.7 Appointee request from Swannanoa Cricket Club Domain Development Group – Karyn Ward (Community Board Advocate)

K Ward introduced the report.

J Ensor expressed an interest in being the Board’s appointee advising that he had had significant past involvement with the Swannanoa Domain group, including assisting with electricity, irrigation and planting.

D Nicholl advised the Board that M Brown, who had given his apologies for the meeting, had also expressed his interest to the Chair via email.

Moved S Farrell seconded W Doody

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 170922102675.

(b) Approves the appointment of Board Member J Ensor as a Board representative and liaison person, to the Swannanoa Cricket Club Domain Development Group.

A first amendment was proposed

Moved D Nicholl seconded J Lynn

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 170922102675.

(b) Approves the appointment of Board Member M Brown as a Board representative and liaison person, to the Swannanoa Cricket Club Domain Development Group.

A second amendment was then proposed

Moved W Doody seconded J Lynn

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 170922102675.

(b) Lies the report on the table due to absentee members.

CARRIED

7.8 Applications for Oxford-Ohoka Community Board Discretionary Grant 2017-2018 – K Ward (Community Board Advocate)

J Lynn asked why the Oxford Night Patrol Group had only requested one set of signs. W Doody responded they could only drive one car at a time and also noted that the Board could not award more funds than the application requested.

J Lynn queried the Oxford Communities Families Trust minimal charge for the paintball equipment loan. T Robson advised that he understood that the Boys Brigade used the equipment more than anyone else.

S Farrell queried whether the Oxford Community Men’s Shed Trust application met the grant’s criteria. Additional information had been provided by the Men’s Shed and was tabled which clarified the purpose for which the funds were being sought. TRIM No. 171101118165.
THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 170920101664.
(b) Approves a grant of $500 to Oxford Communities Families Trust (Oxford ICONZ) towards the costs of paint-balling supplies.
(c) Approves a grant of $239.05 to Oxford Night Patrol Group towards the costs of reflective magnetic signs to identify patrollers using private vehicles.

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
(d) Approves a grant of $500 to Oxford Community Men’s Shed Trust towards the costs of the Spring into Oxford event.

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 170925102999.
(b) Approves Board Member, Thomas Robson, to attend the LGNZ Young Elected Members Retreat, 9 to 11 November 2017 being held in the Selwyn District.
(c) Notes that any member attending a conference is requested to write a report on the Retreat, sharing ideas and knowledge gained, and the report is included in the Board’s December 2017 agenda.

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 170830094004.
(b) Ratifies the Board’s Submission to the Waimakariri District Council regarding the Draft Waimakariri Accessibility Strategy: “Towards an Inclusive Environment” – E Cordwell (Governance Adviser)
regarding the Draft Waimakariri Accessibility Strategy: “Towards an Inclusive Environment” (Trim 170830093927).

CARRIED

8 CORRESPONDENCE
Moved S Farrell  seconded T Robson

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

CARRIED

9 CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT
9.1 Chairperson's Report for September 2017
Moved S Farrell  seconded J Lynn

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
(a) Receives report No 170829093224.

CARRIED

10 MATTERS FOR INFORMATION
10.1 Woodend Sefton Community Board meeting minutes – 14 August 2017 (Trim No. 170822090257)
10.2 Kaiapoi Tuahiwi Community Board meeting minutes – 21 August 2017 (Trim No. 170818089346)
10.3 Capital Projects Report for the period ended 30 June 2017 – Report to Audit and Risk Committee 19 September 2017 (Trim No. 17090609337)
10.4 Changes to Kaiapoi (West) Speed Limits – Report to Council 5 September 2017 (Trim No. 170822090290)
10.5 West Eyreton and Summerhill Backup Source Options – Report to Council 5 September 2017 (Trim No. 170627066208)

Moved T Robson  seconded S Farrell

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board receives the information in items 10.1-10.5.

CARRIED

11 MEMBERS' INFORMATION EXCHANGE
11.1 J Ensor
• Concerned that the third lane on the motorway be only for express use.
• Had attended Mandeville Residents Association (MRA).
  o MRA had concerns regarding flooding and effects of local business operation continue.
• Mandeville Sports Centre (MSC).
  o the Pegasus toilets had proven unsuitable for relocation to MSC. This project would now need to be taken to the LTP.
• Attended All Boards Briefing.
• Congratulated staff on the new Oxford Service Centre.

11.2 **S Farrell**
• Attended Oxford Historical Society meeting.
• Attended MRA.
  o MRA plan to submit regarding the ECan notified resource consent for Canterbury Landscaping.
• Attended Spring into Oxford event.

11.3 **T Robson**
• Attended Youth Council.
  o the possibility of presenting to the Community Boards was discussed.
• Attended Spring into Oxford event.

11.4 **M Brown** (tabled due to absence)
• Had met with West Eyreton School’s Principal, and written to Swannanoa School regarding the availability and criteria of the Board’s Discretionary Grant.
• Written to three Pony Clubs; Oxford, View Hill and Kaiapoi, reminding them of the opportunity to apply for the Board’s Discretionary Grant.
• Communicated with Oxford Rural Drainage Advisory Group about possible changes coming up with a second well and Poyntz’s Road scheme being merged with that at West Eyreton.
• Lodged two Service Requests for pot holes and road reflectors.
• Requested an update on maintenance of the West Eyreton tennis club building.

11.5 **W Doody**
• Tabled her report.
• Noted upcoming Passchendaele commemoration at Kaiapoi.
• Noted the asbestos found in Courtney Drive and the decision to kerb and channel rather than have a swale, and the financial implications of that.
• Noted the Malaysian Ministerial Delegation’s visit to better understand community support and development in the Waimakariri District.
• Attended a general museum meeting in Cheviot.

12 **CONSULTATION PROJECTS**

12.1 **District Plan Review**
Consultation closes 5pm, 27 October 2017.

The upcoming workshop to discuss this matter, 12 October 2017, was noted.

Moved S Farrell    seconded J Ensor

**THAT** the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
(a) **Resolves** that they wish to submit on the District Plan Review Consultation.

CARRIED
12.2 **Canterbury Landscape Supplies Ltd.**

Consultation closes 5pm, 26 October 2017.


V Caseley advised that she may be able to answer some of the Board’s questions and would provide an update on the process.

S Farrell asked if the Council could object to the Resource Consent for the composting activity lodged with Environment Canterbury (ECan). V Caseley advised that for ECan consultations Board members were usually recommended to lodge a submission as individuals, but the Board could also submit as an entity in its own right.

V Caseley explained that the Council was involved through planning officer reports, as the operation also required a consent from WDC that dealt with those matters as related to the District Plan. Due to the nature of the business activity of the applicant, there may be cross over effects between Council and ECan responsibilities. Therefore the Council could not make a submission, but the Board could.

D Nicholl asked if the Board made a submission, did it need to be prepared and presented by a lawyer. V Caseley advised that this would not be necessary.

- Anyone could make a submission, but may seek assistance from an independent person with expertise in resource management.
- There were some legal requirements to be met under the Resource Management Act (RMA).
- A lawyer was not needed at the hearing.
- The submission should be broad enough to cover the area(s) that the submitter specifically wanted to comment on at the hearing.
- At a hearing the applicant would firstly present their evidence, then those submitters in support of the application, followed by those in opposition, finally ECan (or Council officers according to the hearing body) submitted their report.
- By presenting to the Hearing a submitter could answer any potential questions from the Hearing panel.

D Nicholl confirmed that a spokesperson could be nominated by the Board.

T Robson asked about the communication between ECan and WDC as the consent applications were quite closely linked. V Caseley said they were not in day to day contact. The last contact had been last Wednesday or Thursday when ECan had advised formally that its consent should be publicly notified. The resource consent application to WDC was still subject to further assessment and information and a decision as to whether it met the criteria for public notification had not yet been taken.

V Caseley advised that the RMA required decision makers, where consent applications were linked, to make such decisions at the same time.

J Lynn queried when decisions could be made on the application to WDC and V Caseley replied this had to follow a defined legal process. When all the information was available the first thing to consider was whether the effects were ‘more than minor’, if they were it would be publically notified. If not, the application process could be non-notified.
J Lynn commented that this application had generated a lot of community interest and asked if the land use consent had been held up due to a lack of information. V Caseley advised the reason the application was on hold was due to consideration of using independent processing officers, and legal advice had been sought.

J Lynn noted that there had been concern raised about trucks still accessing the site and asked if that had been followed up. V Caseley advised that following the September OOCB meeting there had been a site inspection and that complaints formally lodged, were followed up.

S Markham advised that the RMA process was very prescriptive and the Council needed to be careful to adhere to that otherwise there was potential for Judicial Review. He appreciated that it could appear confusing as to how the process fitted together in this instance however that was the nature of the legislation and the relevant responsibilities of the territorial authorities involved.

J Ensor spoke of residents’ concerns with regard to possible water contamination issues.

S Farrell queried the process going forward if the Board resolved to submit on the ECan consent application. S Markham advised that the Council would engage an independent planner to assist the Board as it was not appropriate for a WDC planner to participate in the process.

Moved J Lynn seconded J Ensor

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Resolves that they will submit on the ECan consent applications in relation to Canterbury Landscape Supplies Ltd, Diversion Road operation.

AND

(b) Notes that any elected member may choose to submit on this matter as a private individual.

CARRIED

W Doody abstain

There was a break of two minutes to allow members of the public to depart.

Item 7.3 was taken at this time.

13 REGENERATION PROJECTS

13.1 Town Centre, Oxford

Updates on the Oxford Town Centre projects are emailed regularly to Board members. These updates can be located using the link below:


S Markham advised there would be a workshop on the Oxford Town Centre at the November meeting.

13.2 New Arterial Road, Kaiapoi

Regular updates on the progress of the new Arterial Road will be posted on the Council’s website. There are also links to intersection layout plans for
each of the new intersections. The updates can be located using the link below:


14 BOARD FUNDING UPDATE

14.1 Board Discretionary Grant

Balance as at 5 October 2017: $4,900.

15 MEDIA ITEMS

M McIlraith, Communications and Engagement Manager, has assigned a staff member from his team to liaise with D Nicholl and assist the Board with media matters.

16 QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

Nil.

17 URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDERS

Nil.

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board is scheduled for Thursday 9 November 2017 commencing at 7.00pm, at Oxford Town Hall.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AT 10.15pm

CONFIRMED

____________________
Chairperson

____________________
Date
At its meeting of 5th October 2017 the Board decided that the report on the review of the speed limit on Tram Road should lay on the table pending information on the layout of the access to the Mandeville Village shopping area.

This memo includes minor updates to the report to the Board meeting (TRIM 170913099302[v3]).

A Board briefing on the matter was also provided by staff on 26 October 2017.

The report remains largely unchanged, with the exception of the following amendments:

Section 1.7 (process and timelines) changes to:

1.7. The proposed process and timeline for the speed limit change is as follows;

- Oxford-Ohoka Community Board support to consult and recommend to Council – 9 November 2017 (this report)
- Council consideration of approval of the speed limit change – 5 December 2017
- Notify NZTA and Police of the change – 8 December 2017 (subject to Council approval).
- Implement the change (10 working day minimum period required following notification to NZTA and the Police of the change) – 26 January 2018 (subject to Council approval).

Staff Recommendations

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) **Receives** Memo No. 171027116188.
(b) **Approves** consultation being carried out on the proposal to change the speed limit on Tram Road to 80km/h, as outlined in the plan (TRIM 170914099898) attached to the main report (TRIM 170913099302).
(c) **Notes** that consultation on this proposal will be carried out between 10 November and 24 November 2017.
(d) **Notes** that the Board will be updated at the end of the consultation process.
(e) **Notes** that any submissions on the proposal will be taken into account before the change is presented to the Council on 8 December 2017 for consideration.
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board’s support to consult on a proposal to change the speed limit on Tram Road, within the Mandeville Community area.

1.2. A speed limit of 80km/h is proposed on Tram Road, from 500m east of Bradleys Road to 300m west of the Bradleys Road.

1.3. The Mandeville Community has changed significantly, from a predominantly large block rural area, to an area of smaller block rural/residential sections.

1.4. In August, the Council approved the following speed limit changes on roads within the Mandeville area,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>New Limit</th>
<th>Previous Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wards Road</td>
<td>From Bradleys Road to the boundary of Millfield Subdivision</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawsons Road</td>
<td>From Wards Road for 800m</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradleys Road</td>
<td>From Tram Road to 400m north of Modena Place</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Cul-de-sacs and Access Roads within the Mandeville Community</td>
<td>Full length</td>
<td>50km/h</td>
<td>70km/h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5. It was noted at the time that the speed limit on Tram Road would be considered at a later date once the detailed design for the commercial area was confirmed and a safety audit carried out.
1.6. A draft of the safety audit on the frontage to the commercial development south of the intersection of Tram Road and McHughs Road has raised serious concerns about the speed on Tram Road at the access point, and recommended that a speed limit review be carried out on Tram Road over this section.

1.7. The proposed process and timeline for the speed limit change is as follows;
   - Oxford-Ohoka Community Board support to consult and recommend to Council – 5 October 2017 (this report)
   - Consultation – 6 October 2017 – 20 October 2017
   - Council approval of the speed limit change – 7 November 2017
   - Notify NZTA and Police of the change – 10 November 2017
   - Implement the change (14 day period required following notification to NZTA and the Police of the change) – 24 November 2017

Attachments:
i. Plan showing proposed speed limits (TRIM 170914099898)
ii. Speed Count Results on Tram Road (TRIM 170413036842)
iii. Report to Council on Changes to Mandeville Speed Limits (TRIM 170713072773)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:
(a) Receives report No. 170913099302.
(b) Approves consultation being carried out on the proposal to change speed limit on Tram Road to 80km/h, as outlined in the attached plan (TRIM 170914099898).
(c) Notes that consultation on this proposal will be carried out between 6 October to 20 October 2017
(d) Notes that the Board will be updated at the end of the consultation process.
(e) Notes that any submissions on the proposal will be taken into account before the change is presented to the Council on 7 November 2017 for consideration.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. The Mandeville community has changed significantly from a predominantly large block rural area to an area of rural/residential sections. The reason for reviewing the speed limits within Mandeville community include:
   - Increased traffic volumes
   - Increased population, resulting in increased pedestrians and cyclists
   - Expected changes to traffic patterns due to the proposed business development south west of the Tram Road McHughs Road intersection
   - A crash history at the Bradleys, McHughs, Tram Roads intersection
   - Feedback from some residents indicating that current speed limits are not appropriate

3.2. In March 2017, engagement with the Mandeville community and road users was carried out to gain some initial feedback on a series of possible speed limit options within the Mandeville community. Based on the initial feedback received a formal speed limit proposal was put out for community consultation.

3.1. The speed limit on Tram Road in the vicinity of the McHughs Road and Bradleys Road intersection was included in the initial discussion. Whilst generally there was support for a
lower speed limit the length of the speed limit and the impact of the proposed commercial
centre raised a number of questions. It was agreed that at busy times safety is a concern
and a lower speed limit would help. However at other times the speed environment is more
suited to 100km/h due to the long straight nature of Tram Road and no obvious changes
in environment apart from the intersection.

3.2. Some respondents thought a variable intersection speed limit similar to the one at
Pineacres would be a good option. However the proximity of the McHugh's Road,
Mandeville Road intersection to the Bradleys Road, McHugh's Road, Tram Road
intersection are likely to make it difficult to reliably detect vehicles turning from McHugh's
Road into Tram Road in time to signal a change in speed limit to vehicles on Tram Road.
It is also likely to be difficult to detect vehicles turning from the commercial development
onto Tram Road in time to signal a change in speed limit.

3.3. In August, Council therefore agreed to consider the speed limit on Tram Road at a later
date when the detailed design for the commercial area has been confirmed and a safety
audit carried out. Council also approved the following speed limit changes on roads within
the Mandeville area,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>New Limit</th>
<th>Previous Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wards Road</td>
<td>From Bradleys Road to the boundary of Millfield Subdivision</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawsons Road</td>
<td>From Wards Road for 800m</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradleys Road</td>
<td>From Tram Road to 400m north of Modena Place</td>
<td>80km/h</td>
<td>100km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Cul-de-sacs and Access</td>
<td>Full length</td>
<td>50km/h</td>
<td>70km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads within the Mandeville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1. A draft of the safety audit on the access to the commercial development at the corner of
Tram Road and McHugh's Road identified speed at the access as a “Serious” concern.
There are four rankings of NZTA Safety Audit concerns, ranging from Minor to Serious.
NZTA's safety audit proforma defines a serious concern as “A major safety concern that
must be addressed and requires changes to avoid serious safety consequences.”

3.2. The safety audit makes the following recommendation regarding speed at the access:

“That the designer and / or client raise this concern with the
Waimakariri District Council to encourage a review of the posted speed
restriction on Tram Road. However, based on the speeds recorded, this
may require more than posted speed limit signs.”

3.3. NZTA has recently reviewed the way speed limits are managed nationally and late last
year the new NZ Speed Management Guide was published. The NZ Speed Management
Guide sets out a framework to set safe and appropriate speed limits for different road

3.4. Tram Road is an Arterial Road with a 100km/h speed limit. The Average Daily Traffic (ADT) on Tram Road is 5,391 vehicles per day (vpd). Tram Road is a key route linking Kaiapoi and Christchurch with the Oxford area. Tram Road is expected to carry increasing traffic volumes following the completion of the commercial development southwest of the Tram Road McHughs Road intersection.

3.5. The Traffic Impact Assessment for the Mandeville commercial development has estimated the Peak hour turning volumes at the Bradleys Road, McHughs Road, Tram Road intersection and the access to the development for 2021. The estimates include projected traffic volumes for all currently consented developments which feed onto Bradleys and McHughs Roads, and are based on a left in, left out only access to the commercial development. The estimated morning and evening peak hour turning volumes are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement Description</th>
<th>Estimated Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Approach : McHughs Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Turn into Tram</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight Ahead into Bradleys</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Turn into Tram</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Approach: Tram Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left turn into McHughs</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound on Tram</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right turn into Bradleys</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Approach: Bradleys Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left turn into Tram</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight ahead into McHughs</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right turn into Tram</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Approach: Tram Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left turn into Bradleys</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound on Tram</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right turn into McHughs</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1 Predicted Volumes at Tram / Bradleys / McHughs Intersection Morning peak 2021*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement Description</th>
<th>Estimated Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Approach : McHughs Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Turn into Tram Road</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight Ahead into Bradleys Road</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Turn into Tram Road</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Approach: Tram Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left turn into McHughs</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound on Tram</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right turn into Bradleys</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Approach: Bradleys Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left turn into Tram</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight ahead into McHughs</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right turn into Tram</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Approach: Tram Road</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left turn into Bradleys</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound on Tram</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right turn into McHughs</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2 Predicted Volumes at Tram / Bradleys / McHughs Intersection Evening Peak 2021*

3.6. The previous assessment of Tram Road using the new Speed Management Guide assessed 80-100km/h as the safe and appropriate speed range on Tram Road. The commercial development currently has resource consent subject to a safety audit for a left in left out access onto Tram Road. This will result in a number of vehicles entering and leaving the commercial area while other vehicles are traveling straight past at much higher speeds. The proposed left in – left out access requires a solid concrete centre island to discourage drivers from turning right into or out of the site. These are considered potential hazards for vehicles travelling at 100km/h.

3.7. The NZTA Safer Journeys Risk Assessment Tool is a nationwide, automated desktop tool for assessing risk ratings of roads. These risk ratings can then be used to identify safe and appropriate speeds for roads. Using the tool to assess the section of Tram Road around the Bradleys Road intersection resulted in a Medium Infrastructure risk rating. This indicates that 80km/h is considered a safe and appropriate speed for this section of Tram Road. One of the main factors for this is the Death and Serious Injury (DSi) equivalent score.

3.8. Using the new Speed Management Guide to assess the area with the new commercial development included, the infrastructure risk rating was assessed as medium.

3.9. The road safety metrics that also feed into determining the safe and appropriate speed are the collective and personal risk metrics. Assessment of the personal risk, representing the crash risk exposure to each individual vehicle traveling along a road corridor, resulted in a “Low-Medium” score. Assessment of the collective risk, the measure of crash density at a network level, resulted in a “Medium” risk score.
3.10. Taking into account the assessments from above (including table 2.2 of the Speed Management Guide) the recommended safe and appropriate speed is therefore 80km/h.

3.11. For the reasons above, it is recommended that the speed limit on Tram Road, from 300m west of Bradleys Road to 500m east of Bradleys Road, be changed to 80km/h.

3.12. The existing operating speed on Tram Road was determined using data collected from a special count site, 900m west of Bradleys Road. A mean speed of 97.0km/h and 85th percentile speed of 104.8km/h were recorded.

3.13. The speed management guide recommends that traffic engineering measures are installed so that the measured mean operating speed is within 5km/h of the proposed speed limit.

3.14. The commercial development will introduce a large parking area, significant commercial buildings (including a service station canopy), and prominent signage. The presence of these features will result in a more “urban” feel to this section of Tram Road. This is likely to result in some reduction in operating speed in the area. However, it is considered that these features, on their own, are unlikely to result in reduction in mean speed exceeding 10km/h.

3.15. The following additional engineering measures are therefore proposed on this section of Tram Road, to reinforce the proposed speed limit:

- Threshold treatments at each end of the 80km/h section. These would consist of large speed signs with “Mandeville” beneath the speed limit (see Figure 2).

![Figure 1 Tram Road / Bradleys Road intersection with commercial development in background](image)
• Narrow lanes (3.0m wide)
• Wide centreline (similar to State Highway 1 south of Woodend – See Figure 3)

• Large map type direction signs showing directions to the commercial development, Mandeville, Ohoka, Oxford, and Kaipoi. A preliminary
3.16. The safety audit also identified a concern with the left in left out arrangement. It considered that vehicles may endeavour to turn right into or out of the site by doing U turns around the ends of the concrete islands. The commercial development designer is currently considering options to address this. These options may include designing the commercial access to accommodate full right turns. The proposed 80km/h speed limit and engineering measures is considered to be appropriate for that environment.

3.17. The safety audit team will have an opportunity to comment on options to address the serious issues raised in the audit.

3.18. The lowering of the speed limit for the short section through Mandeville will have insignificant impacts on motorists travel time between Oxford and Kaiapoi. The difference in travel time between traveling at 100kph (current sign posted speed limit) and 80 km/h (new proposed speed limit) for the 800m section of road will result in a 7.2 second increase in travel time.

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

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. The Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2003 [54001] as amended requires the Council to formally consult with a number of external agencies during the review of a speed limit. The following persons will be consulted in accordance with this requirement and their views will be taken into account:

- The local community that is considered to be affected by the proposed speed limit
- The Commissioner of Police
- The Chief Executive Officer of NZ Transport Agency
- The Chief Executive Officer of the NZ Automobile Association Inc
- The Chief Executive Officer of the Road Transport Forum NZ
4.2. It is proposed to seek community views through the Council’s website, social media, notice in the local newspapers and letters to all property owners adjoining the roads being changed.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. The developer of the commercial development will meet costs associated with the access to the development, including all signage and road marking required for the access. The developer will also meet the costs associated with installing 2 of the speed limit threshold signs at the eastern end of Tram Road.

5.2. Council will be responsible for the following costs associated with changing the speed limit:
   - Centreline removal at $0.65 per m²
   - Centreline repainting at $0.35 per m of broken white line
   - Centreline repainting at $0.65 per m of solid white line
   - 2 speed limit threshold signs at a rate of approx. $3000 per sign

The total length of road marking associated with the development access has not been confirmed yet. Therefore, the length Council is responsible for is also unknown.

The total cost to Council is therefore unknown, but is expected to be small, and can be met from existing budgets.

5.3. There are no significant risks associated with changing this speed limit.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **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.

   The Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits Rule (54001/1) requires that permanent speed limits be set by bylaw.

   The Speed Limits Bylaw 2009 enables the Council to set speed limits by Council resolution.

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

   (a) There is a safe environment for all:
   - Crime, Injury and road accidents are minimised
   - Harm to people from natural and manmade hazards is minimised

   (b) Transport is accessible, convenient, reliable, affordable and sustainable
   - The standard of our District’s roads is keeping pace with increasing traffic numbers

Bill Rice
Senior Transport Engineer
Vehicle speeds were surveyed at four locations in the Mandeville area in August 2016. The results of the speed surveys are summarised below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Filter time</th>
<th>Vehicles</th>
<th>Posted speed limit</th>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Mean Exceeding</th>
<th>85% Speed</th>
<th>95% Speed</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0889BSP.1.2NS</td>
<td>VICENZA DR 140m north of Biella Place</td>
<td>14:41 Friday, 5 August 2016 =&gt; 11:21 Tuesday, 16 August 2016</td>
<td>984 (90 per day)</td>
<td>70 km/h</td>
<td>0 (0.00%)</td>
<td>0.00 km/h</td>
<td>52.97 km/h</td>
<td>57.38 km/h</td>
<td>45.09 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0830ASP.1.2NS</td>
<td>VERONA PLACE 450m east of Bradleys Road</td>
<td>15:09 Friday, 5 August 2016 =&gt; 11:38 Tuesday, 16 August 2016</td>
<td>1140 (100 per day)</td>
<td>70 km/h</td>
<td>109 (9.56%)</td>
<td>76.23 km/h</td>
<td>66.57 km/h</td>
<td>74.86 km/h</td>
<td>52.83 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0656DSP.1.2NS</td>
<td>TRAM RD 900m west of Bradleys Road</td>
<td>14:18 Friday, 5 August 2016 =&gt; 11:49 Tuesday, 16 August 2016</td>
<td>39803 (3,620 per day)</td>
<td>100 km/h</td>
<td>15172 (38.12%)</td>
<td>105.32 km/h</td>
<td>104.83 km/h</td>
<td>110.12 km/h</td>
<td>97.74 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0076ASP.1.2NS</td>
<td>BRADLEYS RD 180m north of Modena Place</td>
<td>14:54 Friday, 5 August 2016 =&gt; 11:28 Tuesday, 16 August 2016</td>
<td>12599 (1,150 per day)</td>
<td>100 km/h</td>
<td>1780 (14.13%)</td>
<td>106.52 km/h</td>
<td>99.36 km/h</td>
<td>106.56 km/h</td>
<td>86.40 km/h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **SUMMARY**

   1.1. The purpose of this report is to address the formal request from the Swannanoa Cricket Club for an Oxford-Ohoka Community Board member to be appointed to the Swannanoa Cricket Club Domain Development Group.

   **Attachments:**
   
i. Letter from the Swannanoa Cricket Club (Trim 170922102617)

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

   **THAT** the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

   (a) Receives report No. 170922102675.

   (b) Approves the appointment of Board Member …………………… as a Board representative and liaison person, to the Swannanoa Cricket Club Domain Development Group.

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

   3.1. At the beginning of each electoral term members of the Board are appointed to outside organisations with the aim of continuing a strong relationship with the Community Board. Many of these appointments have been on-going relationships over a period of years. Board members have shared responsibilities of attending meetings with the organisations. The main purpose of a Board appointment to these organisations is to act as a liaison person between the group and Council organisation, and the ability to report happenings back to the Board.

   3.2. Periodically throughout a term the Board may receive additional requests for representatives to be appointed to appropriate community groups.

   3.3. The Swannanoa Cricket Club has requested the Board appoint a representative to the Swannanoa Cricket Club Domain Development Group which operates under the umbrella of the Swannanoa Cricket Club.
3.4. Green Space are aware of the existence of the Swannanoa Cricket Club Domain Development Group and their plans for the Domain. However, Green Space staff have no direct involvement with this group.

3.5. Nonetheless Green Space staff support the request of an appointee to the Swannanoa Cricket Club Domain Development Group due to the extensive vision this group has for Swannanoa Domain.

3.6. The letter attached to this report (Attachment i) gives details of work the Swannanoa Cricket Club Domain Development Group has undertaken to date, their current plans to relocate their pavilion on the Domain’s site, and their wish for the Domain to be enhanced for the Swannanoa Cricket Club and to the benefit of all local residents.

3.7. To ensure benefits extend to the wider community the Swannanoa Cricket Club office-holders think an appointed representative from the Board would be very beneficial to ensure the Cricket Club’s goals align with those of the Council and wider community.

3.8. The Swannanoa Cricket Club Domain Development Group meets bi-monthly, approximately four times per year, and is also represented at the Annual General Meeting of the Swannanoa Cricket Club.

3.9. The Board discussed this appointment at their 7 September 2017 meeting, and Board member Mark Brown expressed interest at that time in taking on the representation appointment for the Swannanoa Cricket Club Domain Development Group.

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

4. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

4.1. Not sought.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. There are no financial implications or risk, as this is a liaison role between group, community board and Council.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Legislation**

Legislation not applicable but delegated from Council Delegation SD-M1041.

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

6.3.1. There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision-making by public organisations that affect our District.

6.3.2. Creating a strong sense of community.

Karyn Ward  
Community Board Advocate
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek support from the Board for staff to submit The Oaks Draft Concept Plan (Attachment i, Trim No 171016111793) to Council for funding consideration from the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

1.2. This report proposes that staff seek funding approval from the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan to develop The Oaks Reserve into a reserve that includes a dog park, a woodland area and the provision of walking tracks and linking paths between the areas. Staff have developed a Draft Concept Plan which if funding is approved will be subject to a process of further public consultation before a more detailed concept plan was prepared. This would then be presented back to the Oxford Ohoka Community Board for approval prior to being implemented.

1.3. Attachments:
   i. Draft Concept Plan for The Oaks Reserve (Trim No: 171016111793)
   ii. ‘Let’s Talk’ consultation flyer posted to local residents (160512043602)
   iii. Consultation flyer delivery area (160728073326)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Oxford Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No 16106111868

(b) Notes that staff have undertaken initial consultation with the community through a feedback flyer (attachment ii) and at the request of the Oxford Eyre Ward Advisory Board used the results of this feedback to guide the design of the Draft Concept Plan for The Oaks Reserve, included as attachment i.

(c) Supports staff submitting The Oaks Draft Concept Plan to Council for funding consideration from the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan. (Trim No. 71016111793).

(d) Notes that if funding is approved, the plan would be subject to a process of further public consultation before a more detailed concept plan was prepared. This would then be presented back to the Oxford Ohoka Community Board for approval prior to being implemented.
Notes that if the Board wishes to redevelop the area it will be necessary to change its classification under the Reserves Act from a Gravel Pit Reserve.

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. The Oaks Walkway is located at 90 High Street in Oxford, and backs onto the Oxford Cemetery. The site is approximately 3.6 hectares, although 3500 square metres is currently leased for the Sicon works yard. The remaining site is leased for grazing with the licence being extended in September this year with a break out clause that if at any time the Council wanted the land we could terminate at one month’s notice. There is an informal walkway through the site that is included in the Waimakariri Walking and Cycling Guide.

3.2. The Oxford Eyre Ward Advisory Board previously discussed the possibility of building a dog park in Oxford and suggested that The Oaks Walkway could be an appropriate location. Consultation was undertaken with the community to understand how they would like to use The Oaks Walkway for recreation (refer Section 4 for discussion on the consultation feedback).

Draft Master Plan

3.3. Based on the community feedback, a draft master plan was prepared for The Oaks Walkway and presented to the Oxford Eyre Ward Advisory Board at their August meeting in 2016. Based from the community feedback, this draft plan balanced the support for a dog park as well as support for The Oaks Walkway to be a natural woodland space for walking and picnicking.

3.4. The draft master plan proposed a 9000m² (0.9 hectare) dog park in the southern portion of The Oaks Walkway and an informal 1.3 hectare woodland recreation area (with walkway and seating/picnic tables) in the north. A path through The Oaks Walkway from High Street to the Oxford Cemetery was also suggested.

3.5. When presented, this draft master plan had not been the subject of any community consultation and the Board were advised that should they wish to progress with the development of The Oaks Walkway, staff suggest a more detailed concept plan is prepared with estimated costs and that staff would bring this back to the Board for approval should the Board wish to develop The Oaks Walkway.

3.6. It was also noted that the implementation of such a plan will require Council approval of a budget as part of the Long Term Plan process in 2018 where it will be considered alongside other requests for reserve developments and that there is currently no funding allocated for any development at The Oaks Walkway.

3.7. At the direction of the Board, staff began working on a more detailed draft concept plan for The Oaks Walkway and the costs associated with the potential development. Below the elements within this concept plan are discussed.

3.8. Dog Park

3.8.1. A dog park is a fenced area where dogs can exercise off lead. The draft Concept Plan for The Oaks Walkway proposes a dog park in the southern section of The Oaks Walkway. The proposed dog park is approximately 9000 square metres in size. The size is dictated by the area available at the southern end of The Oaks Walkway and to avoid surrounding the residential property at 96 High Street on three sides. The location of the proposed dog
park also avoids the drainage channel through the middle of the site and along the eastern boundary.

3.8.2. The suggested location for the dog park also includes a reduced number of oak trees. Oak tree leaves and acorns are considered dangerous to dogs (generally if consumed in large amounts). It is not considered cost effective, or practical to regularly remove leaf and acorn fall. While there are still some oak trees in the southern portion of the reserve it is considered there will be much less fall than if the park extended further under the oaks to the north.

3.8.3. This park will be surrounded with deer fencing with a finer mesh at the base and includes two double gated entrance portals one at each end of the park. Dog waste bag dispensers and bins will be located at each entrance along with signage welcoming visitors to the park and outlining appropriate use of the space. The park will also include two park benches and a crusher dust loop track which is particularly important in the wetter winter months.

3.8.4. While dog parks are typically fenced areas with a low level of development, staff have found with Millton Memorial Dog Park (in Rangiora) that user’s request a much higher level of service once the park is open. Staff have had repeated requests for park shelters for dog owners to use to shelter from sun/rain, floodlighting so the dog park can be used at night, dog agility/training equipment, water features for dogs to play in, and public toilets. All these items are costly and have not been included in the concept plan at this point. Should there be high demand once the park is open for any of these things then this can be assessed and if necessary a funding request put to the following annual plan.

3.8.5. While some dog parks are divided into separately fenced areas such as Millton Memorial Dog Park in Rangiora, as there is only approximately 9000 m² available at The Oaks this is considered too small to have two separate areas.

3.8.6. The Draft Concept Plan shows a small car park adjacent to the proposed dog park. Staff have observed that at other dog parks in the region, users appear to drive to the park rather than walk their dog to the park. Without a car park, users would likely park on High Street (near the intersection with Weka Street) which has a narrow width of six metres (although there is a wide grass berm). This could potentially create issues for vehicles using High Street. This issue was raised by one commenter who felt that a dog park would create congestion on High Street.

3.8.7. Some tree work/removals would be required to enable the proposed dog park and car park to be built at the southern end of The Oaks Walkway (between 96 High Street and the Sicon yard). A portion of established hedge along the High Street frontage would also require removal for access to the car park.

3.9. Woodland area

3.9.1. The Draft Concept Plan shows a woodland area between High Street and the Cemetery. It is proposed that this area be tidied up and a walkway linking through to the cemetery and picnic tables installed.

3.9.2. Should The Oaks Walkway be opened up for formal public use there is significant work that needs to be undertaken on the existing trees. There are in excess of 250 trees in the reserve area and these have never had any maintenance work. Maintenance work would include pruning and limbing up existing trees, removing any hangers, and chipping existing fallen branches
and debris. Staff have engaged the services of the Council’s contracting
arborist to provide a report on the health of these trees and a basic costing to
bring them to a standard where it is safe to encourage public use of the space.
This report is included as attachment iii.

3.9.3. The path included in the concept plan will meander from High street through
the oak trees and meet up with the road in the cemetery at the open chapel
structure.

Apart from the track and a couple of picnic tables, this space would be left
open as a relaxed park-like setting. This is encouraged by the Bright Horizons
Preschool (located in Campbell Lane) who advised that they would like to see
The Oaks Walkway remain as a place for natural play and relaxation and to
explore nature. The retention of some of the reserve as a woodland area will
enable imaginative, natural play for children.

3.10. Planting

3.10.1. There is also a large amount of planting within the concept plan. Planting has
been used to create a buffer between the two adjoining private properties
to the dog park and will consist of thick mixed native vegetation to help block
sound and the visual impact and also encourage native flora and fauna in the
area.

3.10.2. There is also provision within the plan for islands of bulbs and undergrowth
plants to be planted within the woodland area to bring some autumn and
spring colour to the reserve however if there was a desire to retain the grazing
lease for a portion of the reserve; consideration would need to be given as to
how any new plantings would fit with this.

3.11. Grazing Lease

3.11.1. As stated above, the current lease for grazing was extended in September
this year with a break out clause should council want to use the land for a
different use. This grazing lease could be retained extended over the area
(excluding the dog park). There are a number of challenges associated with
this:

3.11.2. While signage at path entrances would state that dogs are to be kept on a
lead until safely within the dog park, there is no guarantee that users will
respect these signs. This could pose a hazard to sheep from any loose dogs
and to children if the sheep were to bolt.

3.11.3. Currently there is a lot of farm equipment and machinery being stored on the
site by the lease holder. This would be a significant hazard if not removed as
the public have full access to the reserve within the draft concept plan and
therefore could injure themselves on it. Staff recommended that this
machinery be stockpiled in a single location and fenced off from public entry.

3.11.4. There is also a risk of stress to the sheep during times of lambing however
this could be addressed with the reserve/walkway being closed at certain
times. Staff understand this has occurred in the past, with access to the
reserve restricted by the lease holder during lambing, with no issues raised.

3.11.5. Should the development be approved and go ahead, staff recommend that
the grazing lease be reviewed with the lease holder to determine what areas
they would like to lease and the conditions that this lease would require.

3.12. The Management Team/CE has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.
4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. In May 2017 a Let’s Talk consultation flyer was posted to 750 households in the Oxford Township (refer Attachments ii and iii). Display advertisements were also placed in the Oxford Bulletin and Oxford Observer during June. The flyer was also available on the Council website and in hardcopy at the Oxford Service Centre. A letter and copy of the flyer was sent to all the properties immediately adjacent to The Oaks Walkway. Feedback on The Oaks Walkway was open until the 17 June 2016 (a three week period), although comments were accepted after this with the last arriving on the 12 July.

4.2. The Let’ Talk consultation flyer sought ideas on how the community would like to see The Oaks Walkway developed for recreation purposes. The flyer signalled three potential development options for the area:

- Retain the status quo (a grazing lease with walking access)
- A dog park
- Another recreation activity.

4.3. A site visit was undertaken on the 13 June with the Bright Horizons Preschool (including children, parents and teachers). Green space staff as well as Cr Doody and Cr Felstead attended. A site visit was also undertaken with the current leaseholder on 10 June 2016 to discuss any concerns he had with any development.

4.4. In total, 99 responses were received and a report went to the August meeting of the Oxford Eyre Ward Advisory Board summarising the comments within the feedback received and those from the two site meetings. In summary:

- 50 commenters directly supported a dog park at The Oaks Walkway (50%)
- 22 commenters directly opposed a dog park at The Oaks Walkway (22%)
- 12 commenters requested leaving The Oaks Walkway as it is now (leased and grazed with a rural walkway (12%)
- 8 commenters supported a dog park on part of The Oaks Walkway in combination with other recreation activities (8%)
- 8 commenters did not support or oppose a dog park but made other recreation suggestions (8%)

4.5. The report to the Oxford Eyre Ward Advisory Board also included a number of other ideas which people wished for at The Oaks. The Board requested that staff prepare a more detailed concept for The Oaks which included a dog park and that staff do a cost estimate for the construction of this development.

4.6. Staff do not intend to undertake further consultation with the community regarding the plan prior to submitting it to council for funding consideration from the long term plan. Staff do not want to raise community expectation that the development will go ahead prior to funding being approved. If funding is approved, the plan would be subject to a process of further public consultation before a more detailed concept plan was prepared. This would then be presented back to the Oxford Ohoka Community Board for approval prior to being implemented. In conjunction with Councils Memorandum of Understanding, Staff would approach Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga as part of this consultation asking for their input and what level of involvement they would like on this project.
5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

**FUNDING**

5.1. Initial estimates of the cost of implementing the Draft Concept Plan for The Oaks Reserve has been estimated to be $300,000. As there is currently no funding allocated to develop The Oaks, Council will need to consider whether funding is allocated as part of the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan.

5.2. Staff have undertaken an assessment of the capital projects required to bring the Councils parks and reserves in line with current and planned levels of service. Combined with capital replacements, a number of projects have been identified as being required over the next ten years and staff have assessed these projects against each other to determine priority. Funding for the high priority projects is then applied for in the early part of the LTP while those with less priority will be in the later years. The development of The Oaks land has been assessed by Staff and when compared to other developments within the district has a lower priority. It is likely therefore that any funding towards this development will be closer to the end of the 2018-2028 LTP.

**RISKS**

5.3. Should there be a desire to continue the grazing lease there is the risk that the dog park and grazing activities are incompatible. There is therefore a risk that the concept plan produced which tries to cater for both dog park users and also the farming lease will provide something which is not suitable for either use. Staff do not believe this will happen, however there may be some in the community which share this view.

5.4. The current lease arrangement provides $300 per annum to Council (plus rates for that portion of land, minus the sewer loan rate). This could cease should the area be developed. However, should the area be developed, there is the opportunity to offer a grazing lease for a reduced area.

5.5. Staff do not propose to do any further consultation with the community prior to funding being allocated by Council. Staff do not want to raise expectations in the community that the development will occur in case funding is not provided.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. Policy

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

6.2. Legislation

6.2.1. Reserves Act 1977

6.2.2. The Oaks Walkway is currently classified as a Gravel Pit Reserve. Should recreation activities be the primary activity on the reserve it will need to be reclassified. This would require a public notification process in accordance with the Reserves Act 1977. Should the reclassification occur, The Oaks Walkway could be categorised as a recreation and ecological linkage for management purposes.

6.2.3. The Reserves Act 1977 required all reserves to have a reserves management plan. The Council has chosen to prepare composite plans for its reserves and have decided to prepare 9 different plans in line with the parks categories identified in the Activity Management Plan. The Recreation and Ecological...
Linkage Management Plan is currently being drafted and would be the guiding document relating to how the green space can be developed should it be reclassified.

6.3. Community Outcomes

6.3.1. The Oaks Reserve Concept Plan is considered to meet the following Community Outcomes;

- Public spaces and facilities are plentiful, accessible and high quality
- There is a wide variety of public places and spaces to meet people’s needs.
- There are wide ranging opportunities for people to enjoy the outdoors.
- The range and accessibility of community and recreation facilities meets the changing needs of our community.
- There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making by local, regional and national organisations that affects our District
- Local, regional and national organisations make information about their plans and activities readily available.
- Local, regional and national organisations make every effort to take account of the views of people who participate in community engagement.
We would like to know what recreation ideas the community have for the area known as The Oaks Walkway in Oxford.

The Council has received suggestions for how land at The Oaks Walkway might be used. The Oxford Eyre Ward Advisory Board have discussed ideas including the possibility of building a dog park on this land. The Board want to know what ideas the community has for this area.

The Oaks Walkway
The Oaks Walkway is located at 90 High Street, Oxford. This area is currently leased for grazing and has a rural walkway through it. The area backs onto the Oxford Cemetery and the Sicon works yard. The current lease at The Oaks Walkway ends in September this year.

What is a dog park?
As mentioned some in the community have signalled they would like to see the land developed as a dog park. A dog park is a fenced area where dogs can exercise off their leads. It could also include a gravel path, rubbish bins, water bowls, and seating.

Other ideas
We would like to know what other ideas the community may have for The Oaks Walkway. There are a number of options for this land:
- Keep the walkway and continue to lease the land out for grazing (as happens now)
- Develop the land as a dog park
- Develop the land for another recreation activity.

Where to from here?
The Oxford Eyre Ward Advisory Board wants your suggestions for how land at The Oaks Walkway could be used. Council staff will then look at all the ideas and prepare a draft concept plan for the Board’s consideration.

There is currently no funding allocated for any development at The Oaks Walkway. If there is to be any development, funding will need to be sought from the Council.

What do you need to do?
Write your ideas for The Oaks Walkway on the back of this sheet and send to Council (no stamp needed).
Email your ideas to Council at records@wmk.govt.nz
Please make sure your ideas reach us by 17 June 2016.
1. **SUMMARY**

1.1. The purpose of this report is to adopt the meeting dates for the period of December 2017 to December 2018. These dates are based on meeting each month on the first Thursday following the Council meeting.

1.2. Due to the distance across the Oxford-Ohoka ward it is recommended three regular areas be used to enable ease of access to residents and establishes a pattern for the community; being West Eyreton, Oxford and Ohoka. This does not preclude other venues within the community being utilised if the need arises.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) **Receives** report No. 171026116094

(b) **Resolves** to hold Board meetings at the following venues, commencing at 7.00pm on the following dates:

- Thursday 7 December 2017 – West Eyreton Hall
- Thursday 8 February 2018 – Oxford Town Hall (auditorium)
- Thursday 8 March – Ohoka
- Thursday 5 April – West Eyreton Hall
- Thursday 3 May – Oxford Town Hall (A&P Room)
- Thursday 7 June – Ohoka
- Thursday 5 July – West Eyreton Hall
- Thursday 9 August – Ohoka
- Thursday 6 September – Oxford Town Hall (A&P Room)
- Thursday 4 October – West Eyreton Hall
- Thursday 8 November – Ohoka
- Thursday 6 December – Oxford Town Hall (A&P Room)

3. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

3.1. All scheduled meetings are advertised and operate under the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA).
3.2. Since the start of the triennial term 2016-19 term the Community Board has met on the first Thursday after the Council meet each month at 7pm in West Eyreton, Ohoka, Oxford, and Mandeville. It is recommended that this pattern continue for 2018 as it dovetails with other Council, Committee and Community Board meetings. In past years, the Board has not met in January and this is recommended to continue.

3.3. Briefings and workshops are generally held after the Board meeting where possible, however if a significant timeframe is anticipated a separate meeting at a mutually agreed time will be scheduled.

3.4. A report was presented to the Board at their 6 April 2017 meeting that evaluated 19 venues within the Board’s community area. Staff recommended the West Eyreton Hall and Oxford Town Hall for the balance of the 2017 schedule of Oxford-Ohoka Community Board meetings. The Board chose to add Ohoka Community Hall and Mandeville Sports Centre to the meeting venue list for 2017.

3.5. Staff recommend that the Mandeville Sports Centre is not utilised again due to not being able to ensure it has exclusive use of the space for the duration of the meeting. When the Board held a meeting in this location, the other user group had the bar operating and this is not considered a conducive or appropriate environment for a Community Board meeting to operate.

3.6. The meeting date and venue schedule does not preclude additional meetings or workshops on other dates. Occasional meetings occurring in other areas of the community, should there be topical items of interest on the agenda, are feasible and can be conducive to greater accessibility for the public to observe democracy and transparency. It has been noted that when a Community Board utilises many venues, the community can be confused by these frequent changes in venue and it is not always beneficial to the community, hence the recommendation to maintain three regular steady venues.

3.7. Therefore it is recommended that meetings occur at West Eyreton Hall, Oxford Town Hall, and Ohoka Community Hall and/or Ohoka Domain Pavilion as the most appropriate facilities. The Ohoka Domain Pavilion is due for refurbishment in early 2018; once completed and subject to other community bookings this venue would be considered for future use.

3.8. In the event of insufficient business for any one month, the Board may wish to hold a workshop on topical matters, in consultation with the Chairperson. It is the responsibility of the Chairperson to cancel any meeting, in consultation with Council staff.

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

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. The established pattern of the Community Board meetings has generally worked well for members, taking into account other community commitments. Other Community Board meetings start either at 4.00pm or 7.00pm.

4.2. Community views were not sought. We are not aware of any adverse comments from the public on meeting times.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. All meetings are serviced from existing Council budgets. Meeting venues are generally Council owned assets and are not charged. The remuneration payable to the Community Board members is based on an annual sum set by the Remuneration Authority.
5.2. The one venue suggested that is not a Council owned asset is Ohoka Community Hall; there may therefore be a charge to utilise this space that would be paid for from the Board’s operational budget.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Legislation**

Local Government Act 2002 schedule 7 clause 19.

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision-making by local, regional and national organisations that affect our District.

Sarah Nichols
Governance Manager
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board’s ratification of its submission to Environment Canterbury (ECan) regarding RC175184 Canterbury Landscape Supplies Ltd 949 South Eyre Road & 33 Diversion Road Eyreton.

Attachments:

i. The Oxford-Ohoka Community Board’s Submission to ECan (Trim 171024114418)

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 171027116328.

(b) Ratifies the Board’s Submission to ECan regarding RC175184 Canterbury Landscape Supplies Ltd 949 South Eyre Road & 33 Diversion Road Eyreton. (Trim 171024114418)

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

3.1. Public submissions to ECan regarding RC175184 Canterbury Landscape Supplies Ltd closed on 26 October 2017.

3.2. A draft submission was circulated to Board members via email on 18 October and comments sought.

3.3. The submission was approved by the Board Chairperson in order to meet the deadline of 26 October.

3.4. The Management Team has reviewed this report.

4. COMMUNITY VIEWS

4.1. A Public submission period closed 26 October 2017.
5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

5.1. An external, independent, consultant Planner was employed to work with the Board to produce their finished submission to prevent any perception of conflict of interest.

6. **CONTEXT**

6.1. **Policy**

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

6.2. **Legislation**

   Not Applicable.

6.3. **Community Outcomes**

   6.3.1. There is a safe environment for all.
   
   6.3.2. The land is healthy.
   
   6.3.3. Businesses in the district are diverse, adaptable, and growing.
   
   6.3.4. The air is clean.
   
   6.3.5. People have wide ranging opportunities for learning and being informed.
   
   6.3.6. The distinctive character of our towns, villages and rural areas is maintained.
   
   6.3.7. There is sufficient clean water to meet the needs of communities and ecosystems.
   
   6.3.8. There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making by local, regional and national organisation that affects our District.

Karyn Ward
Community Board Advocate
The Oxford-Ohoka Community Board (the Community Board) is elected to represent and advocate for the interests of more than 8,000 residents within Oxford and the surrounding areas of Eyereton, Ohoka, Mandeville and Swannanoa. The Community Board is concerned about the current unconsented composting operations undertaken by Canterbury Landscape Supplies (CLS) at 97 Diversion Road and 949 South Eyre Road, Swannanoa and the effects the operation is having on the environment and the community. The Community Board wish to submit in opposition of the following two resource consent applications made by CLS to the Canterbury Regional Council:

- **CRC175344** to discharge contaminants (including odour and dust) into air from a composting operation; and

- **CRC175345** to discharge contaminants into land that may enter water as a result of the composting and stockpiling of compost on land.

In particular, the Community Board is concerned about the potential adverse effects on air quality and sensitive receptors arising from the dust and odour nuisance and the potential adverse effects on groundwater quality and groundwater abstractors as a result of the operation.
Potential adverse effects on air quality and sensitive receptors

The composting operations proposed, and currently being undertaken, are causing, and have the potential to cause, adverse effects on air quality and localised sensitive receptors if not managed appropriately.

**Dust nuisance**

Vehicle movements across the site, loading and unloading of materials, stockpiling, blending and turning of compost can cause dust nuisance if not managed appropriately. Uncontrolled discharges of dust arising from the site can cause soiling of surfaces including vegetation, windows and powerlines. Dust can also cause adverse health effects for the nearby community, particularly those whose health is already compromised. The stockpiling of compost at the site is also a fire risk and has the potential to combust, resulting in an uncontrolled discharge of unknown particulate matter into air. The Community Board is concerned that measures to mitigate dust proposed by CLS are not adequate to prevent any dust generated extending beyond the site boundary and causing nuisance effects and adverse health effects for the local community. In addition, the application does not include a dust management plan which is required under the provisions of the proposed Canterbury Air Regional Plan (pCARP) to set out the practices or actions that will be undertaken to ensure the overall frequency, intensity, duration, offensiveness and location of a discharge of dust into air is not offensive or objectionable.

**Odour nuisance**

The application states that the production of odour from the site can be adequately avoided, remedied or mitigated. Therefore, the production of odour that is objectionable or offensive from the site is considered by CLS as being of low risk.

While detecting an odour beyond the boundary of a site does not necessarily result in an effect that is offensive and objectionable, the Community Board consider the number of complaints received by the Regional Council since operations commenced at the site indicates that this odour is at times offensive and objectionable. The Community Board is concerned about the adverse effect the offensive and objectionable odour from this site will have on those living adjacent to CLS’s operation and the wider community. The presence of an odour that is objectionable and offensive can result in reduced quality of life and amenity for the community subject to the odour. Strong odours can cause eye and nose irritation for those in close proximity to the odour source. The Assessment of Environmental Effects of Discharges to Air provided with the application summarises guideline setback distances from composting facilities to sensitive receptors. All guidelines listed recommend setback distances of at least 1000 metres, in this case the nearest sensitive receptor is located approximately 820 metres from CLS’s composting operation. The Community Board consider the recommended separation distances should be followed as a minimum to mitigate potential adverse effects.
It is the Community Board’s view that the mitigation measures and conditions proposed in the application do not provide adequate certainty that CLS can manage their operations while avoiding a discharge of odour from the site that is offensive and objectionable. The relevant objectives and policies in the pCARP seek to maintain amenity values of the receiving environment and locate new activities to take into account adjacent land uses and sensitive activities. The Community Board consider the location of CLS’s compost operation in its current state does not take into account adjacent land uses and sensitive activities and as such, does not achieve the intent of the pCARP. In addition, the high number of complaints received by the Regional Council demonstrate that the statements and conclusions made in the application are not valid and the adverse effects of the existing operation are significant.

Potential adverse effects on groundwater quality and groundwater abstractors

Information and assessment provided by CLS considers the potential adverse effects on groundwater quality and users will be less than minor. This is based on a hydrogeologic assessment, assessment of onsite operations and the development of a nitrogen transport model.

The Community Board consider the groundwater resource in the area is highly sensitive, given most of the surrounding dwellings are reliant on private bore water for domestic supplies. Contaminants arising from compost leachate include nitrogen and ammonia, which have the potential to render drinking water unsuitable for consumption. Groundwater in the area is shallow and the area has been defined as a Red Nutrient Allocation Zone in the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan (LWRP), meaning that water quality outcomes in the zone are not currently met. Policies in the LWRP restrict the granting of new or existing resource consents if the activity would cause the water quality outcomes listed in Schedule 8 of the LWRP to not be met. The Community Board consider the potential risk to water quality as a result of CLS’s operations is uncertain. Contaminant transport modelling and the hydrogeologic assessment provided with the application recommends further study is undertaken to improve and verify the conclusions made. As it is uncertain what level of adverse effect may occur, the Community Board do not consider the proposed conditions provide sufficient certainty that any contamination of groundwater via leaching or runoff would be detected or managed appropriately.

Overall the Community Board considers the discharge into land where contaminants may enter groundwater provides an unacceptable level of risk to groundwater quality and the community who are reliant on bore water supply in close proximity to the site.
Conclusion

Overall the Community Board do not consider the new composting activity is appropriately located to take into account existing adjacent land uses and sensitive activities. The Community Board is concerned that the application in its current state lacks the level of certainty required for such a proposal at this stage of the resource consent process and the adverse effects already arising from the operation are significant and not in accordance with the objectives and policies of the pCARP and LWRP. It is the Community Board’s view that an alternative location with adequate separation distances from sensitive receptors and groundwater abstractors is the most appropriate option for this proposal.

The Community Board seeks the following decision from the Regional Council:

That CRC175344 to discharge odour and dust into air and CRC175345 to discharge contaminants into land where contaminants may enter groundwater are refused.

The Oxford-Ohoka Community Board wish to be heard in support of their submission.

Yours sincerely

Doug Nicholl
Chairperson
Oxford-Ohoka Community Board

c.c. Loe Pearce & Associates
100 Weston Road
Christchurch 8052
Attn: Barry Loe
Email: barrylow@xtra.co.nz
Appendix 1 – Relevant pCARP and LWRP Provisions

pCARP Provisions

Objective 5.2
Ambient air quality provides for the health and wellbeing of the people of Canterbury.

Objective 5.6
Amenity values of the receiving environment are maintained.

Objective 5.7
Discharges from new activities are appropriately located to take into account of adjacent land uses and sensitive activities.

Policy 6.5
Offensive and objectionable effects are unacceptable and actively managed by plan provisions and the implementation of management plans.

Policy 6.6
Discharges into air from new activities are appropriately located and adequately separated from sensitive activities taking into account land use anticipated by a proposed or operative district plan and the sensitive of the receiving environment.

LWRP Provisions

Objective 3.6
Water is recognised as essential to all life and is respected for its intrinsic values.

Objective 3.8A
High quality fresh water is available to meet the actual and reasonably foreseeable needs for community drinking water supplies.

Objective 3.23
Soils are healthy and productive, and human-induced erosion and contamination is minimised.

Objective 3.24
All activities operate at good environmental practice or better to optimise efficient resource use and protect the region’s freshwater resources from quality and quantity degradation.
Policy 4.7
Resource consents for new or existing activities will not be granted if the granting would cause a quality or quantity limit set in Sections 6 to 15 to be breached or further over allocation (water quality and/or water quantity) to occur or in the absence of any water quality standards in Sections 6 to 15, the limits set in Schedule 8 to be breached. Replacement consents, or new consents for existing activities may be granted to:

(a) allow the continuation of existing activities at the same or lesser rate or scale, provided the consent contains conditions that contribute to the phasing out of the over allocation (water quality and/or water quantity) within a specified timeframe; or

(b) exceed the allocation limit (water quality and/or water quantity) to a minor extent and in the short-term if that exceedance is part of the proposal to phase out the over-allocation within a specified timeframe included in Sections 6 to 15 of this Plan.

Policy 4.8A
(1) When considering any application for a discharge the consent authority must have regard to the following matters:

(a) the extent to which the discharge would avoid contamination that will have an adverse effect on the life-supporting capacity of fresh water including on any ecosystem associated with fresh water and

(b) the extent to which it is feasible and dependable that any more than minor adverse effect on fresh water, and on any ecosystem associated with fresh water, resulting from the discharge would be avoided.

(2) When considering any application for a discharge the consent authority must have regard to the following matters:

(a) the extent to which the discharge would avoid contamination that will have an adverse effect on the health of people and communities as affected by their secondary contact with freshwater; and

(b) the extent to which it is feasible and dependable that any more than minor adverse effect on the health of people and communities as affected by their secondary contact with fresh water resulting from the discharge would be avoided.

(3) This policy applies to the following discharges (including a diffuse discharge by any person or animal):

(a) a new discharge or

(b) a change or increase in any discharge – of any contaminant into fresh water, or onto or into land in circumstances that may result in that contaminant (or, as a result of any natural process from the discharge of that contaminant, any other contaminant) entering fresh water.
Policy 4.8B

(1) When considering any application the consent authority must have regard to the following matters

(a) the extent to which the change would adversely affect safeguarding the life supporting capacity of fresh water and of any associated ecosystem and

(b) the extent to which it is feasible and dependable that any adverse effect on the life supporting capacity of fresh water and of any associated ecosystem resulting from the change would be avoided.

(2) This policy applies to:

(a) any new activity and

(b) any change in the character, intensity or scale of any established activity – that involves any taking, using, damming or diverting of fresh water or draining of any wetland which is likely to result in any more than minor adverse change in the natural variability of flows or level of any fresh water, compared to that which immediately preceded the commencement of the new activity or the change in the established activity (or in the case of a change in an intermittent or seasonal activity, compared to that on the last occasion on which the activity was carried out).

Policy 4.14

Any discharge of a contaminant into or onto land where it may enter groundwater (excluding those passive discharges to which Policy 4.26 applies):

(a) will not exceed the natural capacity of the soil to treat or remove the contaminant; and

(b) will not exceed available water storage capacity of the soil; and

(c) where meeting (a) and (b) is not practicable, the discharge will:

(i) meet any nutrient limits in Schedule 8 or Sections 6 to 15 of this Plan; and

(ii) utilise the best practicable option to ensure the size of any contaminant plume is as small as is reasonably practicable; and

(iia) ensure there is sufficient distance between the point of discharge, any other discharge and drinking-water supplies to allow for the natural decay or attenuation of pathogenic micro-organisms in the contaminant plume; and

(iii) not result in the accumulation of pathogens, or a persistent or toxic contaminant that would render the land unsuitable for agriculture, commercial, domestic, cultural or recreational use or water unsuitable as a source of potable water or for agriculture; and

(iv) not raise groundwater levels so that land drainage is impeded.
**Policy 4.23**

*Any water source used for drinking-water supply is protected from any discharge of contaminants that may have any actual or potential adverse effect on the quality of the drinking-water supply including its taste, clarity and smell and community drinking water supplies are protected so that they align with the CWMS drinking-water targets and meet the drinking-water standards for New Zealand.*
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT

FILE NO and TRIM NO: GOV-26-10-06 / 171009109016

REPORT TO: Oxford-Ohoka Community Board

DATE OF MEETING: 9 November 2017

FROM: Edwina Cordwell - Governance Adviser

SUBJECT: Ratification of the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board’s Submission regarding the District Plan Review ‘Comments and Issues’ Phase.

SIGNED BY: (for Reports to Council or Committees) Department Manager Chief Executive

1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek the Board’s ratification of its submission regarding the Waimakariri District Council’s District Plan Review ‘Comments and Issues’ Phase.

Attachments:

i. The Oxford-Ohoka Community Board’s Submission to the Waimakariri District Council (Trim 171009108984).

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

(a) Receives report No. 171009109016.

(b) Ratifies the Board’s Submission regarding the Waimakariri District Council’s District Plan Review ‘Comments and Issues’ Phase (Trim 171009108984).

3. ISSUES AND OPTIONS


3.2. Board members informally agreed to submit with a formal decision to this effect being made at the Board’s meeting of 5 October 2017.

3.3. A discussion session was held on 12 October 2017 and an initial draft circulated for comment on 16 October 2017.

3.4. The submission was approved by the Board Chairperson in order to meet the deadline of 27 October.

3.5. The Management Team has reviewed this report.
4. COMMUNITY VIEWS


5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

5.1. Not applicable.

6. CONTEXT

6.1. Policy

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

6.2. Legislation

Not Applicable.

6.3. Community Outcomes

There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that affects our District.

Edwina Cordwell
Governance Advisor
District Plan Comments and Issues Phase - October 2017

Oxford-Ohoka Community Board

In general Board members welcomed an activity based plan. It was felt that any rules needed to be very clear and enable enforcement action. It was also felt that enforcement needed to take place quickly and effectively if further issues such as the plastics factory and composting operation were to be avoided.

There was also a general feeling that any proposals should not cause any untoward or detrimental affect on accepted and current ‘farming practices’.

1. Transport and Utilities

Transport

Board members felt that Rangiora is identified as the ‘centre’ of the District and that it should be planned and developed accordingly. Existing roads and routes through the township are not well signed and it is extremely difficult to navigate through or around the centre – like a rabbit warren. The ‘centre’ of the town is itself not well defined with commercial and retail now spreading in a number of directions adding to the confusion. It appears to be haphazard and needs to be planned.

There is some concern that the impact of Ravenswood has not been fully factored into the District’s traffic management strategies.

Perhaps a form of ring road to take heavy vehicles away from the ‘defined centre’ would be beneficial. One member suggesting Temuka as a model enabling freight to by pass and local traffic to more easily enter the township.

Parking is not easy and a new parking building should be considered to match the much needed increase in patronage of the town and its facilities.

There is a need for an integrated transport network across the District linking the main centres, larger subdivisions and key activity hubs including access to SH1 north and south. Rangiora/Woodend was noted in particular.

Freight management needs to be considered with the most effective methods of transit through the District identified to limit damage to roads and reduce the adverse effects of such activities on the smaller villages and townships.

‘Uber style’ transport options and self-driving vehicles need to be considered in any strategies.

Electric fleet vehicles for large corporates and Government agencies including CCC are being introduced rapidly with a commensurate need for charging points and easy accessibility to these.

Car ownership may change as in other countries to be that of a ‘shared’ ownership with cars parked at various locations available for pick up by a range of these ‘shared users’ to enable one car to be more fully utilised rather than multiple cars under used. An enhanced version of the WDC car pool for general participation.

It was also noted that electric vehicles are silent which may cause safety issues for pedestrians and those with disabilities.

Utilities
There is general concern regarding the increase in the number of houses being built and the demands these place on the relevant infrastructure. Drainage, sewage and other utilities will need to be increased with accompanying costs to the ratepayers. It is suggested that further integrated future planning is needed using the combined expertise of 3 Waters and drainage staff working with developers and planners.

There is also concern that existing septic tanks have a finite life span and that many will be either have failed or will fail over the coming years leaching contaminants into the soil which may go undetected for many years. Long term planning for sewage and septic tank failures is needed. Members also suggest that further rural subdivisions will exacerbate this situation and that these should now be limited.

There should be very limited and controlled discharges to ground and only ‘on site’ treatments permitted to ensure that even those bio solids currently collected from septic tanks will not require treatment at the main sewage ponds, thereby progressively reducing the need for bio solid processing generally.

Flood prone/natural hazards areas should be prohibited from subdivision, or further development e.g. Mandeville.

The location and height of concrete pads should be carefully considered as part of housing design. Raised pads can alleviate flooding and assist with water run-off. Piles appear not to being used extensively in modern foundation construction and members felt that this should be reviewed and potentially encouraged.

A modern telecommunications network is essential and the Council is requested to lobby service providers, the Mayoral Forum and government to ensure that a high speed solution is available district wide. It is understood that there is inconsistency of charging for even phone calls across the District.

2. Heritage and Open Space

A higher level of protection is needed for historic buildings in particular facades even if the main building cannot be protected. Board members recognise and understand the reasons why the listing process is currently voluntary but would seek ways in which appropriate owners could be encouraged to list some or all of their properties.

Farm buildings, stables and shearing sheds should perhaps be considered and relevant owners approached and made aware of the listing process.

Notable trees are extremely important and more protection is needed.

3. Rural Zones

The Board agree that a clear definition of ‘rural’ is needed. Activities need to be defined as well as the locations across the district where they will be permitted to take place.

There is a need to limit subdivision in areas where there is fertile soil capable of food production and of value to NZ and the economy. Subdivision of larger farms on such soils should not be permitted. Farm production is a key contributor to the local and national economy and needs to be retained and enhanced. This also applying to more modern and technological methods of farming and food production. Retention of ‘future’ food chains and sources must be protected.
Clear rules regarding quarrying and the associated effects of quarrying – lorries, dust and other particulates need to be defined. If mitigation is in place this should be strictly monitored on a regular basis and enforcement action able to be instigated swiftly. It is noted that some methods of cultivation may produce dust and these will need to continue and potentially be separately defined to those associated with quarrying.

It is suggested that all non-listed rural activities should be publicly notified.

New subdivision developers and those buying in the subdivisions need to be informed from the start about what activities are or could be permitted in the area around them in the future under the DP. Whether this could be on the LIM, so that there are no surprises for new residents when ‘permitted activities’ establish in the future nearby.

There are concerns that a lot of land across the district is not being used effectively or appropriately and restrictions are needed to halt this for the future.

Town boundaries also need to be defined and enforced.

More use of conservation methods for water and self-sustainability should be required for life stylers. Farmers are already engaged significantly in these activities.

The Board notes that each lifestyle block usually requires a new well to be dug leading to a proliferation of water takes over and above that which would be required by a ‘traditional’ large farm on the same acreage.

De-forestation is also having an impact on the landscape and fertility of the land and needs to be carefully monitored and managed.

Palm kernel importation and usage is increasing with the potential to introduce new weed and other species in to New Zealand as well as having a direct impact on the fertility of our soils. The long term impact is hard to measure and could give rise to serious adverse consequences for the NZ economy and landscape.

It was noted that the Zone Committee and Farm Management Plans are making a significant contribution but that this is not all encompassing.

Shingle extraction also impacts on the rural landscape and changes the environment considerably and permanently. Plans for future sites when existing ones are exhausted need to be defined.

There is general concern that Environment Canterbury enforcement activities do not seem to be having any real affect and abatement notices are being ignored and potentially damaging practices allowed to continue.

Again perhaps this could be raised at the Mayoral Forum.

4. Natural Environments

Many of the comments for 3 above also apply to this topic.

Members assert that more pressure should be placed on farmers to plant out waterways rather than just fencing off to prevent cattle access to these areas. This to apply to all land users including life stylers.
There is also concern that weed eradication near to roadside drains and water races as well as creeks and streams may be toxic and affecting aquatic life. It is understood that there is currently little monitoring of the pesticides used and the impact of these on life.

Riparian and Esplanade management and plantings are supported as well as setbacks. It is felt that earthworks could be managed better and monitored. Some concerns regarding the loss of clay from the substrate soil when such earthworks are dug leading to problems with water loss and retention.

It is also unclear what is being buried under and within larger earth works and how this is monitored. Anecdotal evidence suggests that monitoring does not take place and inappropriate material potentially creating future hazards can easily be buried without any awareness for many years to come.

Board member suggest the rules are quite weak at the moment and need to be strengthened together with the associated enforcement activity.

Smaller biodiversity issues on smaller sub divisions/lifestyle lots can be missed – e.g. felling of trees and leaching into the aquifers.

It is noted that the activities of the Zone Committee and Farm Management Plans are beginning to yield visible improvements and should be publicised and supported.

5. Retail, Commercial and Industrial Activities

Better management of the expansion of Rangiora is needed with clear planning for what is required and where activities should take place.

Oxford Township needs to retain its unique look and feel and this needs to be reflected within the District Plan.

Many other small townships such as Ohoka, Mandeville, Swannanoa and West Eyreton also need to retain their character and this may require specific restrictions and rules within the District Plan to ensure that this occurs. There is concern that commercial style buildings are already ‘creeping’ into Oxford and other towns given the current relaxed rules and that this needs to be prevented quickly so as not to enable a precedent to be set.

It is acknowledged that a little more land in an appropriate location may be needed for industrial zoning.

The shopping mall type areas within Rangiora are disconnected and need to link to the Town Centre. Need to have parking plans that are realistic and support the local economy and shoppers and their requirements. Shopper behaviour and the elderly trend for the population generally suggests that parking should be co-located or very near to shopping areas.

6. Residential Zones

There is a need to fully plan the consequences of residential developments prior to them being approved. It is felt that a number of elements were missed or not evaluated properly for the Mandeville area which has led to serious issues with flooding and other matters.

The pre requisite for model and formally evaluate run off due to sealing of roads and concrete pads for houses should be undertaken and used to regulate the proposed development design.
Sea level rise should be an active consideration.

Critical infrastructure such as water supply and pump sheds should be built on higher or less hazard prone land.

Lessons should be learned from the negative and long term issues arising out of the areas of intensive and ‘same design’ housing at Pegasus and should be avoided.

Street widths need to be maintained and not reduced to enable developers to build more houses. Pegasus road widths are reduced in a number of areas and now causing many issues as parking increases and access is made even harder for other residents and emergency vehicles.

Houses need to inspire for the long term and whilst affordable housing is much needed this can also be achieved in a variety of styles and finishes.

Apartments are not conducive to New Zealand so should be avoided. There should be no more intensive/same style housing permitted in the District.

Ravenswood has the ability to learn and to develop in a more suitable manner and the Board sincerely hope that this can be achieved. Whilst smaller section sizes are required this should not be at the expense of design and a house that is liveable and practical and can be enjoyed in quality surroundings and in a mixed development encouraging neighbourliness and community spirit.

Doug Nichol – Chairperson
Dear @submitter.title @submitter.last_name

**Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan and Kerbside Options**

On behalf of the Council I would like to thank you for your interest in, and time taken to prepare your submission on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan. The Hearing Panel valued the opportunity to hear submissions from whose who presented their submission in person. The Panel also noted the widely divergent community opinions about rural recycling services, multiple bin collections and the collection and composting of organic waste.

The Hearing Panel has recommended to Council that Option C (four service choices for kerbside collections) be included in the draft Long Term Plan 2018-2028 for further consultation, and also recommended that residents have the choice to 'opt-in' to receive bin collection services. The Council will consider the Hearing Panel recommendation at their meeting on 7 November 2017.

The draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan will be amended to reflect the Council’s decision at their November meeting. The final Waste Management and Minimisation Plan will be presented to Council for adoption on 5 December 2017.

Thank you for your interest in, and contribution to, the development of our District’s Waste Management and Minimisation Plan.

Yours sincerely

Kitty Waghorn
Solid Waste Asset Manager
MANDEVILLE RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

Re Speed Limits at Commercial Development at the Mandeville Village.

Dear Sir,

At our recent meeting dated 18th October, 2017 during the information sharing of the Mandeville Commercial Village the residents were very pleased and totally supported their proposal and shopping complex.

As they discussed the access to and from the site, it was revealed a right turn bay heading eastward into the complex and right turn access out of the complex, this was meet with grave safety concern by all present being so close to Bradleys, McHughs, and tram roads intersections.

A number of suggestions were made to try and get a safe outcome with this new access arrangement.

SUGGESTIONS TO BE CONSIDERED

1. An 80km over the larger area say 500 meters, then a internal 70km closer to the intersections operating over peak times.

2. It was totally agreed by all present that the 80km was too fast for the new traffic arrangement.

3. The speed limits 70km like near Rolleston

4. Similar to the Pine Acres corner.

5. The speed limit indicator like they move around the district indicating your actual speed on a peak time basis only.

6. Incorporate a fenced off lane barrier similar to BP on Johns Road opposite Reward Fresh which prevents all right turns onto Tram Road, this was met with major support at the meeting.

7. The plastic pop up barrier posts similar to Pine Acres and the Tram Road entry onto the motorway to prevent right turning.

8. The Community felt access onto Mandeville Road McHughs Road Tram Road as it gave clear safe access to all uses.

9. Chevron markings between lanes considerably improves site access.

Community suggestions to be considered.
Yours faithfully.

Karen Jackson
SECRETARY
Dear Karen,

Re: Mandeville Business Complex

Thank you for the letter, dated 1 November, sent on behalf of the Mandeville Residents’ Association regarding the Mandeville Business Complex and raising some concerns on the potential entry and exit designs, associated speed limit and other matters.

I would like to reassure the Association that all parties are working with appropriate professional experts to address various aspects of the entry and exit to the complex, including an independent safety audit.

Although the final decision on Speed Limits is a matter for Council, permission to consult the community on any proposal is usually sought from the relevant Community Board. In this instance, although the Board did consider the matter at its meeting of 5 October, members requested further information from staff and no decision to consult was taken at that meeting.

Additional information has now been provided to the Community Board and the Board will reconsider the request to consult at its upcoming meeting on 9 November.

If approval is given the intention would be to undertake community consultation from 10 November through to 24 November. The Board would be updated with the outcome of the consultation and a final decision taken by the Council at its 8 December meeting.

I will ensure that the Association’s letter is forward to the staff working on the Speed Limit Review and ask them to regard it as a formal submission. It will also be placed as correspondence on the Board’s November meeting Agenda.

If you have any further queries or concerns please contact our Senior Transport Engineer - Bill Rice who will endeavour to assist.

With kind regards,

Doug Nicholl
Chairperson
Oxford-Ohoka Community Board
Jill Waldron  
Chairperson  
Waimakariri Access Group  
99 East Belt  
Rangiura  
7400  
Waldron_rga@xtra.co.nz

The Chairperson  
Oxford - Ohoka Community Board  
58 Mill Road  
RD2 Kaiapoi  
7692

20/10/17

Dear Mr Nicholl

The Waimakariri Access Group is a voluntary group of people with a high level of expertise in the area of accessibility issues in the community.

The Waimakariri Access Group (WAG) is a group that advises the council on accessibility issues in the district.

The purpose of the Group is to:
Promote access to public places and facilities in the district and a barrier free environment for all people in the community by:

1) Identifying factors in the social and physical environments in the District which restrict people from carrying out normal activities.
2) Being a point of contact for people with concerns about mobility and/or access in public places in the district.
4) Provide appropriate training on disability and accessibility issues
5) Work collaboratively with the council providing expertise and experience with accessibility issues both environmental and attitudinal.

We would like to invite a person from your board to attend our meetings so we can work together towards a fully inclusive barrier free environment for all people in the community. Our meetings are held on the second Tuesday of the Month at 11 am at the Meeting Room at the Council. Our next meeting is on November 14th.

Yours sincerely

Jill Waldron  
Chairperson

[Handwritten signature]
1. **SUMMARY**

2 October: attended joint session at West Eyreton with members of the Rangiora-Ashley Community Board and the Water Advisory Group re Water Supply projects

5 October: Community Board meeting

11 October: meeting with staff regarding the District Plan Review and Board Submission

12 October: attended the Passchendaele Memorial service at the Kaiapoi Cenotaph

   This was a well-organised and run service and was a tribute to the RSA for providing such a tribute to the men who lost their lives a century ago

12 October: Discussion of the Notified Resource Consent for Canterbury Landscapes

   The Board, supported by an independent planner has made a submission on the matter. This is part of an ongoing consenting process.

18 October: attended the Mandeville Residents’ Association meeting where the main topics of discussion were:

   - Tram Road speed limits and the configuration of the entry/exit to the business park
   - flooding issues, and

19 October: the Board received a presentation on the proposed Parks and Reserves Management Plan

26 October: approved the District Plan Review Submission to meet the deadline also attended Governance Training session for Oxford-Ohoka Board members

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

   **THAT** the Oxford-Ohoka Community Board:

   ** Receives ** report No. 171031117684